Boaventura de Sousa Santos

THE END OF THE COGNITIVE EMPIRE

THE COMING OF AGE OF EPISTEMOLOGIES OF THE SOUTH

THE END OF THE COGNITIVE EMPIRE

This page intentionally left blank

THE END OF THE COGNITIVE EMPIRE

THE COMING OF AGE OF EPISTEMOLOGIES OF THE SOUTH

Boaventura de Sousa Santos

Duke University Press   Durham and London   2018

© 2018 DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

All rights reserved. Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper ∞. Text designed by Courtney Leigh Baker. Cover designed by Matthew Tauch. Typeset in Whitman and Futura by Westchester Publishing Services.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Names: Santos, Boaventura de Sousa, [date] author.
Title: The end of the cognitive empire : the coming of age of epistemologies of the South / Boaventura de Sousa Santos.
Description: Durham : Duke University Press, 2018. | Includes bibliographical references and index.
Identifiers: LCCN 2017059816 (print)
LCCN 2018000306 (ebook)
ISBN 9781478002000 (ebook)
ISBN 9781478000006 (hardcover : alk. paper)
ISBN 9781478000150 (pbk. : alk. paper)
Subjects: LCSH: Knowledge, Sociology of. | Social epistemology. | Social justice—Developing countries.
Classification: LCC HM651 (ebook) | LCC HM651 .S245 2018 (print) | DDC 303.3/72—dc23
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2017059816

This book was developed in the context of the research project Alice—Strange Mirrors, Unsuspected Lessons, coordinated by the author at the Centre for Social Studies of the University of Coimbra–Portugal. The project was funded by the European Research Council, 7th Framework Program of the European Union (FP/2007–13)/ERC Grant Agreement n. [269807] (http://alice.ces.uc.pt/en). This publication also benefits from the financial support of the Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology, under the Strategic Program UID/SOC/50012/2013.

Contents

Preface | vii |

Introduction: Why the Epistemologies of the South? Artisanal Paths for Artisanal Futures | 1 |

PART I. POSTABYSSAL EPISTEMOLOGIES

1. Pathways toward the Epistemologies of the South | 19 |
2. Preparing the Ground | 37 |
3. Authorship, Writing, and Orality | 53 |
4. What Is Struggle? What Is Experience? | 63 |
5. Bodies, Knowledges, and Corazonar | 87 |

PART II. POSTABYSSAL METHODOLOGIES

6. Cognitive Decolonization: An Introduction | 107 |
7. On Nonextractivist Methodologies | 143 |
8. The Deep Experience of the Senses | 165 |
9. Demonumentalizing Written and Archival Knowledge | 185 |

PART III. POSTABYSSAL PEDAGOGIES

10. Gandhi, an Archivist of the Future | 209 |
11. Pedagogy of the Oppressed, Participatory Action Research, and Epistemologies of the South | 247 |
12. From University to Pluriversity and Subversity | 269 |

Conclusion: Between Fear and Hope | 293 |

Notes | 303 | References | 337 | Index | 365 |

This page intentionally left blank

Preface

We live in a period in which the most morally repugnant forms of social inequality and social discrimination are becoming politically acceptable. The social and political forces that used to challenge this state of affairs in the name of possible social and political alternatives seem to be losing steam and, in general, appear to be everywhere on the defensive. Modern ideologies of political contestation have been largely co-opted by neoliberalism. There is resistance, but it is less and less credible as a bearer of a realistic alternative. It occurs increasingly outside institutions and not through the modes of political mobilization prevalent in the previous period: political parties and social movements. Dominant politics becomes epistemological when it is able to make a credible claim that the only valid knowledge available is the one that ratifies its own dominance. In such an epochal *Zeitgeist*, it seems to me that the way out of this impasse is premised upon the emergence of a new epistemology that is explicitly political. This means that the reconstruction or reinvention of confrontational politics requires an epistemological transformation.

Writing in 1845, Karl Marx ends the *Theses on Feuerbach* with the famous thesis eleven: "Philosophers have hitherto only *interpreted* the world in various ways; the point is to *change* it."[1] This thesis would become the cornerstone of Western-centric critical thinking, claiming the centrality of the concept of praxis as the synthesis between theory and practice. Almost two hundred years later, it is imperative that we return to interpretation, to reinterpret the world before trying to change it. The critical theories developed during this period with the specific objective of transforming the world failed to transform it according to what was predicted. Instead, they gave rise to an immense historical frustration made of perverse effects, dreams sliding into nightmares, hopes ending up in deeper fear, and revolutions betrayed; civilizational gains deemed

irreversible ended up undone, and positive expectations were turned into negative ones. Moreover, modern conservative thinking, all along dedicated to preventing the types of changes called for by critical thinking, seems to have been much more successful—so much so that the gradual narrowing down of the alternatives laid out by progressive critical thinking has reached such an extreme in our time that it becomes possible to say what in the last two hundred years was considered too patently wrong to be said: there is no alternative. Once political theory and practice, the domain par excellence for engaging alternatives, credibly claims that there is no alternative, it then assumes an epistemological value. The political becomes epistemological when any political alternative to the current state of affairs is credibly framed in the same way as fancy against fact or as falsehood against truth.

This state of affairs would dictate the end of—or at least the end of the need for—any form of transformative critical thinking, if there were no social groups unsatisfied with the status quo, if there were no social groups fighting against oppression and domination across the globe. But this is patently not the case. How to account for this? How to expand whatever is embryonically present in a present not totally hijacked by this past? To account for such struggles by resorting to the same or to variations of the same critical thinking seems impossible or, if not impossible, self-defeating. After all, why did Eurocentric critical thinking surrender so much for so long? The argument of this book is that in order to answer this question, it is imperative to go beyond the truly magnificent and brilliant body of theories generated by such thinking and to question their epistemological foundations. The core problem is that the epistemological premises of both Eurocentric critical thinking and Eurocentric conservative thinking have strong (and fatal) elective affinities. They represent two different versions of what I call in this book the epistemologies of the North.

An epistemological shift is necessary in order to recover the idea that there are alternatives and indeed to recognize, as the bearers of potential alternatives, the struggles against oppression that continue to be fought in the world. The argument of this book is that such a shift lies in what I call the epistemologies of the South. It amounts to a call for a twelfth thesis: we must change the world while constantly reinterpreting it; as much as change itself, the reinterpretation of the world is a collective endeavor. Six corollaries derive from this thesis. First, we don't need alternatives; we need rather an alternative thinking of alternatives. Second, the constant reinterpretation of the world can only be possible in the context of struggle and, therefore, cannot be conducted as a separate task disengaged from the struggle. Third, as much as struggles mobilize multiple kinds of knowledge, reinterpretation cannot be provided by any sin-

gle body of knowledge. Fourth, given the centrality of social struggles against domination, if, by an absurd hypothesis, the oppressed social groups ceased to struggle against oppression, either because they didn't feel the need or considered themselves utterly deprived of the conditions necessary for struggle, there would be no room, and indeed no need, for the epistemologies of the South. George Orwell's *1984* is the metaphor of the social condition where there is no room for the epistemologies of the South (Orwell 1949). Fifth, we don't need another theory of revolution; we need rather to revolutionize theory. Sixth, since constantly reinterpreting the world while changing it is a collective work, there is no room for philosophers conceived of as vanguard intellectuals. Instead, the epistemologies of the South call for rearguard intellectuals, intellectuals that contribute with their knowledge to strengthening the social struggles against domination and oppression to which they are committed.

In a time characterized by so much desertification of alternatives, it is as difficult to imagine the end of capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy as to imagine that they will have no end (Santos 2014: 19–43). The imagination of the end is being corrupted by the end of imagination. With the fall of the Berlin Wall, global capitalism got rid of a potentially fatal threat that had confronted it throughout the twentieth century—socialism. In the process, it also got rid of a less serious threat, a threat that, while not questioning the possibility of capitalism reproducing itself indefinitely, would affect its drive for concentration of wealth. I have in mind European-style social democracy. Having gotten rid of these two threats, global capitalism seems to be thriving in spite of (or because of) being permanently in crisis. A permanent crisis is a new type of crisis. Instead of demanding to be explained and calling for its overthrow, it explains everything and justifies the current state of affairs as the only possible one, even if it involves the imposition of the most grotesque and unjust forms of human suffering that were supposed to have been thrown into the dustbin of history by the progress of civilization. The slogan "capitalism or barbarism," proclaimed by such mid-twentieth-century apostles of free trade and the minimal state as von Hayek, is sliding into "capitalism *and* barbarism."[2] In the meantime, and not by coincidence, the original cry of "socialism or barbarism" by Rosa Luxemburg is conspicuously absent. Under the logic of permanent crisis, people are led to live and act in crisis but not to think and act critically.

In such a time, those who struggle against domination cannot rely on the light at the end of the tunnel. They must carry with them a portable light, a light that, however shaky or weak, provides enough light to recognize the path as one's own and to prevent fatal disasters. Such is the type of light that the epistemologies of the South propose to generate.

This book is divided into three parts. Part I lays out the foundations for the epistemologies of the South. Part II deals with the methodological issues that arise from doing research consonant with the epistemologies of the South. Part III focuses on the pedagogical challenges posed by the epistemologies of the South. In the introduction, I summarize my argument. The epistemologies of the South occupy the hegemonic conceptions of epistemology, which I call the epistemologies of the North. In spite of resorting to the North-South dichotomy, the epistemologies of the South are not the symmetrical opposite of the epistemologies of the North, in the sense of opposing one single valid knowledge against another one. In chapter 1, I explain the key concepts of the epistemologies of the South: the abyssal line and the distinction between abyssal and nonabyssal exclusions, the sociology of absences, the sociology of emergences, the ecologies of knowledges, intercultural translation, and the artisanship of practices. In chapter 2, I deal with the responses given to the most common objections raised by the epistemologies of the North. I select three of them: the concepts of science, relativism, and objectivity. In chapter 3, I begin an inquiry into the epistemological issues that are specific to or autonomously raised by the epistemologies of the South. In this chapter, I deal with the questions of knowledge authorship and written and oral knowledge. In chapter 4, I deal with two concepts that lie at the core of the ways of knowing in accordance with the epistemologies of the South: the concept of struggle and the concept of experience. In chapter 5, I argue for the corporeality of knowledge, thereby challenging the quintessential mind/body distinction and going beyond Merleau-Ponty's conception of the embodiment of knowledge. I focus on three experiences of embodiment particularly akin to the epistemologies of the South: the dying body, the suffering body, and the rejoicing body. I also deal with what I call the warming-up of reason, the existential point where reasons and emotions meet in order to nurture the will and the capacity to struggle against domination and oppression.

In chapter 6, I introduce the main issues concerning the development of methodologies of research for social struggles consonant with the epistemologies of the South, that is, methodologies of postabyssal research. I argue for the need to decolonize the social sciences and for the search for nonextractivist methodologies, methodologies grounded on subject-subject relations rather than on subject-object relations. Such methodological work requires much epistemological imagination. I identify some of the markers of this imagination. In chapter 7, I analyze in greater detail the existential context in which the methodologies guiding postabyssal research must be conducted. In chapter 8, I focus specifically on the sensory and emotional dimensions of postabyssal

research. The deep experience of the senses lies at the antipodes of the epistemologies of the North, and, as such, it has been demonized, ignored, and oftentimes even suppressed. In chapter 9, I continue to lay out further methodological issues, namely the ways to demonumentalize written knowledge and how to conceive of the counterhegemonic use of the archive as a sociology of emergences.

In chapter 10, I start addressing the pedagogical implications of the epistemologies of the South. I focus on the pedagogy of intercultural translation developed by Mahatma Gandhi and examine the ways in which such a pedagogy may contribute to generate and strengthen transnational articulations among social struggles and movements, thus building counterhegemonic globalization, one of the main goals pursued by the epistemologies of the South. Chapter 11 highlights two radical pedagogies, the pedagogy of the oppressed of Paulo Freire and the participatory action research of Orlando Fals Borda, to which the epistemologies of the South are much indebted. More than anything else it is the context of our *Jetztzeit*, our historical here and now, that accounts for the specificities of the epistemologies of the South in relation to such a brilliant and rich heritage. Chapter 12 deals with the challenges and tasks involved in decolonizing the Western or Westernized university, which has been the nursery and lately the nursing home of the epistemologies of the North. It also addresses the key issue of popular education and illustrates some of the paths through which the university may flourish as a pluriversity and as a subversity.

Most of those to whom I owe this book will not be able to read it. They are the activists and leaders of social movements that have shared their knowledge with me on numberless occasions and in numberless circumstances, at the meetings of the World Social Forum, in retreats and seminars, on marches, and most recently in the workshops of the Popular University of Social Movements. Most particularly, I owe this book to my friends and comrades living in the favela of Jacarezinho in Rio de Janeiro, and to those in Barcouço, a small village close to my hometown, Coimbra, peasants who for more than a decade shared with me the dream of organizing a cooperative, the COBAR (Cooperativa de Barcouço).

In recent years I directed two large international research projects that allowed me to collaborate very closely with a large number of scholars: Reinventing Social Emancipation: Towards New Manifestos (1999–2001), funded by the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation and the Gulbenkian Foundation (see chapter 9); and Alice—Strange Mirrors, Unsuspected Lessons: Leading Europe to a New Way of Sharing the World Experiences (2011–2016), funded by the European Research Council.[3] This book reflects the research and

scientific debates carried out in the context of these two projects, particularly the more recent one. I want to express my most sincere gratitude to my colleagues that shared with me the scientific coordination of the Alice project (by alphabetical order of first name): Bruno Sena Martins, João Arriscado Nunes, José Manuel Mendes, Maria Paula Meneses, Sara Araújo, and Teresa Cunha. Even though all of them took an active role in the preparation of one or more of the chapters of this book, I owe special thanks to Maria Paula Meneses, whose research support was particularly time consuming and diversified. I would also like to thank the whole research team: Alice Cruz, Aline Mendonça, Antoni Aguiló, Cristiano Gianolla, Élida Lauris, Eva Chueca, Francisco Freitas, José Luís Exeni Rodríguez, Julia Suárez-Krabbe, Luciane Lucas dos Santos, Mara Bicas, Maurício Hashizume, Orlando Aragón Andrade, Raúl Llasag Fernández, and Tshepo Madlingozi. A research project of this magnitude could not be carried out without the dedicated and competent collaboration of two staff members, Rita Kacia Oliveira, executive secretary; and Inês Elias, research assistant.

As with all my previous books, Maria Irene Ramalho discussed with me all the main themes and translated into English a good part of the manuscript. Much beyond that, over the years she has helped me to be a better person and a better scholar and never to separate one being from the other. For that, nobody can ever adequately express sufficient gratitude. Most heartfelt thanks are also due to my research assistant Margarida Gomes, who over the years has helped me in my research and in the preparation of manuscripts for publication with unsurpassable competence. My research assistant Mateo Martinez Abarca helped me in my research on *sumak kawsay*. My special thanks to three colleagues: Gustavo Esteva, for conveying to me the full meaning of the Commune of Oaxaca; Miguel Teubal, for helping me to discover the methodological richness of the work of a dear colleague and friend in the meantime deceased, Norma Giarraca; and Mário Chagas, for helping me with the research on the Maré Museum, an insurgent archive. As always, I counted on Mark Streeter for outstanding copyediting. Last but not least, my dear secretary, friend, and collaborator Lassalete Simões, overseeing all my professional activities throughout hectic years, deserves a very special thanks.

The Centro de Estudos Sociais (CES), the social sciences research center of the University of Coimbra, has always been my home. To thank individually all my colleagues and all the staff members would be impossible. At CES we are a community that excels in a rare combination of professional competence and enthusiasm. The following special thanks are, however, imperative: the executive director of CES, João Paulo Dias; the librarians, Maria José Carvalho and

Acácio Machado; and information technology coordinator Pedro Abreu. All of them are my dear friends and all of them combine high professionalism and enthusiastic commitment, the rarest combination of all in research centers of our time. In a world in which the homeless population is growing more than ever, I am fortunate enough to have two homes. My second home for the past thirty years has been the Law School of the University of Wisconsin–Madison. My heartfelt thanks go to dean Margaret Raymond and my colleagues, too many to name here. A special thanks to two staff members: the librarian Jay Tucker, whose generosity is unsurpassable and love for books rivals mine; and Darryl Berney, information technology specialist, always available to ease my uneasy relationship with computers. Two anonymous reviewers of the manuscript made very pertinent comments and suggestions, for which I am very thankful. Last but not least, I would like to thank Gisela Fosado, editor at Duke University Press, for having steered so diligently the publication of this book.

This page intentionally left blank

Introduction

WHY THE EPISTEMOLOGIES OF THE SOUTH? ARTISANAL PATHS FOR ARTISANAL FUTURES

The epistemologies of the South concern the production and validation of knowledges anchored in the experiences of resistance of all those social groups that have systematically suffered injustice, oppression, and destruction caused by capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy. The vast and vastly diversified field of such experiences I designate as the anti-imperial South. It is an epistemological, nongeographical South, composed of many epistemological souths having in common the fact that they are all knowledges born in struggles against capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy. They are produced wherever such struggles occur, in both the geographical North and the geographical South. The objective of the epistemologies of the South is to allow the oppressed social groups to represent the world as their own and in their own terms, for only thus will they be able to change it according to their own aspirations. Given the uneven development of capitalism and the persistence of Western-centric colonialism, the epistemological South and the geographical South partially overlap, particularly as regards those countries that were subjected to historical colonialism. But the overlap is only partial, not only because the epistemologies of the North also flourish in the geographical South (I mean the imperial South, the epistemological little Europes that are to be found and are often dominant in Latin America, the Caribbean, Africa, Asia, and Oceania) but also because the epistemological South is also to be found in the geographical North (Europe

and North America) in many of the struggles waged there against capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy.

The epistemologies of the South concern the knowledges that emerge from social and political struggles and cannot be separated from such struggles. They are not, therefore, epistemologies in the conventional sense of the word. Their aim is not to study knowledge or justified belief as such, let alone the social and historical context in which they both emerge (social epistemology is a controversial concept as well). Their aim, rather, is to identify and valorize that which often does not even appear as knowledge in the light of the dominant epistemologies, that which emerges instead as part of the struggles of resistance against oppression and against the knowledge that legitimates such oppression. Many such ways of knowing are not thought knowledges but rather lived knowledges. The epistemologies of the South occupy the concept of epistemology in order to resignify it as an instrument for interrupting the dominant politics of knowledge. They are experiential epistemologies.[1] There are epistemologies of the South only because, and to the extent that, there are epistemologies of the North. The epistemologies of the South exist today so that they will not be necessary someday.

Occupying Epistemology

The term *epistemology* corresponds roughly to what in German is designated as *Erkenntnistheorie* or *Erkenntnislehre*. Focusing initially on the critique of scientific knowledge, epistemology today has to do with the analysis of the conditions of identification and validation of knowledge in general, as well as justified belief. It has, therefore, a normative dimension. In this sense, the epistemologies of the South challenge the dominant epistemologies on two levels. On the one hand, they consider it a crucial task to identify and discuss the validity of knowledges and ways of knowing not recognized as such by the dominant epistemologies. Their focus is thus on nonexistent knowledges, deemed as such either because they are not produced according to accepted or even intelligible methodologies or because they are produced by absent subjects, subjects deemed incapable of producing valid knowledge due to their subhuman condition or nature. The epistemologies of the South have to proceed according to what I call the sociology of absences, that is to say, turning absent subjects into present subjects as the foremost condition for identifying and validating knowledges that may reinvent social emancipation and liberation (Santos 2014). As stated below, the epistemologies of the South necessarily invoke other ontologies (disclosing modes of being otherwise, those of the oppressed and silenced

peoples, peoples that have been radically excluded from the dominant modes of being and knowing). Since such subjects are produced as absent through very unequal relations of power, redeeming them is an eminently political gesture. The epistemologies of the South focus on cognitive processes concerning meaning, justification, and orientation in the struggle provided by those resisting and rebelling against oppression. The question of validity emerges from this strong presence. The recognition of the struggle and of its protagonists is an act of preknowledge, an intellectual and political pragmatic impulse implying the need to scrutinize the validity of the knowledge circulating in the struggle and generated by the struggle itself. Paradoxically, in this sense, recognition precedes cognition.

On the other hand, the subjects that are redeemed or disclosed, or brought to presence, are often collective subjects, which completely changes the question of knowledge authorship and, therefore, the question of the relation between the knowing subject and the object of knowledge. We are facing processes of social and political struggle in which a kind of knowledge that often does not have an individualizable subject is lived performatively. The knowledges redeemed by the epistemologies of the South are technically and culturally intrinsic to certain practices—the practices of resistance against oppression. They are ways of knowing, rather than knowledges.[2] They exist embodied in social practices. In most cases they emerge and circulate in a depersonalized way, even though certain individuals in the group have privileged access to them or formulate them with more authority (more on this below). While knowledges appropriate reality, ways of knowing embody reality. That is why the English *know-how* is translated into Romance languages as "knowing how to do" (in French, for example, *savoir-faire*).

This distinction between ways of knowing and knowledge was stressed by Foucault (1969), but here it is understood differently. According to Foucault, a way of knowing implies a collective, anonymous process, something unsaid, a historical-cultural a priori accessible only through the archaeology of ways of knowing. However, the ways of knowing that concern the epistemologies of the South are not the cultural a priori, that is, the unsaid of Foucault. At most, they are the unsaids of those unsaids, meaning unsaids that emerge from the abyssal line dividing metropolitan and colonial societies and sociabilities in Western-centric modernity. Such an abyssal line, the most fundamental epistemological fiat of Western-centric modernity, was ignored by Foucault. Foucault's disciplines are as based on the experiences of the metropolitan side of modern sociability as their Foucauldian cultural unsaids. The disciplines are falsely universal not just because they actively forget their cultural unsaids but rather

because they, as much as their cultural unsaids, do not consider the forms of sociability existing on the other, colonial, side of the line. Thus, the Foucauldian unsaid is as falsely common to modernity and as Eurocentric as Kant's idea of rationality as emancipation vis-à-vis nature. This very same form of rationality linked to nature the peoples and sociabilities existing on the other side of the line, in the colonial zone. Of course, both Kant's and Foucault's philosophies are important advancements in relation to the Lockean tabula rasa, according to which knowledge gets inscribed starting from nothing. But, in the place of tabula rasa, they both put forward presuppositions or a prioris that, according to them, condition all contemporary human experience. They were unaware that all that experience was an intrinsically truncated experience, for it had been constructed to disregard the experience of those that were on the other side of the abyssal line—the colonial people. If we wanted to formulate the epistemologies of the South in Foucauldian terms, which is not my purpose here, we would say that they aim at the archaeology of the archaeology of ways of knowing.

Throughout the twentieth century, North-centric feminist epistemologies performed an early occupation of the dominant versions of the epistemologies of the North. They showed that the idea of knowledge conceived of as independent of the experience of the subject of knowledge, on whose basis, especially after Kant, the distinction between epistemology, ethics, and politics was established, was the epistemological translation, and consequent naturalization, of male political and social power. A God's-eye view was the other side of the view from nowhere. Heavily indebted to Foucault, such feminist epistemologies argued, rather, for the situatedness and positionality of knowledge, as well as for the reciprocal implicativeness between the subject and the object of knowledge. However, the said occupation was, in general, only partial, since it did not contest the primacy of knowledge as a separate practice. Not surprisingly, the North-centric feminist epistemologies put pressure on the epistemologies of the North to the latter's limits, but they themselves remained within such limits. They provided, therefore, an internal critique like several others that I mention in this book. They were, however, of crucial importance to open up the space for the emergence of South-centric feminist epistemologies, which broke said limits and performed external critiques of the epistemologies of the North. In doing so, they became a constitutive component of the epistemologies of the South, as shown below.

Before identifying the different degrees of separation between the epistemologies of the South and those of the North, the following questions must

be answered: Are there any mirror games between the epistemologies of the South and of the North to be avoided? Can we build an expanded commons on the basis of otherness?

The Danger of Mirror Images

In contrasting the epistemologies of the South and of the North, we may easily fall into image mirroring, a temptation much akin to the dualistic, binary structure of Western imagination. The dominant currents in the epistemologies of the North have focused on the privileged validity of modern science that has developed predominantly in the global North since the seventeenth century. These currents are based on two fundamental premises. The first one is that science based on systematic observation and controlled experimentation is a specific creation of Western-centric modernity, radically distinct from other sciences originating in other regions and cultures of the world. The second premise is that scientific knowledge, in view of its rigor and instrumental potential, is radically different from other ways of knowing, be they lay, popular, practical, commonsensical, intuitive, or religious.

Both premises contributed to reinforcing the exceptionalism of the Western world vis-à-vis the rest of the world, and by the same token to drawing the abyssal line that separated, and still separates, metropolitan from colonial societies and sociabilities. Both premises have been critically scrutinized, and such criticism actually has gone hand in hand with scientific development since the seventeenth century. To a large extent, it has been an internal criticism, carried out within the Western cultural world and its assumptions. An early and remarkable case is undoubtedly that of Goethe and his theories of nature and color. Goethe was as interested in scientific development as his contemporaries, but he thought that the dominant currents, with their origin in Newton, were totally mistaken. Goethe contrasted the artificial empiricism of controlled experiments with what he called delicate empiricism (*zarte Empirie*), "the effort to understand a thing's meaning through prolonged empathetic looking and seeing grounded in direct experience" (Seamon and Zajonc 1998: 2).[3]

I have analyzed elsewhere different dimensions of internal criticism of modern Western science that was carried out during the last century by the different currents of critical epistemology and by sociology of science and social science studies (Santos 2007c). The epistemologies of the South move beyond internal criticism. They are not so much interested in formulating one more line of criticism than in formulating epistemological alternatives that may

strengthen the struggles against capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy. In this regard, the idea that there is no social justice without cognitive justice is followed, as mentioned above, by the idea that we do not need alternatives; we need rather an alternative thinking of alternatives.

As in the case of the epistemologies of the South, rather than a single epistemology of the North there are several, though they all tend to share some basic assumptions: the absolute priority of science as rigorous knowledge; rigor, conceived of as determination; universalism, conceived of as a specificity of Western modernity, referring to any entity or condition the validity of which does not depend on any specific social, cultural, or political context; truth conceived of as the representation of reality; a distinction between subject and object, the knower and the known; nature as *res extensa*; linear time; the progress of science via the disciplines and specialization; and social and political neutrality as a condition of objectivity.[4]

From the standpoint of the epistemologies of the South, the epistemologies of the North have contributed crucially to converting the scientific knowledge developed in the global North into the hegemonic way of representing the world as one's own and of transforming it according to one's own needs and aspirations. In this way, scientific knowledge, combined with superior economic and military power, granted the global North the imperial domination of the world in the modern era up to our very days.

The epistemologies of the North are premised upon an abyssal line separating metropolitan societies and forms of sociability from colonial societies and forms of sociability, in the terms of which whatever is valid, normal, or ethical on the metropolitan side of the line does not apply on the colonial side of the line.[5] As this abyssal line is as basic as it is invisible, it allows for false universalisms that are based on the social experience of metropolitan societies and aimed at reproducing and justifying the normative dualism metropolis/colony.[6] Being on the other, colonial, side of the abyssal line amounts to being prevented by dominant knowledge from representing the world as one's own and in one's own terms. Herein lies the crucial role of the epistemologies of the North in contributing to reproducing capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy. They conceive of the Eurocentric epistemological North as the only source of valid knowledge, no matter where, in geographic terms, that knowledge is produced. By the same token, the South, that is, whatever lies on the other side of the line, is the realm of ignorance.[7] The South is the problem; the North is the solution. On these terms, the only valid understanding of the world is the Western understanding of the world.

The alienation, self-estrangement, and subordination of the mind that this state of affairs effects on non-Western people, including non-Western social scientists, is eloquently formulated by J. Uberoi, an Indian sociologist. His words deserve a long citation; they were written in 1978, but I wonder if the situation has dramatically changed today from what he described then:

> By the same application of such means it is made to seem that there is only one kind of science, modern Western science, left to rule in the world today. This modern scientific and rational knowledge is the self-existent storehouse of truth and it is *sui generis*, the only one of its kind. The rest is charmingly called "ethnoscience" at best, and false superstition and darkest ignorance at the worst. The relentless logic of this general situation of spiritual travail, which has prevailed steadily over the non-Western world ever since 1550 or 1650 or some similar historical date, inevitably produces in me for one a shameful inferiority complex which I can never hope to overcome alone or in good company. It is a false situation wholly destructive of all scientific originality. With one stroke it kills all the inward joy of understanding, individual and collective, that is the sole truthful sustenance of local intellectual labour. Surely there is no reason in the nature of things why such a subordinate and colonial relation, more or less broken in politics by 1950 or so, should still persist in science. The situation is not at all improved, as I am assured, when it is supposed that there are two different sorts of theories, the imported and the inherited, somehow held together, the one sort for scientific and the other for non-scientific purposes. This seems to me merely to substitute the problem of intellectual self-estrangement for that of subordinate mind; and I do not know which is the worse. As I see it, this is the chief problem of all intellectual life in modern India and in the non-Western world. (Uberoi 1978: 14–15)

However, the anti-imperial South, the South of the epistemologies of the South, is not the reversed image of the North of the epistemologies of the North. The epistemologies of the South do not aim to replace the epistemologies of the North and put the South in the place of the North. Their aim is to overcome the hierarchical dichotomy between North and South. The South opposing the North is not the South constituted by the North as victim, but rather the South that rebels in order to overcome the existing normative dualism. The issue is not to erase the differences between North and South, but rather to erase the power hierarchies inhabiting them. The epistemologies of the South thus affirm and valorize the differences that remain after the hierarchies have

been eliminated. They aim at a bottom-up subaltern cosmopolitanism. Rather than abstract universality, they promote pluriversality. A kind of thinking that promotes decolonization, creolization, or *mestizaje* through intercultural translation.

The epistemologies of the South aim to show that the dominant criteria of valid knowledge in Western modernity, by failing to acknowledge as valid kinds of knowledge other than those produced by modern science, brought about a massive epistemicide, that is to say, the destruction of an immense variety of ways of knowing that prevail mainly on the other side of the abyssal line—in the colonial societies and sociabilities. Such destruction disempowered these societies, rendering them incapable of representing the world as their own in their own terms, and thus of considering the world as susceptible to being changed by their own power and for their own objectives. Such a task is as important today as it was at the time of historical colonialism, since the disappearance of the latter did not imply the end of colonialism as a form of sociability based on the ethnocultural and even ontological inferiority of the other—what Aníbal Quijano (2005) calls coloniality. The coloniality of knowledge (as of power) continues to be fundamentally instrumental in expanding and reinforcing the oppressions caused by capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy.

Retrieving the suppressed, silenced, and marginalized knowledges requires engaging in what I have been calling a sociology of absences, a procedure aimed at showing that, given the resilience of the abyssal line, many practices, knowledges, and agents existing on the other side of the abyssal line are in fact actively produced as nonexistent by the dominant ways of knowing on this side of the abyssal line, and all the more so when they are engaged in resistance against the abyssal exclusions caused by capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy. Identifying the existence of the abyssal line is the founding impulse of the epistemologies of the South and the decolonization of knowledge that is their main objective. Identifying the abyssal line is the first step toward overcoming it, whether at the epistemological or political level. Identifying and denouncing the abyssal line allows for the opening of new horizons regarding the cultural and epistemological diversity of the world. At the epistemological level, such diversity translates into what I designate as an ecology of knowledges, that is, the recognition of the copresence of different ways of knowing and the need to study the affinities, divergences, complementarities, and contradictions among them in order to maximize the effectiveness of the struggles of resistance against oppression.

Can We Build an Expanded Commons on the Basis of Otherness?

The epistemologies of the South reject epistemological or political ghettos and the incommensurabilities they feed on. I would like to bring into consideration some concepts that emerged in the struggles of resistance against Western-centric domination during the last seventy years, and most particularly during the last forty years. Such concepts have been formulated in noncolonial languages and, in spite of that or just because of that, they have gained a specific political weight. Such concepts include *ubuntu*, *sumak kawsay*, *pachamama*, *chachawarmi*, *swaraj*, and *ahimsa*.[8]

During the past forty years, one crucial impulse for the epistemologies of the South has come from the peoples that suffered most harshly the epistemicide provoked by modern science and the genocide resulting from European colonialism. I mean the indigenous peoples of the Americas, Africa, and Oceania. These were the peoples rendered most invisible or discardable by Eurocentric political thinking, including critical theory. Against such erasure, their struggles have been giving shape to proposals that greatly expanded the political agenda of some countries, thus contributing to reveal new facets of the diversity of the social, political, and cultural experience of the world, as well as new repertoires of social emancipation. Such rich experience will be wasted unless it is grasped and valorized by an epistemological turn capable of grounding an adequate politics of knowledge. Such waste will be as much an intellectual loss as a political loss to the world. It will amount to trivializing or making invisible otherwise important social struggles, thus blocking the possibility that such struggles contribute to expanding and deepening the global horizon of social emancipation—the very idea that another world is possible. The epistemologies of the South are the expression of the struggle against a possible double waste: an intellectual as well as a political waste.

Here are some examples, among many others, of the ways in which the emancipatory scripts of the world have been expanding and enriching beyond the confines of Western-centric politics and knowledge. In some cases they invoke practices and ideas that are foreign to Western-centric politics and knowledge and are accordingly expressed in the languages in which they originated; in other cases, they constitute hybrid, non-Eurocentric renditions of Eurocentric concepts, such as law, state, or democracy, and are accordingly expressed in a colonial language usually qualified by an adjective (e.g., communitarian democracy, plurinational state).

The concept of ubuntu, a southern African idea that calls for an ontology of co-being and coexisting ("I am because you are"), exerted a decisive influence on the Truth and Reconciliation Commission that dealt with the crimes of apartheid; it has also exerted some influence on South Africa's constitutional jurisprudence after 1996, besides remaining a topic of major debate in the field of African philosophy.[9] The concept of sumak kawsay, in Quechua, or *suma qamaña*, in Aymara, was included in the constitutions of Ecuador (2008) and Bolivia (2009) in order to designate an emancipatory horizon, that is, the idea of a *buen vivir* / good living that dispenses with the concepts of both development and socialism. Pachamama, also included in the Constitution of Ecuador, designates a non-Cartesian, non-Baconian conception of nature, that is to say, nature not as a natural resource but rather nature as a living being and source of life, to which rights are ascribed as to humans: nature rights side by side with human rights, both having the same constitutional status (chapter 7, article 71, of the Ecuadorian Constitution). The Quechua idea of chachawarmi has become a key concept in the liberation struggles of indigenous women in some countries of Latin America. It designates an egalitarian, complementarian notion of gender relations while dispensing with the patterns and languages underlying Eurocentric feminism.

Long before the struggles that brought the above-mentioned concepts into political agendas, Gandhi was resorting to Hindi to express key concepts in his struggle against British colonialism. One example is swaraj, understood as the quest for deep self-determination, which has recently been recovered in the party politics of India. There is also ahimsa, an important concept in Hindu texts that Gandhi transformed into the crucial principle of resistance as nonviolence, which was adopted by social groups in India and elsewhere.

Several examples of hybrid, non-Eurocentric renditions of Eurocentric concepts could also be given. Indigenous, communitarian democracy is included in article 11 of the Bolivian Constitution as one of the three types of democracy recognized by the political system, the other two being representative and participatory democracy. Communitarian democracy envisages forms of democratic deliberation totally different from those of representative or participatory democracy, the two types usually considered in Eurocentric debates on democracy. Another example is the plurinational state, as enshrined in the constitutions of both Bolivia (article 1) and Ecuador (article 1), which combines the modern Western civic nation with an ethnocultural nation, and which calls for an asymmetrical, nonmonolithic, and intercultural administrative structure.[10] Finally, a social and solidarity economy can express the various forms of grassroots, peasant, indigenous, and communal economy and the kinds of

property associated with them, different among themselves but, as a rule, anticapitalist and anticolonialist (and often also antipatriarchal), based on principles of reciprocity and relationality at the antipodes of capitalist and colonialist logics.

We should not exaggerate the cultural strangeness of the concepts referred to above. They should be understood as hybrid cultural entities, cultural and conceptual mestizajes bringing together Western and non-Western elements. On the one hand, the fact that some of them are included in a hypermodern and Western text, such as a constitution, changes their nature profoundly, if for no other reason than because it requires the transition from an oral culture to a written culture, a transition whose complexity I address below. Besides, the formulations that allow them to enter broader political agendas are necessarily hybrid. For example, the concept of the rights of nature (as established in the Constitution of Ecuador) is a hybrid one, combining Western and non-Western cultural elements.[11] According to indigenous cosmovisions or philosophies, it makes no sense to attribute rights to nature, for nature is the source of all rights. It would be like a monotheistic religion recognizing God's rights. The concept of the rights of nature is a hybrid construct combining the Western notion of rights with the indigenous notion of nature/pachamama. It is formulated in this way to be intelligible and politically effective in a society saturated with the idea of human rights.

It should also be emphasized that a careful and nonmonolithic review of modern Western tradition, that is to say, a review that includes both dominant and marginalized conceptions, will identify in this tradition a complementariness or correspondence with some of these non-Western concepts. For instance, there are affinities between the idea of pachamama and *natura naturans* (as opposed to *natura naturata*) in Spinoza, even if the Spinozan conception was an object of inquisitorial prohibition (the accusation of pantheism) and was submerged under the weight of the Cartesian conception of nature as res extensa, which was to become the commonsensical Western conception of nature. The same undercurrent of Western modernity can be traced through the following centuries, from Goethe's conception of nature to the philosophy of Aldo Leopold and the deep ecology of Arne Naess.[12]

The quest for the recognition and celebration of the epistemological diversity of the world underlying the epistemologies of the South requires that these new (actually, often ancestral and newly reinvented) repertoires of human dignity and social liberation be conceived of as being relevant far beyond the social groups that caused them to emerge from their struggles against oppression. Far from leaving them stuck in identitarian essentialisms, they must be seen as contributing to the renewal and diversification of the narratives and repertoires of

the concrete utopias of another possible world, a more just world (*just* in the broadest sense of the word), as regards relationships not only among human beings but also between human beings and nonhuman beings. Such a renewal is all the more needed because the Eurocentric concepts that designated such utopias in modernity seem to have exhausted their mobilizing efficacy, whether the concept of socialism or even of democracy. Hence, the African idea of ubuntu or the Andean ideas of pachamama and sumak kawsay, once inscribed in the world by the voices of oppressed African or Latin American social groups, became potentially relevant to the struggles against oppression and domination in the world at large. Far from being an idiosyncrasy or eccentricity, they are rather constitutive of a pluriversal polyphony, a polylectal, rather than ideolectal, conception of cultural and political imagination. That is why the vicissitudes these ideas undergo in their originary context do not rob them of their epistemological and political legitimacy. Quite the opposite, they may be sources of inspiration for other struggles in other times and contexts.

Today it is already quite evident that many of the above-mentioned intercultural and plurinational innovations, such as those introduced in the constitutions of Ecuador and Bolivia, are not being carried out in practice, but are rather being subverted and undermined by the dominant political practices; indeed, in recent years, governmental policies and national legislation have been contradicting, often explicitly, what is stated in the constitutions of both countries, a process that has been designated by constitutional lawyers and political sociologists as deconstitutionalization. However radical this process may be, it will not succeed in erasing the inscription of new narratives of dignity and justice that these ideas brought into world struggles against oppression. For example, young ecologists all over the world have been including in their repertoires of struggle the Andean ideas of pachamama and sumak kawsay. They don't have to ask permission of the Andean indigenous peoples, nor need they be experts in Andean cultures. They just have to identify and agree with the overall political and philosophical orientation of those ideas in order to integrate them into the ecologies of knowledges to which they resort in order to give a deeper sense to their struggles, thereby strengthening them.

Degrees of Separation: Building New Homes for Thinking and Acting

The epistemologies of the South raise epistemological, conceptual, and analytical problems, issues, or challenges. Indeed, they raise new questions and seek out new answers, new problems for new solutions. They call for much

methodological critique and innovation. However, some of the problems are bound to be formulated in terms that are to a large extent provided by the dominant epistemologies of the North. Some problems are thus more predictable than others. I identify the following layers of problems, advancing from the most to the least predictable, representing the successive degrees of separation between the epistemologies of the South and of the North. The first layer concerns the problems that directly confront the epistemologies of the South with the epistemologies of the North. They are the foundation upon which the theoretical and methodological issues raised by the epistemologies of the South must be examined. Among them, I mention the following:

1. *The problem of relativism*. Since the ecologies of knowledges consist of the copresence of different kinds of knowledges, how are we to establish their relative validity?
2. *The problem of objectivity*. How is objectivity to be distinguished from neutrality, a distinction at the core of the epistemologies of the South?
3. *The problem of the role of science in the ecologies of knowledges*. Even if modern science is not the only kind of valid knowledge, it is certainly recognized as one of the most important ones. How is scientific knowledge to be articulated with nonscientific knowledge in the ecologies of knowledges?
4. *The problem of authorship*. Most knowledges that emerge from social struggles are collective or operate as such. Rather than having authors, they are authors. Nonetheless, superauthors frequently emerge in the struggles. How does one understand this?
5. *The problem of orality and writing.* Since most of the knowledges present in the ecologies of knowledges circulate orally and some have no written version, how can knowledges in such an evanescent and even imperceptible flux be validated?
6. *The problem of struggle.* Since the knowledge privileged by the epistemologies of the South is born in struggle, what is a struggle and what is its specific epistemological potential or content?
7. *The problem of experience*. Where is the territory where practical relations of struggle are planned, opportunities calculated, risks measured, and pros and cons weighed?
8. *The problem of the corporeality of knowledge.* The epistemologies of the South are about knowledges embodied in concrete bodies, whether collective or individual. Body, as a living entity, is the body that suffers oppression and resists it, that mourns with defeat and death and

rejoices with victory and life. Can an epistemology account for this powerful presence of individual and collective bodies?

9 *The problem of unjust suffering*. We live in a time of war, a time of declared and nondeclared, regular and irregular, internal and imperialist wars. Most of the victims of violence are not actively involved in the conflicts and are therefore innocent. The layers of factors causing such widespread suffering are multiple, thus obscuring the dichotomy between oppressors and oppressed and the ethical and political judgments of suffering. Starting from the consequences rather than from the causes is one possible way of addressing suffering.

10 *The problem of warming up reason, or* corazonar. Inspired by Ernst Bloch, in my previous work I have distinguished between warm reason and cold reason. Warm reason is the reason that lives comfortably with emotions, affections, and feelings without surrendering its reasonableness. In the context of struggle, particularly of struggles that involve personal risks, reason must be warmed up in a very specific way. How can we do it?

11 *The problem of how to relate meaning to copresence.* The centrality of the struggles against oppression in the epistemologies of the South invites engagement with the issue of the possible immediacy of copresence prior to meaning. In struggles, particularly in those involving greater risks, copresence is a thingness that often comes before meaning. Can recognition precede cognition? Can we account for forms of unmediated copresence such as those occurring in struggle?

The second layer of problems concerns the theoretical, methodological, and conceptual reconstructions called for by the epistemologies of the South:

12 *How to decolonize knowledge as well as the methodologies by which it is produced?* Since colonialism is a cocreation, decolonizing entails decolonizing the knowledge of the colonized as much as the knowledge of the colonizer. Does this entail developing hybrid concepts or theories, along the lines of a decolonized mestizaje in which the mix of knowledges, cultures, subjectivities, and practices subverts the abyssal line that grounds the epistemologies of the North?

13 *How to develop methodologies that are consonant with the epistemologies of the South, that is, nonextractivist methodologies?* Abyssal modern social sciences rely on methodologies that extract information from research objects in very much the same way as mining industries extract minerals and oil from nature. The epistemologies of the South,

on the contrary, by relying on knowing-with rather than knowing-about, that is, by relying on the cocreation of knowledge among cognitive subjects, must offer some guidelines as to the methodologies that can carry out such tasks successfully.

14 *What are the contexts for the mixes of scientific and artisanal knowledges in the ecologies of knowledges?* Different knowledges relate differently to the struggles against capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy. Their integration in the ecologies of knowledges raises different issues.

15 *What does it entail to be a postabyssal researcher?* The positionality of different knowing subjects (outsiders/insiders) is crucial to understanding how much unlearning and unthinking is involved in the construction of epistemic *mingas* (see chapter 7). As cognitive processes are embedded in contexts of struggle and resistance, the risks involved must also be considered, as well as the existing wounds and the healing processes.

16 *What is a deep experience of the senses?* To take seriously the idea that knowledge is embodied implies recognizing that knowing is a corporeal activity potentially mobilizing the five senses. For the epistemologies of the North, valorizing the senses as sources of knowledge is out of the question. Only the mind knows; only reason is transparent regarding what is known; hence, only reason is trustworthy. The epistemologies of the South are at the antipodes of such a stance, which raises issues that have been barely charted.

17 *How to demonumentalize written knowledge and promote authorship?* Written knowledge, in general, and scientific knowledge, in particular, is monumental knowledge. Being monumental, it is fatally inadequate to engage in dialogue or conversation with other knowledges, an objective that underlies the whole idea of the epistemologies of the South. Hence the methodological task of demonumentalizing.

18 *The problem of the archive.* How is it possible to retrieve the past experiences and memories of agencies and realities that were subjected to abyssal exclusion by Western-centric abyssal thinking? Through the sociology of absences and the sociology of emergences, the epistemologies of the South open up the archive of the present. But what about the archive of the past, without which no archive of the future is possible?

The third layer of problems concerns the postabyssal pedagogies called for by the epistemologies of the South, the ways in which the epistemologies of

the South are converted into a kind of new common sense for wider subaltern, counterhegemonic publics engaged in progressive transformative practices:

19. *The problem of intercultural translation.* How to articulate and entertain a conversation among different knowledges that, in some instances, are anchored in different cultures?
20. *The problem of popular education.* How to develop, proliferate, and sustain contexts for collaborative self-learning through which the ecologies of knowledges are practiced in light of commonly agreed-upon transformative practices?
21. *The problem of decolonizing the university.* How to refound the university on the basis of the primacy of the principle of cognitive justice?
22. *How to link popular education and the university through ecologies of knowledges and an artisanship of practices?* How to recognize knowledges born or present in social struggles while these are being fought and, once ended, irrespective of their outcomes?

The first layer of problems is dealt with in chapter 2 (1–3), chapter 3 (4 and 5), chapter 4 (6 and 7), and chapter 5 (8–11). The second layer of problems is dealt with in chapter 6 (12), chapter 7 (13–15), chapter 8 (16), and chapter 9 (17 and 18). The third layer of problems is analyzed in chapter 10 (19), chapter 11 (20), and chapter 12 (21 and 22).

Part I

POSTABYSSAL EPISTEMOLOGIES

This page intentionally left blank

PATHWAYS TOWARD THE EPISTEMOLOGIES OF THE SOUTH

The main tools of the epistemologies of the South are as follows: the abyssal line and the different types of social exclusion it creates; the sociology of absences and the sociology of emergences; the ecology of knowledges and intercultural translation; and the artisanship of practices.

Abyssal and Nonabyssal Exclusions

I have been arguing that modern science, particularly modern social sciences, including critical theories, have never acknowledged the existence of the abyssal line (Santos 2007a: 45–89; 2014). Modern social sciences have conceived of humanity as a homogeneous whole inhabiting this side of the line and hence as wholly subjected to the tension between regulation and emancipation. Of course, modern science did acknowledge the existence of historical colonialism based on foreign territorial occupation, but it did not recognize colonialism as a form of sociability that is an integral part of capitalist and patriarchal domination, and which, therefore, did not end when historical colonialism ended. Modern critical theory (which expresses the maximum possible consciousness of Western modernity) imagined humanity as a given, rather than as an aspiration. It believed that all humanity could be emancipated through the same mechanisms and according to the same principles, by claiming rights

before credible institutions grounded on the idea of formal equality before the law. At the very heart of this modernist imagination is the idea of humanity as a totality built upon a common project: universal human rights. Such humanistic imagination, an heir to Renaissance humanism, was unable to fathom that, once combined with colonialism, capitalism would be inherently unable to relinquish the concept of the subhuman as an integral part of humanity, that is to say, the idea that there are some social groups whose existence cannot be ruled by the tension between regulation and emancipation, simply because they are not fully human. In Western modernity there is no humanity without subhumanities. At the root of the epistemological difference there is an ontological difference.

In this regard, Frantz Fanon is an unavoidable presence. He eloquently denounced the abyssal line between metropolis and colony, as well as the kinds of exclusions that the abyssal line creates. He also formulated, better than anyone else, the ontological dimension of the abyssal line, the zone of nonbeing it creates, the thing into which the colonized is transformed, a thing that only "becomes man during the same process by which it feels free" (Fanon 1968: 37). Inspired by Fanon, Maldonado-Torres proposes the concept of coloniality of being as side by side with the concepts of coloniality of power and coloniality of knowledge: "colonial relations of power left profound marks not only in the areas of authority, sexuality, knowledge and the economy, but on the general understanding of being as well" (2007: 242). "Invisibility and dehumanization are the primary expressions of the coloniality of being. . . . The coloniality of being becomes concrete in the appearance of liminal subjects, which mark, as it were, the limit of being, that is, the point at which being distorts meaning and evidence to the point of dehumanization. The coloniality of being produces the ontological colonial difference, deploying a series of fundamental existential characteristics and symbolic realities" (2007: 257).

The abyssal line is the core idea underlying the epistemologies of the South. It marks the radical division between forms of metropolitan sociability and forms of colonial sociability that has characterized the Western modern world since the fifteenth century. This division creates two worlds of domination, the metropolitan and the colonial world, two worlds that, even as twins, present themselves as incommensurable. The metropolitan world is the world of equivalence and reciprocity among "us," those who are, like us, fully human. There are social differences and power inequalities among us that are prone to creating tensions and exclusions; in no case, however, do these question the basic equivalence and reciprocity among us. For this reason, the exclusions are nonabyssal. They are managed by the tension between social regulation and social emancipation as well as by the mechanisms developed by Western modernity to manage it, such

as the liberal state, the rule of law, human rights, and democracy. The struggle for social emancipation is always a struggle against social exclusions generated by the current form of social regulation with the objective of replacing it by a new and less excluding form of social regulation.

By the same token, the colonial world, the world of colonial sociability, is the world of "them," those with whom no equivalence or reciprocity is imaginable since they are not fully human. Paradoxically, their exclusion is both abyssal and nonexistent as it is unimaginable that they might ever be included. They are on the other side of the abyssal line. The relations between us and them cannot be managed by the tension between social regulation and social emancipation, as happens on this side of the line in the metropolitan world, nor by the mechanisms pertaining to it. These mechanisms, such as the liberal state, the rule of law, human rights, and democracy may be invoked but only as a form of deception. On the other side of the line, the exclusions are abyssal, and their management takes place through the dynamics of appropriation and violence; the appropriation of lives and resources is almost always violent, and violence aims directly or indirectly at appropriation. The mechanisms at work have evolved over time but remain structurally similar to those of historical colonialism, that is to say, those mechanisms involving violent regulation without the counterpoint of emancipation. I mean the colonial and neocolonial state, apartheid, forced and slave labor, extrajudicial elimination, torture, permanent war, the primitive accumulation of capital, internment camps for refugees, the dronification of military engagement, mass surveillance, racism, domestic violence, and femicide. The struggle against appropriation and violence is the struggle for total liberation from colonial social regulation. Contrary to the struggle for social emancipation on the metropolitan side of the abyssal line, the struggle for liberation does not aim at a better and more inclusive form of colonial regulation. It aims at its elimination. The priority given by the epistemologies of the South to abyssal exclusions and the struggles against them is due to the fact that the epistemicide caused by the Eurocentric modern sciences was far more devastating on the other side of the abyssal line, as colonial appropriation and violence were converted into the colonial form of social regulation. Modern critical theories recognized the different degrees of exclusion but refused to consider qualitatively different types of exclusion and were therefore totally unaware of the abyssal line. This is not to say that nonabyssal exclusions and the struggles against them are not equally important. Of course they are, if for no other reason than because the success of the global struggle against modern domination cannot be achieved if it does not include the struggle against nonabyssal exclusions. If the epistemologies of the South do not grant any epistemological

privilege to nonabyssal exclusions, it is only because the latter benefited from much cognitive investment and because the struggles against them for the past five hundred years have been far more visible politically. From the perspective of the epistemologies of the South, nonabyssal exclusions and the struggles against them gain a new centrality once the existence of the abyssal line is recognized. The political agenda of the groups struggling against capitalist, colonial, and patriarchal domination must then accept as a guiding principle the idea that abyssal and nonabyssal exclusions work in articulation, and that the struggle for liberation will be successful only if the different struggles against the different kinds of exclusion are properly articulated.

An incursion into the lived experience of abyssal and nonabyssal exclusion may help to clarify what has been stated. Following the end of historical colonialism, the abyssal line persists as colonialism of power, of knowledge, of being, and goes on distinguishing metropolitan sociability from colonial sociability.[1] These two worlds, however radically different, coexist in our postcolonial societies, both in the geographical global North and in the geographical global South. Some social groups experience the abyssal line while crossing between the two worlds in their everyday life. In what follows, I present three hypothetical examples that are all too real to be considered a mere figment of the sociological imagination.

First example: In a predominantly white society, a young Black man in secondary school is living in a world of metropolitan sociability. He may well consider himself excluded, whether because he is often avoided by his schoolmates or because the syllabus deals with materials that are insulting to the culture or history of peoples of African descent. Nonetheless, such exclusions are not abyssal; he is part of the same student community and, at least in theory, has access to mechanisms that will enable him to argue against discrimination. On the other hand, when the same young man on his way back home is stopped by the police, evidently due to ethnic profiling, and is violently beaten, at such a moment the young man crosses the abyssal line and moves from the world of metropolitan sociability to the world of colonial sociability. From then on, exclusion becomes abyssal and any appeal to rights is no more than a cruel façade.

Second example: In an overwhelmingly Christian society bearing strong Islamophobic prejudices, a migrant worker holding a work permit inhabits the world of metropolitan sociability. He may feel discriminated against because the worker next to him earns a higher salary, even though they both perform the same tasks. As in the previous case, and for similar reasons, such discrimination prefigures a nonabyssal exclusion. However, when he is assaulted in the street just because he is a Muslim and therefore immediately deemed to be a

friend of terrorists, at that particular moment the worker crosses the abyssal line and moves from the world of metropolitan sociability to the world of colonial sociability. In this way, exclusion becomes radical because it focuses on what he is rather than what he says or does.

Third example: In a deeply sexist society, a woman with a job in the formal economy inhabits the world of metropolitan sociability. She is the victim of nonabyssal exclusion to the extent that, in violation of employment labor laws, her male coworkers receive a higher salary to perform the same tasks. On the other hand, when she is returning home and is a victim of gang rape or is threatened with death just because she is a woman (femicide), at that particular moment, she is crossing the abyssal line and moving from the world of metropolitan sociability to the world of colonial sociability.

The crucial difference between abyssal and nonabyssal exclusion is that only the former is premised upon the idea that the victim or target suffers from an ontological *capitis diminutio* for not being fully human, rather a fatally degraded sort of human being. It is therefore unacceptable or even unimaginable that the said victim or target be treated as a human being like us. As a consequence, the resistance against abyssal exclusion includes an ontological dimension. It is bound to be a form of reexistence. As long as the three modes of modern domination (capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy) are in force and act in tandem, large social groups will experience in their lives and in a systematic way, however differently in different societies and contexts, this fatal crossing of the abyssal line. Modern domination is a global mode of articulation between abyssal and nonabyssal exclusions, an articulation that is both uneven, as it varies according to societies and contexts, and combined at the global level. Following historical colonialism, the elusiveness of the abyssal line and the consequent difficulty in recognizing these two types of exclusion are due to the fact that the ideology of metropolitanness, as well as all the juridical and political apparatuses that go with it, hovers above the world of colonial sociability as the ghost of a paradise promised and not yet lost. The end of historical colonialism produced the illusion that the political independence of the former European colonies entailed strong self-determination. From then on, all the exclusions were considered to be nonabyssal; accordingly, the only struggles considered to be legitimate were those that aimed at eliminating or reducing nonabyssal exclusions. This powerful illusion contributed to legitimate struggles that, while attenuating nonabyssal exclusions, aggravated abyssal exclusions. Throughout the twentieth century, European workers achieved significant victories, which amounted to a compromise between democracy and capitalism, known as the European welfare state and social democracy; nevertheless, such victories were

earned, in part at least, by intensifying the violent appropriation of human and natural resources in the colonies and neocolonies, that is to say, at the cost of aggravating abyssal exclusions.[2]

As a consequence of the invisibility and confusion concerning different kinds of exclusion, social groups that are the victims of abyssal exclusion are tempted to resort in their struggles to the means and mechanisms proper to the struggle against nonabyssal exclusion. The current model of aid to development is a good example of how an abyssal exclusion can be disguised (and worsened) by treating it as if it were nonabyssal. The persistence of the invisible abyssal line, and the difficulty in disentangling abyssal from nonabyssal exclusions, makes the struggles against domination even more difficult. However, from the perspective of the epistemologies of the South, liberation is premised upon building alliances between abyssally excluded groups and non–abyssally excluded groups, thereby articulating struggles against abyssal exclusions and against nonabyssal exclusions. Without such an articulation, nonabyssal exclusions, when viewed from the other side of the abyssal line (the colonial side), look credibly like privileged forms of social inclusion. Conversely, abyssal exclusions, when viewed from this side of the abyssal line (the metropolitan side), are alternatively considered as the product of fate, of self-inflicted harm, or of the natural order of things. By the same token, abyssal exclusions are never seen on this side of the line (the metropolitan side) as exclusions, but rather as a fatality or the natural order of things. Historically, social groups excluded by abyssal forms of exclusion have been forced to resort to means of struggle adequate only for fighting against nonabyssal exclusions. No wonder there has been a lot of frustration.

Alliances and articulations are a demanding historical task, not only because different struggles mobilize different social groups and require different means of struggle but also because the separation between struggles against abyssal exclusions and against nonabyssal exclusions overlap with the separation between struggles that are considered to be primordially against capitalism or against colonialism or against patriarchy. Such separation gives rise to contradictory kinds of hierarchies among struggles and among collective subjectivities carrying them out. Thus a struggle conceived of as being against capitalism may be deemed successful to the extent that it weakens a struggle that conceives of itself as being against colonialism or against patriarchy. The opposite is likewise possible. Of course, there are differences between kinds of struggles, but such differences should be mobilized to potentiate the cumulative effect of the struggles and not to justify reciprocal boycotts. Regrettably, reciprocal boycott is what has happened more frequently.

The difficulties in establishing alliances cannot be ascribed to the myopia of social leaders alone, or to the different histories and contexts of the struggle. Between abyssal and nonabyssal exclusions there is a structural difference that affects the struggles against them. Unlike the struggles against nonabyssal exclusions (which fight for change in terms of the logic of regulation/emancipation), the struggles against abyssal exclusions entail a radical interruption of the logic of appropriation/violence. Such an interruption entails a break, a discontinuity. Fanon's insistence that violence is necessary in the decolonization process must be interpreted as an expression of the interruption without which the abyssal line, even if it shifts, goes on dividing the societies into two worlds of sociability: the metropolitan world and the world of coloniality. Interruption may manifest itself in either physical violence or armed struggle, on the one hand, or in boycott or lack of cooperation, on the other (more on this below). Recognizing the abyssal line entails acknowledging that alliances between the struggles against the different kinds of exclusion cannot be built as if all exclusions were of the same kind. Eurocentric critical thought was built upon a mirage, namely that all exclusions were nonabyssal. However vehement the statements against liberal political theory, to think that the struggles against domination can be conducted as if all exclusions were nonabyssal is a liberal prejudice.

The Sociology of Absences and the Sociology of Emergences

Both of these tools are based on the distinction between abyssal and nonabyssal exclusions, as well as on the different ways in which capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy combine to generate specific clusters of domination. The sociology of absences is the cartography of the abyssal line.[3] It identifies the ways and means through which the abyssal line produces nonexistence, radical invisibility, and irrelevance. Historical colonialism was the central drawing table for the abyssal line, where the nonabyssal exclusions (those occurring on the metropolitan side of the line) were made visible while the abyssal ones (those occurring on the colonial side of the line) were concealed. Today the sociology of absences is the inquiry into the ways colonialism, in the form of the colonialism of power, knowledge, and being, operates together with capitalism and patriarchy to produce abyssal exclusions, that is, to produce certain groups of people and forms of social life as nonexistent, invisible, radically inferior, or radically dangerous—in sum, as discardable or threatening. Such an inquiry focuses on the five monocultures that have characterized modern Eurocentric knowledge: valid knowledge,

linear time, social classification, the superiority of the universal and the global, and productivity (Santos 2014: 172–75). Such monocultures have been responsible for the massive production of absences in modern societies, the absence (invisibility, irrelevance) of social groups and modes of social life respectively labeled as ignorant, primitive, inferior, local, or unproductive. Such labels were attributed with different degrees of intensity. The highest degree of intensity generated abyssal exclusions and, hence, absences.

This inquiry cannot be carried out successfully unless the sociologist of absences becomes an absent sociologist, and indeed absent in a double sense. On the one hand, from an academic, sociological point of view, what is not there (because it is absent) can only be retrieved either as past reality or as an artifact of utopian or dystopian imagination, never as a really existing social reality. On the other hand, the inquiry must be conducted against the discipline of sociology, that is, conducted in such a way as to contradict the training, the theories, and the methodologies that constitute the discipline of academic sociology, be it conventional or critical. The sociology of absences is a transgressive sociology in a very radical sense. In order to carry it out, three moments must be considered. The first one is an exacting, painstaking critique of the social scientific knowledge that was produced in order to establish the hegemony of the five monocultures throughout the modern period, and particularly since the end of the nineteenth century. Such critique is important insofar as, by showing the internal pluralism of modern social science, it contributes to demonumentalize Eurocentric monocultures. Moreover, it questions the simplistic or reductionist conceptions of Western modernity that proliferate in most decolonial scholarship (see chapter 6), which, in my view, paradoxically confirms the superiority of the Northern epistemologies. However, the sociology of absences must go beyond Eurocentric critical thinking lest it remain prey to Northern epistemologies. Hence the second moment consists of recognizing and engaging with other ways of knowing that offer alternative understandings of social life and social transformation to the Western-centric monocultures of valid knowledge, linear time, social classification, the superiority of the universal and the global, and productivity. Rather than an internal critique of Western modernity, they offer an external critique. The manufacturing of absences becomes all the more evident once the epistemological foundations of the monocultures get contextualized and provincialized beyond the limits of the internal critique. The third moment is the moment of the pragmatic context in which the two other moments unfold. The sociology of absences, rather than an intellectual endeavor moved by cognitive curiosity, is primordially a resource for the struggles against capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy, and it must be carried out

in light of specific struggles. The context of the struggle—the specific aims and social groups involved—provides noncognitive dimensions that condition the ways in which absent social groups and knowledges become present. In chapters 6, 7, 8, and 9 on methodological orientations, I dwell on the relative autonomy of the inquiry of the sociology of absences.

Considered from the viewpoint of the epistemologies of the North, both the sociology of absences and the sociology of emergences (below) seem to imply a sacrificial suicide insofar as the inquiries they call forth must be achieved against the training, theories, and methodologies established by academic social science. The nature of such suicide is best illustrated if contrasted with the autoreflexivity proposed by Pierre Bourdieu. Bourdieu is without any doubt the twentieth-century sociologist that most forcefully argued against the naive scientism of social scientists. He claimed that the sociology and the history of sociological knowledge were key tools for understanding both society and the limits of the scientific knowledge about it. On the one hand, social scientific knowledge invented much of what it described as existing; such an invention became part of social reality as it got embedded in the ways people behave and perceive social life. On the other hand, established social science creates a false transparency that prevents further, innovative research. Established science always stays in the way of emergent science. Hence, Bourdieu concluded that "one must practice a science—and specially sociology—*against* one's scientific training as much as *with* one's scientific training" (1990: 178).

Bourdieu brilliantly illustrates the possibilities but also, against his own thinking, the limitations of the kind of sociology of absences that can be accomplished within the framework of the epistemologies of the North. To begin with, he assumes that the limitations of previous knowledge about society can be overcome by new and better scientific knowledge. This explains why, in his opinion, only those who master the established science can truly be innovators. There is no room in Bourdieu for the epistemological limitations of modern scientific knowledge, those limitations that, for being intrinsic to the epistemologies of the North, cannot be overcome by new inquiries based on the same kind of knowledge. Following Bourdieu, a demanding exercise in self-reflexivity cannot but strengthen the belief in the monoculture of valid knowledge propounded by the epistemologies of the North. There is no room for bringing into account other ways of knowing that might correct or overcome the past failures of previous scientific knowledge or that might deal with other sets of issues. For this reason, the self-reflexive sociologist, rather than becoming a learned ignorant, is an arrogantly self-confident knower.[4] He or she knows that the inquiry about limits is not an inquiry without limits, but believes that whatever

cannot be addressed by modern science is not worth considering. Moreover, self-reflexivity is a self-contained intellectual exercise that, in order to be conducted efficiently, must reinforce the separation of the scientist vis-à-vis his or her object of research, including his or her own past sociological knowledge. At the antipodes of this, the practitioner of the sociology of absences proposed by the epistemologies of the South, whether an individual or a collective being, besides dealing with other ways of knowing, does so while involved in a social and political struggle that precisely matters for not being a mere intellectual competition with oneself (self-reflexivity) or with others (academic rivalry among schools of thought).

The cautionary epistemological notes referred to above in relation to the sociology of absences apply entirely to the sociology of emergences, and for the same reasons. The sociology of emergences concerns the symbolic, analytical, and political valorization of the ways of being and knowing made present on the other side of the abyssal line by the sociology of absences. The main focus of both the sociology of absences and the sociology of emergences lies with the abyssal exclusions and the resistance and struggles they give rise to. But while the sociology of absences addresses the negativity of such exclusions, in the sense that it highlights and denounces the suppression of social reality brought about by the type of knowledge validated by Northern epistemologies, the sociology of emergences addresses the positivity of such exclusions as it captures the victims of exclusion in the process of setting aside victimhood and becoming resisting people practicing ways of being and knowing in their struggle against domination.[5] Such passage from victimhood to resistance is after all the main political task of the sociology of absences: to denaturalize and delegitimize specific mechanisms of oppression. The sociology of emergences starts from here and focuses on new potentialities and possibilities for anticapitalist, anticolonialist, and antipatriarchal social transformation emerging in the vast field of previously discarded and now retrieved social experience. With resistance and struggle, new evaluations of lived conditions and experience that resignify individual and collective subjectivities emerge. These new features, appearing as material or symbolic practices, affirm themselves always in a holistic, artisanal, hybrid way, thus acknowledging the multidimensional presence of exclusion and oppression. The sociology of emergences evaluates them according to premises that amplify their symbolic and material potential. Herein lies their definition as emergences, as embryonic realities, as inchoate movements, tendencies that point to a successful struggle against domination. They constitute what Ernst Bloch designated as the “not yet” (see Santos 2014: 182–83). They are the building blocks of the politics of hope.

While the task of the sociology of absences is to produce a radical diagnosis of capitalist, colonial, and patriarchal social relations, the sociology of emergences aims at converting the landscape of suppression that emerges from such a diagnosis into a vast field of lively, rich, innovative social experience. In this regard, the epistemologies of the South are doubly present. On one side, they exert epistemological care vis-à-vis the embryonic experiences, the "not yets," by inviting social, political, and analytical investment to nurture them in the most empowering way. On the other side, they provide an epistemological defense against the false allies of the struggles that often force these emergences into accommodating themselves into boxes that separate the different existing dimensions of modern domination: the boxes of anticapitalism, anticolonialism, and antipatriarchy. Glamorized by the disciplinary and thematic divisions of the Eurocentric social sciences, such accommodation and separation has been historically the most vicious, disarming tool for undermining the struggles against capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy. The international NGO-ization of the supposed solidarity with the struggles is the plainest version of this process of neutralization by classification or labeling (more on this below).[6] This is how, for instance, peasant women fighting for their dignity and the dignity of their families, for their local economies and communal land, and against the patriarchal biases of their cultures or religions, are led to assume a specific identity—feminist women—even though they are also peasants, fighters for communal land, and noncapitalist entrepreneurs. They are, of course, women, and most of them consider themselves feminists, but they are, besides all that, protagonists (or victims) of many other local, national, and transnational agendas—economic, political, religious—that remain outside the system of identity labels and are for that reason neglected or made invisible. Likewise, the Black communities of Latin America witness their centuries-old games and dances being protected as immaterial world heritage, while their communities remain neglected, riddled by racism, and entrapped in the materiality of social exclusion, precarious life, lack of access to health care and education, and often risk being banned from their lands for lack of proper entitlement documents.

I distinguish three types of emergences: ruin seeds, counterhegemonic appropriations, and liberated zones. Ruin seeds are an absent present, both memory and alternative future at one and the same time. They represent all that the social groups acknowledge as conceptions, philosophies, and original and authentic practices, which, in spite of having been historically defeated by modern capitalism and colonialism, remain alive in their memory and in the most recondite crevices of their alienated daily lives. These are the sources of their dignity and hope for a postcapitalist and postcolonial future. As happens with

ruins in general, here too there is some nostalgia for a past previous to the unjust suffering and the destruction caused by capitalism and colonialism, as well as by the patriarchy as reconfigured by the other two. Such nostalgia is, however, experienced in an antinostalgic mode, merely as guidance toward a future that escapes the collapse of the Eurocentric alternatives precisely because it has always been outside such alternatives. It may actually consist of invoking a premodern world, but such an invocation is modern, for it means aspiring to a modernity otherwise. We are thus before ruins that are alive, not because they are visited by living people but because they are lived by people that are very much alive in their practice of resistance and struggle for an alternative future. They are, therefore, both ruins and seeds at the same time. They represent the existential paradox of all those social groups that were victims of the cartography of modern abyssal thinking by being located on the other side of the abyssal line, the side of colonial sociability. To answer the question whether we can build an expanded commons on the basis of otherness, we need non-Eurocentric concepts such as those mentioned in the introduction: ubuntu, sumak kawsay, pachamama. We will come back to them in the next chapters.

As conceived of by the epistemologies of the South, ruin seeds are at the antipodes of a nostalgic attraction to ruins that has been typical of Western modernity since the eighteenth century and is still with us today. Writing in 2006, Andreas Huyssen called attention to the fact that "over the past decade and a half, a strange obsession with ruins has developed in the countries of the northern transatlantic as part of a much broader discourse about memory and trauma, genocide and war. This contemporary obsession with ruins hides a nostalgia for an earlier age that had not yet lost its power to imagine other futures. At stake is a nostalgia for modernity that dare not speak its name after acknowledging the catastrophes of the twentieth century and the lingering injuries of inner and outer colonization" (2006: 7). Further down, Huyssen specifies that such imagination of ruins, by contradicting the optimism of the Enlightenment, "remains conscious of the dark side of modernity, that which Diderot described as the inevitable 'devastations of time' visible in ruins" (2006: 13).[7]

Whereas in the world of the colonizer a nostalgia for ruins is at best the disquieting memory of the "dark side of modernity," in the world of the colonized, besides being the disquieting memory of a destruction, the nostalgia for ruins is also an auspicious sign that the destruction was not total and that what can be redeemed as energy of resistance here and now is a unique and original vocation for an alternative future.

Counterhegemonic appropriations constitute another kind of emergence. By counterhegemonic appropriations I mean concepts, philosophies, and prac-

tices developed by dominant social groups to reproduce domination, but which are appropriated by oppressed social groups and then resignified, reconfigured, refounded, subverted, and selectively and creatively changed so as to be turned into tools for struggles against domination. Examples of such appropriations include law, human rights, democracy, and the constitution. In my previous research on the critical sociology of law, I dealt with these appropriations in great detail.[8] More specifically, I have addressed two questions: can law be emancipatory, and is there a transformative constitutionalism?[9] I will come back to this topic.[10]

The third kind of emergence consists of liberated zones, spaces that organize themselves according to principles and rules radically opposed to those that prevail in capitalist, colonialist, and patriarchal societies. Liberated zones are consensual communities, based on the participation of all their members. They are of a performative, prefigurative, and educational nature. They view themselves as realist utopias or, better, heterotopias.[11] Their purpose is to bring about, here and now, a different kind of society, a society liberated from the forms of domination prevailing today. They may emerge in the context of broader processes of struggle or result from isolated initiatives designed to experiment with alternative ways of building collectivities. Such alternatives may be experienced according to a logic of either confrontation or parallel existence. Seen from the outside, liberated zones seem to combine social experience with social experimentation. Hence the educational dimension characterizing them: they conceive of themselves as processes of self-education. In both rural and urban areas there are today many liberated zones, most of them of small dimensions, some lasting long, others being relatively ephemeral. The neo-Zapatista communities of the Sierra Lacandona in southern Mexico, which became famous internationally after 1994, may be considered liberated zones, thus offering a vast field for the sociology of emergences.[12] The Indignados movement that occurred after 2011 gave rise at times to the constitution of liberated zones, some of which subsisted as forms of cooperative and associative life long after the movement was over.[13] Rojava, the autonomous regions in Syrian Kurdistan, can also be considered a liberated zone organized along anarchistic, autonomist, antiauthoritarian, feminist principles (Dirik et al. 2016). The great majority of liberated zones, particularly those composed of the urban young, derive from a feeling of historical impatience.[14] Tired of waiting for a more just society, small groups organize themselves to live experimentally, that is to say, to live today as if today were the future to which they aspire and because they don't want to wait longer. Herein lies their prefigurative character. When they are not mere acts of social dilettantism, that is to say, when they are genuine and imply

risks and costs, such liberated zones are particularly prefigurative and promote self-education. At a time when the ideology of neoliberalism proclaims that capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy are the natural way of life, liberated zones disprove it, even if only in the restricted areas in which they occur. The emergence lies in the performative and prefigurative nature of rebellion.

The Ecology of Knowledges and Intercultural Translation

The ecology of knowledges and intercultural translation are the tools that convert the diversity of knowledges made visible by the sociology of absences and the sociology of emergences into an empowering resource that, by making possible an expanded intelligibility of the contexts of oppression and resistance, allows for broader and deeper articulations between struggles combining the various dimensions or types of domination in different ways. The ecology of knowledges includes two moments. The first consists of identifying the main bodies of knowledge that, if brought into discussion in a given social struggle, might highlight important dimensions of a concrete struggle or resistance: context, grievances, social groups involved or affected, risks and opportunities, and so on. Such diversity is much less glamorous on the terrain of the struggle than in theory. It may indeed be paralyzing. It may provoke a cacophony of ideas and perspectives that are utterly incomprehensible to some of the groups involved, thereby enhancing the opacity of both what is at stake and what is to be done. It may also lead to an overload of theoretical, political, and cultural analysis that is bound to be caught between excessive intellectual lucidity and excessive caution and inefficiency. Bearing this in mind, the ecology of knowledges must be complemented with intercultural and interpolitical translation. The latter is specifically aimed at enhancing reciprocal intelligibility without dissolving identity, thus helping to identify complementarities and contradictions, common grounds and alternative visions. Such clarifications are important in order to place on solid ground decisions about alliances among social groups and articulations of struggles and in order to define concrete initiatives in terms of both their possibilities and their limits.

TO THE EXTENT that it permits the articulation of different social movements and different struggles, intercultural translation contributes to turning the world's epistemological and cultural diversity into a favorable, capacitating factor in furthering the articulation between struggles against capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy. Intercultural translation is not an intellectual exercise

independent of social struggle, nor is it stirred by any cosmopolitan dilettante drive. It is rather a tool that, premised upon the recognition of difference, aims at promoting enough solid consensus to allow for the sharing of struggles and risks. Since it is not an intellectual exercise, it need not be accomplished by militants with an "intellectual profile" or by "organic intellectuals," as Antonio Gramsci (1971: 6) called the politicized or conscious members of the working class in Europe in the 1920s. A lot of the work of intercultural translation occurs at meetings or militant workshops devoted to formation, popular education, and empowering, and is carried out with interventions from the different participants but with no special protagonism. For this reason, as regards building resistance and social struggles, intercultural translation is not a particularly individualized activity either. It is a dimension of cognitive work whenever there are present ecologies of knowledges, exchanges of experiences, assessment of struggles (their own and others'), and careful examination of the knowledge that the dominant social groups mobilize to isolate or disarm the oppressed. The work of intercultural translation does have a dimension of curiosity, that is to say, it encourages opening up to new experiences; such curiosity, however, is born not of dilettante curiosity but rather of necessity. In the great majority of the cases, the work of intercultural translation is carried out anonymously by groups and in informal oral interactions.

It is possible to distinguish several kinds of intercultural translation, whether regarding the processes of translation or the kinds of knowledges or cultures that are the objects of translation. According to the former criterion, intercultural translation may be either diffuse or didactic. Diffuse intercultural translation is the most frequent; it occurs, as I have just said, quite informally and as a dimension of collective cognitive work. It is characterized by its fluidity, anonymity, and orality. Such is the kind of intercultural translation occurring in the workshops of the Popular University of Social Movements (see chapter 12). The second kind is didactic intercultural translation. It takes place by combining, on the one hand, the individual and the collective and, on the other, the oral and the written. It concerns situations in which the leaders of movements or organizations stand out on account of their work of translation to strengthen the social struggles in which they are involved. Their individuality is not individualistic; it expresses a collective will and is geared to strengthen the struggle against economic, social, cultural, and political domination. By the same token, orality, though prevailing in the practice of political organization and struggle, is supplemented by written and published reflection. In chapter 10 I present Gandhi as a case of didactic intercultural translation.

According to the criterion of knowledges or cultures engaged in translation, it is particularly relevant to distinguish two kinds of translation: South-North or North-South translations, and South-South translations. The former occur between knowledges or cultures of the global North (Eurocentric, Western-centric) and the global South, the east included; the latter occur between different knowledges or cultures of the global South. To situate knowledges and cultures according to different epistemic regions of the world does not at all mean that we are facing Leibnizian monads, that is to say, completely autonomous and distinct structures that are thereby endowed with sufficient reason. After so many centuries of transnational exchanges and movements of peoples and ideas, exponentially expanded in the past few decades by information and communication technologies, there are no longer cognitive or cultural entities that can be understood without taking into account influences, miscegenations, and hybridizations. We speak of cultural or epistemic regions as sets of styles, problematics, or priorities of thought and action, regions that are endowed with some identity as compared with others.

Both the ecology of knowledges and intercultural translation were the object of detailed analysis in *Epistemologies of the South* (Santos 2014: 188–235). In chapters 4, 6, and 7 I deal with the methodological aspects of the construction of specific ecologies of knowledges in the context of concrete struggles; in chapter 10 I provide some illustrations of intercultural translation.

The Artisanship of Practices

The artisanship of practices is the apex of the work of the epistemologies of the South. It consists of designing and validating the practices of struggle and resistance carried out according to the premises of the epistemologies of the South. Given the unequal and interlinked ways in which the three modern modes of domination are articulated, no social struggle, however strong, can succeed if it concentrates only on one of those modes of domination. No matter how strong the women's struggle against patriarchy, it will never achieve significant success if it fights against patriarchy alone, without bearing in mind that patriarchy, just like colonialism, is today an intrinsic component of capitalist domination. Moreover, thus conceived, such a struggle may eventually claim success or victory for a result that, in fact, implies greater oppression for other social groups, particularly those that are the victims of capitalist or colonialist domination. The same goes for a struggle conducted by workers who focus only on their struggle against capitalism, or a struggle of victims of racism that is exclusively focused on colonialism.

Hence the need to build articulations between all the different kinds of struggles and resistances. There are many kinds of possible articulations, but three principal ones must be borne in mind, distinguished according to the abyssal or nonabyssal nature of the exclusion: (1) the articulation between different struggles, all fighting against abyssal exclusions; (2) the articulation between different struggles, all fighting against nonabyssal exclusions; (3) the articulation between struggles against abyssal exclusions and struggles against nonabyssal exclusions. Building alliances is always complex and depends on many factors, some of which may have no direct connection with the abyssal or nonabyssal nature of the social exclusions in presence; these include factors such as the possible scale of the alliance (local, national, transnational), cultural difference, the specific intensity of unjust suffering caused by the particular social exclusion, or the type and degree of the violence with which the struggle is likely to be repressed.

The instruments or resources of the epistemologies of the South analyzed above create the conditions for such articulations to be possible. However, the particular way in which they actually occur in the field requires a kind of political work that is similar to artisanal work and artisanship. The artisan does not work with standardized models; the artisan never produces two pieces exactly alike. The logic of artisanal construction is not mechanical; it is, rather, repetition as creation. Processes, tools, and materials impose some conditions, but they leave leeway for a significant margin of freedom and creativity. The truth is that the political work underlying the articulations between struggles, when under the epistemologies of the South, has many affinities with artisanal work. The same is true of the cognitive (scientific and nonscientific) work to be carried out in order to strengthen and expand such political work.[15] Rules may or may not be respected, provided there is freedom as to how to respect rules, if such is the decision; no conflicts, commitments, or resolutions, or even major transcendent plans or options of social change having legislative privileges are considered; determinations are taken into account, but not determinism; often chaos is the operative context; and party or other bureaucracy is abhorred for tying up minds and hands (thought and speech) and hindering improvisation and innovation. We are talking of an extremely specific job that keeps universalism at bay. Its main objective is to fight for liberation against capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy, while making sure that the political struggle itself gives testimony to the said objective and becomes thereby a liberated zone.

This page intentionally left blank

2

PREPARING THE GROUND

The Problem of Relativism, or Relativizing Relativism

The first problem to be addressed here is the problem of relativism. Relativism is not an unequivocal concept. Debates concerning relativism have actually been dominated by antirelativists. For antirelativists, the problem of relativism is the problem of subjectivism, nihilism, incoherence, Machiavellianism, and aesthetic blindness.[1] According to Michael Krausz, relativism holds "that cognitive, moral or aesthetic claims involving such values as truth, meaningfulness, rightness, reasonableness, appropriateness, aptness, or the like are relative to the contexts in which they appear. . . . Relativism denies the viability of grounding the pertinent claims in ahistorical, acultural, or absolutist terms" (1989: 1). In contrast, the epistemologies of the South take for granted that the validation of knowledge criteria is not external to the knowledges they validate. Foucault clearly shows in *The Archaeology of Knowledge* that the philosophy of science, or epistemology in the conventional sense, is not external to the science the validity of whose foundations it investigates. Both are based on the same cultural presuppositions, or epistemes, to use Foucault's own term.

The knowledges born in struggle and resistance that concern the epistemologies of the South call for a pragmatic way of validating knowledge. The social groups historically oppressed by capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy have

been forced to evaluate the scientific knowledge affecting their lives by its consequences rather than by its causes. Likewise, in fighting against oppression and searching for alternatives, knowledges are to be evaluated and ultimately validated according to their usefulness in maximizing the possibilities of success of the struggles against oppression. In a pragmatic way, the epistemologies of the South aim at enhancing the resistance against capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy by providing credibility, feasibility, and justness to alternative ways of being in society. The success or failure of the quest for truth is always related to the strength or weakness of a given, concrete ethical commitment. Neither one nor the other can be determined save for the manner in which a given knowledge strengthens or weakens the experience of struggle for a given epistemic community intent on resisting, in a concrete context, a concrete practice of domination unjustly oppressing it.

From the perspective of the epistemologies of the South, cultural or political relativism is as unacceptable as universalism or fundamentalism. But relativism can also be seen as the right answer to a badly posed question. If this question concerns the position to be taken vis-à-vis a world understood as an unequivocally objective reality to be captured by the same cognitive experience, regardless of all possible contexts, then the right answer is relativism. For those who believe in self-proclaimed universal concepts of reason, rationality, human nature, and human mind, all that does not fit such a concept is irrationality, superstition, primitivism, mysticism, prelogical thinking, and emotivism. In a word, anticognitivism. Seen from this perspective, relativism is not just wrong, it is dangerous. As a matter of fact, a lot of antirelativist literature assumes the character of a moral crusade.[2] That this moralism is easily legitimized in the name of supposed realities that are valid regardless of context and cultural difference reflects the huge epistemicide caused by modern science. Such epistemological arrogance translates itself into normative dualisms, such as truth/falsity or knowledge/opinion; whatever does not fit the premise is imputed to falsity or opinion. As shown by Aníbal Quijano and Enrique Dussel, modern epistemological arrogance is the other side of the arrogance of modern colonial conquest.[3]

On the contrary, the diversity of the experiences of the world, together with a conversation of the world that takes them seriously—that is to say, that allows for a dialogue among those experiences rather than forcefully imposing one of them upon all the others—makes no sense if one takes for granted that the objectivity of the world can be captured on the basis of one experience alone. If that were the case, one sole experience, however subjective and partial, could arrogate to itself the power to declare all others subjective and partial. Indeed,

this is precisely what happened, and goes on happening, with Western modernity and its relentless dispensation of colonialist, capitalist, and patriarchal experiences. There is no European universalism; there is rather a European foundational experience that, due to its overriding economic and military power, imposed itself on other foundational experiences existing in the world and thereby granted itself the prerogative of proclaiming its universal validity.[4] If, on the contrary, we accept that there are multiple objective and subjective lifeworlds of meaning and action, which can be designated as a pluriverse, then relativism is nothing else but the expression of relativity.[5] The work of the epistemologies of the South consists of evaluating the relative reasonableness and adequateness of the different kinds of knowledge in light of the social struggles in which the relevant epistemic community is involved.

The major difficulty challenging the epistemologies of the South in this regard is that they must validate their orientations in a world dominated by the epistemologies of the North, the basic assumption or prejudice of which is to consider diversity as superficial (appearance) and unity as profound (underlying structure). In Clifford Geertz's words, such prejudice corresponds to the desire "to represent one's interpretations not as constructions brought to their objects—societies, cultures, languages—in an effort, somehow, to comprehend them, but as quiddities of such objects forced upon our thought" (1989: 26). Hence, two dimensions of what we might designate as a strong conception of the diversity of objective/subjective worlds must be highlighted.

On the one hand, diversity is not the first step in an inescapable evolution toward uniformity or unity. There is no ideal state of convergence or fusion toward which everything tends. From the pragmatic point of view, to converge or to diverge, to fuse or proliferate, are ever-provisional objectives in the context of the concrete problems of the lifeworld that need to be solved. From the viewpoint of the epistemologies of the South, diversity is not an issue; the issue is the various ways of experiencing diversity and the fact that contextually some are better equipped than others to strengthen the struggles against oppression. The unity of the struggle, rather than excluding the diversity of those engaging in the struggle, nurtures it. On the contrary, unity based on uniformity is the path to despotism and fundamentalism.

On the other hand, the existence of multiple objective and subjective lifeworlds does not create insurmountable incommensurability or incomparability. For those who think that the choice is between total transparency (equivalence, nondifference) and total opacity (unintelligibility, indifference), relativism is always an incoherent position. The problem with this reductionist choice is that, from its perspective, every socially relevant form of sociability is bound

to be incoherent as well. Any nonsolipsistic form of sociability expresses a will to understand and to coexist that transcends the comfort zone of what counts as the same or as the equivalent. The will to understand invites someone to see what one sees very well from the perspective of someone who does not see it very well; it also invites one to understand what one considers as relevant from the perspective of someone who does not consider it equally relevant. Leaving the comfort zone means to consider that what one does see and understand is part and parcel of a larger context that includes what one neither sees nor understands and what others do see and understand. Moreover, to come out of the comfort zone with the will to understand implies that one sees by knowing that one is being seen, that one observes by knowing that one is being observed, that one understands by knowing that one is being the object of others' understanding. It also implies admitting that those on the other side of seeing, observing, and understanding may be more or less reluctant to come out of their own comfort zones. The most perverse way of condemning diversity to exile is to consider that diversity is only at home in our house.

The Problem of Objectivity

I have been arguing that there is neither ignorance in general nor knowledge in general (Santos 2014: 138). All ignorance is ignorance of a given kind of knowledge and all knowledge is overcoming a certain kind of ignorance. All knowledge implies a trajectory from a point A, designated as ignorance, to a point B, designated as knowledge. Neither of the two points exists separately. They both exist only as a pair, which means that a given ignorance always presupposes a given knowledge of which it is ignorant. Once aware of such a presupposition, ignorance becomes itself a certain (residual) form of knowledge, the learned ignorance of Nicholas of Cusa, for instance (Santos 2014: 109–11). Learning a certain kind of knowledge may imply unlearning another kind of knowledge. Thus, in the flux of the different kinds of knowledge in which human beings are involved and engaged, ignorance can be seen both as a point of departure and as a point of arrival. In other words, any system of knowledge is also a system of unknowns as well. A certain system of knowledge is hegemonic to the extent that it convincingly omits the unknowns it lives with or generates and credibly denies that there is any other kind of knowledge in any rival cognitive system.

As regards the epistemologies of the North, trust in a given knowledge resides in its objectivity. Trust is always referred to in relation to the objectives to be reached using the knowledge that is trusted. Western modernity's concep-

tion of such objectives is twofold: social regulation and social emancipation. This double trust criterion has structured modern social and political cleavages and conflicts (Santos 1995: 7–55). At the epistemological level, it consists of two basic types of knowledge: the knowledge that serves the objectives of regulation (knowledge as regulation) and the knowledge that serves the objectives of social emancipation (knowledge as emancipation).[6] Concerning knowledge as regulation, point A, the point of ignorance, is defined as chaos, whereas point B, the point of knowledge, is defined as order. In this kind of knowledge, knowing consists in rendering possible the move from chaos to order. On the other hand, concerning knowledge as emancipation, point A (ignorance) gets defined as exclusion and point B (knowledge) as solidarity. As to this kind of knowledge, knowing consists in rendering possible the move from exclusion to solidarity. This duality is present in all social and human sciences. Modern functionalist theories are grounded on knowledge as regulation while modern critical theories are grounded on knowledge as emancipation. Such an epistemological duality is reproduced in the conceptions of trust. While for knowledge as regulation trust resides in the capacity to achieve order, for knowledge as emancipation trust resides in the capacity to achieve solidarity.

This epistemological paradigm from the start faced two fundamental problems that became increasingly visible in the course of the last century. The two problems are related and can be defined as the hidden agenda or embedded biases of the epistemologies of the North. The first problem resulted from the fact that from the beginning of the Eurocentric modern age, this paradigm constructed (and simultaneously hid the construction of) the abyssal line separating metropolitan from colonial societies and sociabilities. The duality between social regulation and social emancipation was conceived of as universal whereas, in fact, it applied only to metropolitan societies.[7] In the colonies, the duality was between appropriation and violence (Santos 2014: 118–33). At a time when the large majority of the world population was under colonial domination, knowledge as emancipation was excluded from colonial societies. Deprived of its counterpoint (knowledge as emancipation), knowledge as regulation was applied in the colonies as a way of ordering that guaranteed the reproduction of appropriation and violence. Such a duality also ruled the relations with the knowledges existing in the colonies. Any kind of knowledge not susceptible of serving the objectives of the colonial order, and thus of being appropriated, was violently suppressed. Thus, epistemicide was much more devastating in the colonies than in metropolitan societies.

As I have been arguing (most recently in Santos 2014), the seriousness of this state of affairs resides in the fact that the abyssal line did not come to

an end with the end of historical colonialism. The abyssal exclusions created by it are still with us, and often under even more insidious and destructive forms, such as imperialist interventions to impose unilaterally defined regime changes, racism, Islamophobia, xenophobia, the inhuman treatment of undocumented migrant workers, slave labor, and so on.

The second problem consists in the fact that even in metropolitan societies—where the epistemologies of the North were supposed to be fully in force—the duality between knowledge as regulation and knowledge as emancipation is becoming more apparent than real. Particularly from the nineteenth century onward, this duality concealed a normative dualism that ascribed primacy to knowledge as regulation to the detriment of knowledge as emancipation. As the three systems of domination of Western modernity became consolidated—capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy—the said primacy was pushed to the utmost and knowledge as regulation ended up cannibalizing knowledge as emancipation. In the process, it resignified and indeed subverted the cognitive trajectory implied by knowledge as emancipation; solidarity, which was the form of knowledge in the knowledge-as-emancipation paradigm, was reconceptualized as chaos, as the form of ignorance according to knowledge as regulation. Conversely, exclusion, which was the form of ignorance in knowledge as emancipation, was reconceptualized as order, the form of knowledge according to knowledge as regulation. Exclusion, understood as order, and solidarity, understood as chaos—such is the deadlock to which the epistemologies of the North have pushed us since the nineteenth century. This deadlock today afflicts both modern and postmodern critical theories.

The crisis of governability that, in one way or another, is present in contemporary societies is the result of a historical condition intrinsically linked to the current phase of global capitalism (neoliberalism) in which knowledge as regulation is poised to free itself from its counterpoint (knowledge as emancipation) and, as a result, to produce a kind of order structured by the duality between appropriation and violence, the duality characteristic of colonial regulation. As this epochal trend advances, the abyssal line moves insidiously and in such a way that this side of the line, the side of metropolitan societies and sociabilities, shrinks, while the other side of the line, the side of colonial societies and sociabilities, expands. Under such circumstances, objectivity, as a criterion of trust, is today more than ever linked to guaranteeing a type of order possible only through appropriation and violence, that is, through radical forms of epistemological or sociopolitical exclusion.

Scientific objectivity is considered a superior kind of justification, entirely distinct from other possible justifications of trust, such as authority, consensus, tradition, revelation, or efficacy. Nonetheless, it is possible that trust in science may lie, at least in part, in these other justifications, even if disguised as objectivity. Only thus can it be understood why science goes on arousing such trust, even though the concept of scientific objectivity is one of the most contested concepts, whether as regards methods or results, or as regards faithfulness to the facts in light of the increasing lack of autonomy of the scientific community vis-à-vis powerful extrascientific normative commitments and conditionalities.

The epistemologies of the South concern several kinds of knowledge as well as the articulations that can be established among them in the struggles against oppression. Such articulations I call ecologies of knowledges. There are two basic kinds of knowledge in the ecologies of knowledges: knowledges that are born in struggle and knowledges that, while not born in struggle, may be useful in the struggle. Either of these kinds may include scientific and nonscientific knowledges. I designate nonscientific knowledges as artisanal knowledges. They are practical, empirical, popular knowledges, vernacular knowledges that are very diverse but have one feature in common: they were not produced separately, as knowledge-practices separated from other social practices.

The different kinds of knowledge within the ecology of knowledges have, at their origins, different trust criteria. However, once integrated into the ecologies of knowledges, trust in them depends on the efficacy of such knowledges in strengthening the concrete struggles and resistances against oppression, that is to say, the ways in which such knowledges contribute to maximizing the possibilities of the success of the struggles and resistances. Trust in a given kind of knowledge, far from being the cause of the latter's importance in a particular ecology of knowledges, is rather the result of the expected efficacy of such knowledge in strengthening the success of the concrete struggle in which the ecology of knowledges is engaged. To the extent that the ecology of knowledges includes scientific knowledge, the objectivity that is ascribed to it as a source of trust (in relation, for instance, to the proper use of methods) becomes supplemented by the trust criteria proper to the epistemologies of the South (concerning the results to be obtained by recourse to scientific knowledge). I will come back to this matter when I deal with methodological issues.

Such an understanding of the objectivity of science is instrumental and, curiously enough, is beginning to be present in the epistemological debates on science in general. Given the impossibility of minimal consensus, objectivity begins to be seen not as an independent variable (cause) of trust in science but

rather as its dependent variable (consequence). In other words, if the fundamental problem is trust in science, objectivity must be conceived of as whatever may contribute to augment trust in science. Objectivity may thus be understood in different ways, as long as the result is the same: greater trust in science (see Reiss and Sprenger 2017).

In the epistemologies of the North, the question of objectivity is linked to the question of neutrality, even though they are two distinct questions. The question of objectivity concerns, in general, methods and epistemic values (simplicity, consistency, explanatory power, capacity to predict, etc.), whereas the question of neutrality specifically concerns results and contextual values (moral, social, political). From the point of view of the epistemologies of the South, neutrality makes no sense because the criterion for trust lies in the vicissitudes of the struggle against oppression, thus immediately precluding any contextual indifference. An-Na'im eloquently expresses the impossibility, or even immorality, of neutrality in the context in which he carried out his scientific work: "It is unacceptable for an African scholar to devote her or his whole attention to detached academic analysis without attempting to respond to the urgent needs and untold suffering of Africans throughout the continent" (2006: viii). Neutrality is an ideological device in a society divided between oppressors and oppressed. In such a society, to remain neutral amounts to being on the side of the powerful and the oppressors.

The critique of the objectivity of science was made by modern Eurocentric critical theories. In the Marxist tradition, the relationship between objectivity and neutrality was solved by the articulation between objectivity and a strong subjectivity—a collective and historically constituted subjectivity. The most brilliant formulation of this idea is due to Lukács (1971) and his offering of the strong subjectivity of the self-organized working class as the guarantee of scientific objectivity. Lukács's optimism was excessive, as acknowledged later on by the Frankfurt School (Horkheimer and Adorno 1972), but his intuition that there is no objectivity without subjectivity to give it meaning and direction remains valid (with the proviso that, pace Lukács, a strong subjectivity must always be a form of intersubjectivity). Indeed, capitalist domination, always operating in conjunction with colonial and patriarchal domination, multiplies the targets of unjust suffering.[8] Resistance must therefore be plural; the forms of articulation and the aggregation of struggles always involve a multiplicity of subjects that are irreducible to homogeneity or singularity. For the epistemologies of the South, objectivity is always intersubjectivity, indeed, self-conscious intersubjectivity. Thus, the knowledges born in or used in the struggle are always cocreations.

Lifting the Heavy Weight of Science: The Place of Modern Science in the Ecologies of Knowledge

The third problem of the first degree of separation concerns the place of modern science in the ecologies of knowledges. The epistemologies of the South take for granted that neither modern science nor any other way of knowing captures the inexhaustible experience and diversity of the world. All knowledges are incomplete: the broader the knowledge of the diversity of knowledges, the deeper the awareness of the incompleteness of them all. A better understanding of the diversity of knowledges circulating in the world carries with it a better understanding of their limits and of the ignorance they produce. As I said above, there is no knowledge in general, just as there is no ignorance in general.

Given their pragmatic nature, the epistemologies of the South do not, as a matter of principle, reject any form of knowledge. Regarding science, what is rejected is just its claim to the monopoly of rigor, that is to say, its pretension to being the only valid kind of knowledge. Once integrated in the ecologies of knowledges, modern science can be a useful tool in the struggles against oppression.[9] The internal pluralism of science opens up space for the use of science in the struggles against such forms of domination.[10] Under the conditions of our time, the knowledges being mobilized in social struggles are, in general, a combination of scientific, erudite knowledges on the one hand, and artisanal, empirical, practical knowledges on the other. The construction of such combinations, mixtures, or hybridizations is the main task of the ecologies of knowledges. Integrating science into the ecologies of knowledges raises three important problems: first, how to distinguish scientific knowledge from other kinds of knowledge, and in particular from artisanal knowledges; second, what relevance to ascribe to the internal pluralism of science; third, what relevance to ascribe to non-Western conceptions of science, that is, conceptions of science at odds with those formulated by the epistemologies of the North.[11]

As concerns the first problem, it doesn't seem to be possible to stipulate a set of characteristics defining, unequivocally and consensually, a particular item of knowledge as scientific.[12] The current epistemological debates indicate that a minimal consensus regarding the characteristics to be selected would hardly be possible. For the epistemologies of the South, scientific knowledge is what the relevant scientific community considers as such.[13] That which in a given spatial-temporal context works as science can be used as science in the ecologies of knowledges.

To be integrated into the ecology of knowledges, science must meet the twofold trust criterion mentioned above; that is, it must meet the trust criterion of

objectivity as well as the trust criterion of strengthening the struggles against oppression. This twofold criterion makes it possible to disengage objectivity from neutrality as is required by the pragmatic criterion that underlies all knowledge validation according to the epistemologies of the South.

The second problem arising from the integration of science into the ecologies of knowledges concerns the relevance ascribed to the internal pluralism of science.[14] The internal pluralism of science concerns the possibility that while complying with some or even most of the philosophical assumptions underlying modern science, the option for alternative methodological and theoretical paths may lead to a situation in which different or even contradictory scientific results coexist and are considered as valid by different sectors of the scientific community.[15] In the social and human sciences, the ultimate source of the internal pluralism of science has been the above-mentioned distinction between knowledge as regulation and knowledge as emancipation. The above-mentioned vicissitudes this distinction has undergone in more recent decades perfectly express the limits of internal pluralism. In the life and natural sciences, the last forty years witnessed significant pluralism, even if this was traversed by episodes of mutual stigmatization, which often went beyond the limits of reasonableness.[16] By way of example, I introduce a particular case—recent and important—of this internal pluralism of science and its impact on social struggles. There is today a strong debate engaging the biological, chemical, and agronomic sciences on the health and environmental hazards resulting from the use of agrotoxic products in agriculture, a debate, furthermore, that opposes the expansion of industrial agriculture in favor of the preservation of peasant, indigenous, or household farming. Some scientific currents minimize the hazards and argue for the expansion of industrial agriculture, while others take the opposite stance.[17] The latter are allied with the struggles of the peasants and indigenous peoples, who, from experience, fully know that industrial agriculture expels them from their lands, destroys their forests, contaminates their waters, poisons their bodies, and degrades the environment. The struggles against agrarian capitalism and colonialism may benefit and gain additional strength by constructing ecologies of knowledges that combine peasant or indigenous knowledge with scientific knowledge that objectively suits and furthers the indigenous struggles.

However, given the capitalist impulse for commodifying scientific knowledge and thus for reducing the value of scientific knowledge to its market value, and with the consequent subjection of research in universities and research centers to criteria of short-term profit, scientific pluralism may fade away, particularly in those areas that have become coveted fields for capital

accumulation. The reduction of the internal pluralism of science may have a significant impact on the ability of the ecologies of knowledge to integrate scientific knowledge. The greater the subjection of the scientific community to the objectives of capitalist accumulation, the lesser the probability that scientific knowledge will be used in the social struggles against the very domination of which capitalism is an integral part. The reduction of the internal pluralism of science renders more difficult the counterhegemonic use of science.

Conceptions of Science Otherwise

The third problem, the problem of the relevance of alternative, non-Western conceptions of science, is often dismissed as a nonproblem, given the broad-based consensus about what is and what is not science. However, taking into account, as mentioned above, that what in a given spatial-temporal context works as science can be used as science in the ecologies of knowledge, the possibility cannot be excluded that, in a given context, an alternative, non-Western conception of science may prevail. Indeed, there have been some important historical examples, as is shown below. In light of this, the epistemologies of the South have a wider understanding of science than do the epistemologies of the North. For the latter, there is only one kind of science: modern science as developed in Europe from the seventeenth century onward. However, outside the Western-centric world of science the existence of non-Western modes of producing science is widely recognized, some such modes being much older than modern Western science, as is the case with the Chinese science studied by Joseph Needham (1954) (see chapter 6). As remarked by Roger Hart, "little more than the ignorance of the sciences of other cultures, [was] mistaken for the ignorance of other cultures of science" (1999: 89).[18] There are no transhistorical and transcultural criteria to define science and to distinguish it unambiguously from other, nonscientific kinds of knowledge. Particularly outstanding debates on alternative, non-Western conceptions of science have taken place in India and in the Islamic world.[19] In the latter case, Alatas represents the most eloquent and systematic attempt in recent years to address the need for an alternative conception of social science that fits the theoretical and philosophical concerns of Asian societies. Says Alatas, "I have introduced the term 'alternative discourses' as a category that subsumes the works of various authors from a wide variety of disciplines in the social sciences, most of which are concerned with the task of liberation from academic colonialism, with the problem of the irrelevance of Euro-American social sciences and have expressed the need to create the conditions under which alternative social

sciences in non-Western societies may emerge" (2006a: 18). In the following I focus on an earlier attempt by a remarkable practitioner of science otherwise, Mahatma Gandhi.

Gandhi's Conception of Science

On the basis of his critique of modern Western civilization, Gandhi has been labeled as being antiscience. According to Shambhu Prasad (2001: 3721), this has not been addressed adequately either by his followers or by social analysts of Gandhi's philosophy and practice. Below I closely follow Prasad as well as J. Uberoi and Shiv Visvanathan.

Aldous Huxley was among the first to brand Gandhi and the *khadi* movement as antiscience:

> Tolstoyans and Gandhi-ites tell us that we must "return to nature," in other words, abandon science altogether and live like primitives, or, at best, in the style of our medieval ancestors. The trouble with this advice is that it cannot be followed or, rather, it can be followed if we are prepared to sacrifice at least 8–900 million human lives. Science, in the form of modern industrialisation and agricultural technology, has allowed the world's population to double itself in about three generations. . . . Tolstoy and Gandhi are professed humanitarians, but they advocate slaughter, compared with which the massacres of Timur and Jinghiz Khan seem imperceptibly trivial. (1933: 211)

Furthermore, Nehru, while seeking to explain Gandhi's attitude to science, actually ends up furthering the divide between the so-called personal view of Gandhi and the public view of the Congress. Nehru makes a clear divide between himself as a science person and Gandhi as a religious man.[20]

Uberoi starts from the following assumption: "India as a culture area will be nowhere, I think, in the world of knowledge, the sciences and the arts, if it does not first defy the European monopoly of the scientific method, established in modern times. It is no solution to propose to wait until we should ourselves become Europeans" (1984: 8). He sees Gandhi as having a distinct theory and practice of the scientific experiment as well as a scientific explanation that presupposes the equality of humans and nature. Nandy argues that Gandhi was not opposed to technology per se but to technologism, which was a condition that created a hierarchical relationship both between those who possess technology and those who do not and between humans and nature. Gandhi, according to Nandy (1995), judged technology not on the grounds of what it was but on

the grounds of what it replaced, represented, or symbolized. Visvanathan sees Gandhi as one of the greatest and most inventive of scientists of the *swadeshi* era. To escape the modern West, Gandhi had to subvert or transform science, both playfully and politically. According to Visvanathan (1997: 231), Gandhi's was a fluid science of resistance. In Gandhi's altered organization of science, science would need money the least; instead of big laboratories, there would be ashrams and *gurukuls* of science (schools with a guru in residence).

According to Gandhi, "Modern civilisation, far from having done the greatest good to humanity, has forgotten that its greatest achievements are weapons of mass destruction, the awful growth of anarchism, the frightful disputes between capital and labour and the wanton and diabolical cruelty inflicted on innocent, dumb, living animals in the name of science, falsely so called" (1999b: 206). "The boast about the wonderful discoveries and the marvellous inventions of science, good as they undoubtedly are in themselves, is, after all, an empty boast" (Gandhi 1999a: 209). The above quotes indicate the strong views on science that Gandhi held very early in his public life. The use of the phrase "falsely so called" indicates that Gandhi believed that the prevailing practice of science had defects but that this was not necessarily intrinsic to the scientific quest. Nor did such a condition irremediably warrant a total rejection. There was a need for the scientific enterprise to undergo a course correction (Prasad 2001: 3723).

Prasad emphasizes that Gandhi placed science in the larger context of decolonization. The scientist, he believed, was to benefit equally from interaction with the colonies and its subjects. The popularization of science, Gandhi suggested, was not a linear transfer of knowledge from the expert to the layperson but had to be a collaborative effort. It was only thus that science too could benefit from the process (Bilgrami 2002: 79–93). Gandhi saw no reason why science should inevitably be linked to the idea of progress or to the idea of nature as an infinite natural resource: "We are dazzled by the material progress that western science has made. I am not enamoured of that progress. In fact, it almost seems as though God in His wisdom had prevented India from progressing along those lines, so that it might fulfil its special mission of resisting the onrush of materialism" (2013: 53).

In several parts of his writings, Gandhi sees himself as a scientist:

> Now I think that the word "saint" should be ruled out of present life. It is too sacred a word to be lightly applied to anybody, much less to one like myself who claims only to be a humble searcher after truth, knows his limitations, makes mistakes, never hesitates to admit them when he makes them, and frankly confesses that he, like a scientist, is making

> experiments about some of "the eternal verities" of life, but cannot even claim to be a scientist because he can show no tangible proof of scientific accuracy in his methods or such tangible results of his experiments as modern science demands. (1999c: 304)

In his footsteps, Uberoi claims that "if the intrinsic intellectual problem of the positivist theory and praxis of science and its claims come to be appreciated by us, leading to a dialogue with native theory and praxis, whether classical or vernacular, then modern Western science will find itself reconstituted into something new in the process" (1978: 86). The idea of the quest for an alternative science rather than an antiscience attitude comes out clearly when in 1921, inaugurating the Tibbia College at Delhi, Gandhi expounded his views on modern and traditional medicine. His speech started with his radical and then well-known critique of modern medicine. In the same speech, however, he praised the spirit of inquiry of modern scientists and challenged traditional medical doctors to adopt a similar spirit and not "follow without question formulas":

> I would like to pay my humble tribute to the spirit of research that fires the modern scientists. My quarrel is not against that spirit. My complaint is against the direction that the spirit had taken. It has chiefly concerned itself with the exploration of laws and methods conducing to the merely material advancement of its clientele. But I have nothing but praise for the zeal, industry and sacrifice that have animated the modern scientists in the pursuit after truth. I regret to have to record my opinion based on considerable experience that our hakims and vaids do not exhibit that spirit in any mentionable degree. They follow without question formulas. They carry on little investigation. The condition of indigenous medicine is truly deplorable. Not having kept abreast of modern research, their profession has fallen largely into disrepute. I am hoping that this college will try to remedy this grave defect and restore Ayurvedic and Unani medical science to its pristine glory. I am glad, therefore, that this institution has its western wing. (1999f: 342)

For Gandhi, the knowledge of the "science of spinning" was critical to the success of the khadi movement, and he therefore urged all community workers to be well versed in it. Gandhi believed that only those who had a thorough knowledge of both theoretical and practical aspects of the science of spinning could become village workers. The rigorous technical criteria for khadi workers indicate how Gandhi envisaged the community worker as a scientist. The worker was to be well versed in all aspects of cloth making. He was to know

the different varieties of cotton and the method of picking cotton suitable for hand spinning. He had to know how to gin and the varieties of hand gins used in Indian villages. The worker had also to be able to test the strength, evenness, and counts of *yar*, know a good *charkha* from a bad one, be able to repair dilapidated charkhas, and be able to straighten an incorrect spindle. Gandhi analyzed with concern the decline of village industries. He felt out of his depth while researching it:

> Here the field is so vast, there is such an infinite variety of industries to handle and organise, that it will tax all our business talent, expert knowledge and scientific training. It cannot be achieved without hard toil, incessant endeavour and application of all our business and scientific abilities to this supreme purpose. Thus, I sent a questionnaire to several of our well known doctors and chemists, asking them to enlighten me on the chemical analysis and different food values of polished and unpolished rice, jaggery and sugar, and so on. Many friends, I am thankful to say, have immediately responded, but only to confess that there has been no research in some of the directions I had inquired about. Is it not a tragedy that no scientist should be able to give me the chemical analysis of such a simple article as gur? The reason is that we have not thought of the villager. (1999e: 410)

In Gandhi's scheme, the agency of the scientist was of critical importance. The scientist had to be conscious and self-reflecting and it was clear that the right place for the scientist lay neither with the exploiting market nor with the stifling state but with the people. All Gandhi's experiments in science attempted to carve out and articulate this domain. To guide the scientist was his favorite talisman: "Whenever you are in doubt, or when the self becomes too much with you, apply the following test. Recall the face of the poorest and the weakest man whom you may have seen, and ask yourself if the step you contemplate is going to be of any use to him. Will he gain anything by it? Will it restore him to a control over his own life and destiny? In other words, will it lead to swaraj for the hungry and spiritually starving millions? Then you will find your doubts and yourself melting away" (1999d: 311).

In Gandhi's cosmology, the unity of body, mind, and spirit was needed in exploring the relation between nature, humans, and God. In the same vein, Uberoi affirms, "On the scientific side, the new way of life and thought will require us to restructure the project, the curriculum and the hierarchy of the special sciences, theoretical and experimental, so as to discover and affirm the higher unity of the subject and the object, the man and the system. The new

classification will abjure within every special science the distantiation of outer nature from the inner man, the participant from the observer, as a principle of knowledge" (1978: 85).

I conclude this section with the following words by Anthony Parel: "As for epistemology, Gandhi assumes that humans live by truths established by empiricism, reason, and spiritual insights" (2000: 9). This sums up Gandhi's journey through Western and non-Western ways of knowing.

3

AUTHORSHIP, WRITING, AND ORALITY

In this chapter I begin to address the second degree of separation between the epistemologies of the South and the epistemologies of the North. The second layer of problems concerns the diverse contexts and sites of knowing and the diversity of knowledges to which they give rise. They are the foundation upon which the theoretical and methodological issues raised by the epistemologies of the South must be dealt with. In this chapter I tackle the first two problems. The problem of authorship deals with the fact that most knowledges emerging from social struggles are collective or operate as such. Rather than having authors, they are authors. Nonetheless, superauthors frequently emerge in the struggles. How is one to understand this? The problem of orality and writing addresses this question: since most of the knowledges present in the ecologies of knowledges circulate orally, even if they have a written version, and others have no written version, how can knowledges in such an evanescent and even imperceptible flux be validated?

The Question of Authorship

For the epistemologies of the South, the question of authorship is complex; it includes types of authorship that go beyond the paradigm of authorial individualism privileged by the epistemologies of the North, which is characterized

by such distinctions as subject/object, knower/known, mind/body, and theory/practice. For the epistemologies of the South, the concept of authorship itself is problematic. In Western modernity, the concept of author implies notions such as originality, autonomy, and creativity. It is part of the same cluster of idealist philosophies that underlie modern possessive individualism. Such a concept of authorship has little validity in the epistemologies of the South insofar as, for them, the most relevant knowledges are either immemorial or generated in the social experiences of oppression and the struggles against it. In any case, they are rarely traceable to a single individual. Underlying such knowledges, there are always new or ancient collective experiences. Knowledges erupt, often in surprising ways, in moments of action or reflection, moments that are particularly tense because of the risks and challenges at stake. Or they are collective memories (tacit, latent knowledges) that far precede the contexts of life and struggle of the present time.

With these caveats concerning the concept of authorship, at least two types of authorship can be identified: on the one hand, collective knowledges; on the other, knowledges of superauthors. Most knowledges emerging from the struggle are collective or operate as such. Often the most crucial knowledges have no authors. They are authors. In this regard, two questions arise: the question of anonymity and the question of unanimity. Even though collective knowledges belong to a given group or community, there are always people who formulate them with particular authority, accuracy, reliability, or efficacy. Such is the case of the African sages of philosophy mentioned below, or the case of the indigenous or peasant wise men and wise women in the Americas and Asia. They are the intermediaries between collective knowledge and the group or community as a whole. Collective knowledge speaks through them, a kind of mediation that, far from being neutral or transparent, is a prismatic mirror, like a creative and transforming filter. Such situations definitely do not fit the dichotomy of individual/collective. On the other hand, even if shared by a given group or community, collective knowledges are not necessarily common in the sense of being equally perceived and sanctioned by all members of said group or community. On the contrary, variations, different emphases, and even conflicts of interpretation may erupt with particular intensity at moments of crisis or of swift or significant change.[1]

The second type of authorship, that of superauthors, includes two subtypes. On the one hand, the leaders of movements and struggles may, due to their exemplary trajectory or political position, master a kind of knowledge that grants them a special authority. Such authorial protagonism is complex since its individualized nature is often the result of laborious collective processes of knowl-

edge construction. Leaders of national liberation movements—such as Mahatma Gandhi, Julius Nyerere, Kwame Nkrumah, Amílcar Cabral, José Rizal, José Martí—are examples of individuals whose political trajectory granted them the status of being recognized as privileged spokespeople of collective knowledge. On the other hand, there are those whose knowledges carry a special authority in a given community. As mentioned above, such is the case of the wise men and wise women, the sages that inspired the African philosopher Oruka to develop his "sage philosophy" as a major dimension of African philosophy.[2] By critically and creatively reconstructing the group's collective experience and oral tradition, the sages develop critical and creative ways of interpreting and transforming reality.[3] These sages inspired the African thinker Amadou Hampâté Bâ (1901–91) when he said that "in Africa, when an old man dies it is like a library being burnt down" (Diagne 2013: 69).

The warp and woof of relations between the individual and the collective is also very complex. To Oruka's mind, the philosophical sages combine a deep, often ancestral, understanding of oral tradition with an individual, personal perception that allows them to develop a critical consciousness vis-à-vis inherited perspectives, and hence create new perspectives. Such new perspectives always have a double character of analysis and orientation, interpretation and ethics. These sages are creative translators of their own culture; at the same time they keep their feet firmly grounded on the emergencies and demands of the present, resorting selectively and pragmatically to a past that is ever inexhaustible and only partially transparent.

Writing and Orality

Scientific knowledge is written knowledge disseminated by writing, writing being the condition for it to be considered rigorous and monumental. It is rigorous because it offers a univocal version, the one written in the text, and written in a given language that fixes its matrix; it is monumental because, like monuments, writing lasts and thus stands at a distance from daily practices. I mean of course the texts, not their interpretations, for the latter evolve and vary, which is why written traditions are less rigid than the written texts that constitute their basis. However, side by side with written knowledges, there are knowledges that are disseminated orally and have no written expression whatsoever; in most contexts of everyday life, these oral knowledges are utterances rather than texts. If we take the whole world as a landscape of written and oral knowledges, we realize that oral knowledges are more common than written knowledges, although having less prestige if for no other reason than because

the dominant criteria for ascribing prestige are established in contexts where written knowledge prevails. Oral knowledge is not necessarily the knowledge of illiterate people.[4] Nor is it simple, naive, easily accessible, or unreliable when compared with written knowledge. It is a way of knowing with a different logic of production and reproduction.

To capture the difference, a distinction has been proposed between literature and orature. The concept of orature, coined by the Ugandan linguist Pio Zirimu, aims to give oral expression the same status as written expression. According to wa Thiong'o, Zirimu conceives of orature as something more than oral literature, as an oral aesthetic system that dispenses with validation by the (written) literary canon. Indeed, orature claims that literature is derivative, having its sources often in oral literature. Orature has its own value, even though written literature has often taken possession of oral knowledge, turning it into raw material and subjecting it to its aesthetic or epistemological criteria. The truth is that many written cultural products have their roots in orature. This is what happens, according to wa Thiong'o, with the classical epics of any culture, since "even when recorded in writing, they are realizable only in oration, narration orally" (2007: 4–7).[5]

People trained in the written knowledge predominant today tend to be incapable of listening to unwritten knowledges.[6] They may actually hear them when they are spoken, yet still cannot in truth listen to them. That is to say, they do not understand the silences, what is implicit in what is actually being said, or what can only be said and never written down. From the point of view of written knowledge, the absence of deep listening is not a problem; rather, it is a condition to strengthen the capacity to distinguish relevant (written) from irrelevant (oral) knowledge.[7] Conversely, if orature, by inverting the dominant practices, were to bring its logic to bear on written texts and their authors, it would show the limits of the latter's rigor and thus contribute to demonumentalizing them.[8] More on this below.

Orature has a performative dimension that is not to be found in written knowledge.[9] It requires the presence of a performer and an audience, as well as, of course, a performance space, be it a plaza, a street, the shade of a tree, a church, or a bus. Inasmuch as it is transmitted in copresence, oral knowledge is also visual. When traditional, its interpretation requires knowledge of both the oral and the visual traditions.[10] The transmission of oral knowledge may involve dance, theater, and music. Pitika Ntuli, a sculptor, poet, and storyteller from South Africa, claims that more than a fusion of all art forms is the basic characteristic of orature: "Orature is more than the fusion of all art forms. It is the conception and reality of a total view of life. It is a capsule of feeling, thinking,

imagination, taste and hearing. It is the flow of a creative spirit. . . . Orature is the universe of expression and appreciation and a fusion of both within one individual, a group, a community" (1988: 215). Along the same lines, Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o considers that "orature does not take the boundaries between the particularity of nature and that of nurture to be absolute and that the major generic elements of orature—riddle, proverb, story, song, poetry, drama and dance—are an imaginative attempt to explain the universe" (2007: 6).

The borderline between art and oral knowledge is often difficult to establish. How to give space to performance in contexts dominated by nonperformative knowledges, or how to stress the presence of oral knowledges in contexts dominated by written knowledges? These are the challenges that the epistemologies of the South must face. Such challenges are not to be seen as ways of reconciling past and present, modern and traditional knowledges. They will probably have better grounding when considered in relation to the future, to the extent that the electronic age and the virtual space created by it produce an ample and transformed return to orality—what wa Thiong'o (2007: 5) designates as cyberture: "Just as nature has given rise to nurture, nurture itself has given rise to cybernurture or cyberture (virtual reality). Cyberture is to nurture what nurture is to nature. It mimics nurture in the same way that nurture mimics nature."[11] Actually, the revival of oral culture in the world of the Internet is becoming a popular topic. John Foley's Pathways Project, for instance, aims at illustrating the fundamental similarities and correspondences "between humankind's oldest and newest thought-technologies: oral tradition and the Internet"; "despite superficial differences, both technologies are radically alike in depending not on static products but rather on continuous processes, not on 'What?' but on 'How do I get there?' In contrast to the fixed spatial organization of the page and book, the technologies of oral tradition and the Internet *mime the way we think* by processing along pathways within a network. In both media it's pathways—not things—that matter" (2012: 5).

Oral knowledge knows no disciplines, no linear times, no well-delimited spaces.[12] In its multiple manifestations, it imitates, re-creates, and subverts domains of reality that change from being distant to being close, and from strange to familiar, or vice versa. One of its most genuine manifestations is stories told by storytellers. Storytelling generates a sense of immediate and concrete copresence through which social experiences that exist in different times, spaces, and cultures become more easily accessible and intelligible, a type of copresence that cannot be achieved by conceptual language (whether technical, philosophical, or scientific). According to wa Thiong'o, "In a story, as opposed to real life, one can know what happens next. . . . A good storyteller is the one who raises

anew the anxiety of expectation that he then goes on to satisfy. Even when his listeners already know the general outline of the story and the ending, the master storyteller is still able to recreate afresh, in the listener, the anxiety of expectation and then satisfy it. The story becomes new in every telling and retelling" (2012: 79).

Narrative, even when it is a historical narrative, works against time by producing an effect of synchronicity and contemporaneity that helps to convert the strange into the familiar and the remote into the coeval. Moreover, the world's *memoria passionis* (in itself a Judeo-Christian category) lies in remembrance and narratives that, by recounting exemplary struggles of life and death, suffering and liberation, loss and gain, reinforce sentiments of joy and fear, awe and wonder, revenge and compassion, from which a kind of bottom-up shared wisdom of the world emerges.

Contrary to historical reconstruction, the memoria passionis collapses past, present, and future together, sees strengths in weaknesses and alternative possibilities in defeats. The wisdom it gives rise to is as contemplative as it is active; it is a global storehouse of remembrance and vision that converts the past into an energy to empower the present and strengthen the *not yet* or the *perhaps* of the future. Moreover, narratives, stories, and parables are open ended. They offer themselves to reinterpretation and recontextualization and in this sense allow for a continuous reinvention of authorship or coauthorship. Storytellers are always coauthors of the stories they heard from their predecessors.

In the processes of struggle, stories are often empowering knowledge, whether by enhancing the strength of the oppressed (for example, by reminding them of past victories) or by weakening the strength of the oppressors (for example, by ridiculing the reality oppressors hold as uncontested or stressing the fragility of the relations of power they hold as unchangeable). Stories are told, songs are sung with the same objective of creating an intensified sense of sharing and of belonging that will contribute to strengthen and radicalize the will for social transformation. It is not by proselytistic caprice or excessive zeal that all the meetings, rallies, protests, and land occupations organized by one of the most important social movements of our time—the Movement of the Landless Rural Workers in Brazil—start with what they call the *mística*, a moment of silence, prayer, and singing, the militants hand in hand in a circle, individual physical bodies becoming a collective physical body.

Songs and chants have historically been a very strong presence in struggles of resistance and liberation as a way of gathering strength to overcome despair and gain courage to fight against formidable oppressors. Presence through songs and chants is a way of transcending the body without ever leaving it, of

transcending differences for the sake of the harmony needed for a practical task at hand (which may be the singing itself or something beyond it), of constructing material strength out of symbolic strength.[13]

To the best of my knowledge, one of the most remarkable projects regarding decolonizing knowledge and using oral history as a tool of resistance against capitalist and colonial domination is the Taller de Historia Oral Andina (THOA), founded in Bolivia in 1983 on Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui's initiative. From the start, the objective of THOA has been to build the proper history of the indigenous peoples of the Andean region, a history told by themselves and as reflecting their worldviews and ways of life, their views on their struggles throughout the centuries, their heroes, and their aspirations concerning justice, dignity, and self-determination. Creative recourse to the methodologies of oral history, the active involvement of the communities, dozens of publications, and the debates fostered by them—all this has allowed THOA not only to engage in a consistent critique of the epistemologies of the North but also to be a source of militant knowledge at the service of many indigenous organizations that have taken advantage of it to strengthen their own struggles against capitalism and colonialism.[14] The search for a different kind of knowledge, an artisanal knowledge proper to indigenous peoples and peasants, gave rise to a new and complex epistemology in which the oral text was combined with the written text and the knowledge proper to the indigenous peoples was complemented by the knowledge of solidary social scientists.[15] What is truly remarkable about THOA and Cusicanqui's work is the articulation between these different kinds of knowledge as a consistently pursued epistemological option.

The ecologies of knowledges born of struggles often include oral and written knowledges, whether stories, documents, songs, or manifestoes. Performativity follows along various paths. One of them is memorization and recitation. Neither of them is a simple reproduction of written or oral knowledges; rather, they are both knowledges of a third kind—the performative. In given contexts, performative knowledges are crucially formative in the education of the community, even when there is a call for struggle. This is the case of the religious revitalization of Islam by means of the intense reading and recitation of the Qur'an. In her study of religious revivalism in Indonesia in the 1990s, Anne Gade mentions the social role involved in memorizing the Qur'an: "In Islamic traditions the memorization of the Qur'an is a special religious duty incumbent upon Muslims who bear a responsibility to their communities as 'preservers' of revelation" (2004: 62). Concerning recitation, Gade writes: "Qur'an recitation contests represent in Southeast Asian expressions of the global movement of 'Islamic awakening,' a phenomenon that in Indonesia emphasized enthusiastically

developing Qur'anic arts, reading and memorization" (2004: 216). According to her, "those who memorize the Qur'an are recognized to be its 'preservers' (hafiz), known for a specific social persona that derives from an ability to recite the Qur'an without the aid of a text. . . . Memorizers negotiate affectively the expectations for the social role and responsibilities of one who 'carries' the Qur'an in memory for the community" (60).

Memorization and recitation are processes of hybridization between the written and the oral and are very much present in struggles having a strong religious dimension. In such cases, the possibility mentioned above of composition in performance is not present, at least not explicitly, since orality aims to reproduce and reinforce the stability and permanence of the written text. We must however distinguish the memorization and recitation of written texts from that of oral narratives. Written texts are more easily objects of canonization. Discussing his findings while analyzing myths in northern Ghana, Goody stresses that "standardized utterances," as he calls the equivalent to religious written texts in oral cultures, vary significantly even when we are said to be listening to "a single version of a long recitation" (2000: 125).[16]

As a rule, both oral and written texts intervene in the struggles in flexible and creative ways. In actuality, struggles are often defined by the amount of flexibility and creativity they allow in mobilizing and interpreting texts. The degree of flexibility or creativity may have to do with the text's nature or its status for the group summoning it to the struggle; there are, for instance, founding texts that select groups and struggles and texts that are selected by groups and struggles; proper texts and texts that have been appropriated, imported, borrowed, or adopted through intercultural and interpolitical translation; concealed and secret texts and disclosed texts or manifestoes; texts for internal consumption and texts for public consumption, to seduce allies, or to elude enemies; outspoken texts saying it all and texts concealing other texts; and hegemonic texts, particularly religious texts, such as the Bible or Qur'an, that are appropriated by subaltern groups and used for counterhegemonic purposes. The more heated the struggle, the stronger the debate concerning the interpretation of both written and oral texts. In certain contexts, and at certain moments, the struggle may well be reduced to a conflict of interpretations. It is true that, given the creative interpretation of whoever is offering it, in general the oral is more flexible than the written text, but both allow for flexible and creative uses through different kinds of mechanisms. As a matter of fact, the controversy about which kind of text is more manipulable, and therefore less reliable, is very old. In classical antiquity, this topic was heatedly disputed, with some trusting the oral text more, others the written text (Cooper 2007).[17]

For the epistemologies of the South, the valorization of oral knowledge, culture, or tradition has nothing to do with any romantic temptation to idealize the past. It simply results from the role that orality and oral culture play in social struggles, a role frequently underestimated by the written culture that prevails in our time and that often controls the normative protocols that legalize the exercise of capitalist, colonialist, and patriarchal domination. As such, we should heed Goody's warning: "We have to be careful not to set up oral cultures as a more satisfying version of our own, corrupted civilization, and on the other hand not to see that civilization, the culture of cities, a written culture, as the cure for all barbarisms" (1987: 293). Along the same lines, Lévi-Strauss claims in *Tristes Tropiques* that writing is a strange invention whose relation to civilization is far from linear. As an example, during the Neolithic age humankind made gigantic strides without the help of writing. According to him,

> The only phenomenon with which writing has always been concomitant is the creation of cities and empires, that is, the integration of large numbers of individuals into a political system, and their grading into castes or classes. Such, at any rate, is the typical pattern of development to be observed from Egypt to China, at the time when writing first emerged: it seems to have favoured the exploitation of human beings rather than their enlightenment. . . . My hypothesis, if correct, would oblige us to recognize the fact that the primary function of written communication is to facilitate slavery. The use of writing for disinterested purposes, and as a source of intellectual and aesthetic pleasure, is a secondary result, and more often than not it may even be turned into a means of strengthening, justifying or concealing the other. (Lévi-Strauss 1973: 298–99)

The relation between the written and the oral text is particularly meaningful to the epistemologies of the South. During the period of historical colonialism, the written text was often used to silence the oral text of the colonized; the colonized, in turn, resorted frequently to the oral text to resist colonial domination. As I have already suggested, the written text itself, which particularly in the colonial context functioned as the official transcript of the elites, was often used very creatively by the colonized: it was subverted, reinterpreted, and its implied meanings deciphered, so that the stifled voices of the oppressed, to whom only subaltern orality was generally available, could be heard. Such was the case for religious texts in particular. The historical task of the missionaries was to affirm and confirm the superiority of the religion of the book; the purpose of their involvement in literacy campaigns was to promote the acceptance of the Eurocentric religion and, more broadly, the acceptance of the

imperial culture, with the consequent rejection of the religion linked to the oral tradition. In the case of southern Africa, Jean Comaroff and John Comaroff (1991, 1997) speak, in their monumental work *Of Revelation and Revolution*, of the "long conversation" that went on between missionaries and the African peoples: "Most overt was the tangible attempt to convert the Africans, to overwhelm them with arguments of images and messages, thereby to establish the truth of Christianity. Only partially distinguished from this in the evangelical enterprise was the effort to reform the indigenous world; to inculcate in it the hegemonic signs and practices—the spatial, linguistic, ritual, and political *forms*—of European culture" (1991: 310).

With such an objective in view, the colonial powers tried to keep the texts and their interpretation under firm control, though not always with the desired results. In practice, multiple interfaces between orality and the written text were created and often used to strengthen the resistance against colonialism.[18] Beginning from a theory based on the concepts of hegemony, ideology, and gaps, Comaroff and Comaroff explain that, when gaps or cracks occur, innovation, reconstruction, and resistance become possible through mixtures carried out by bricoleurs.[19]

However, while it is important to stress the resiliency of oral culture, in both colonial and postcolonial contexts, given the imposition of literacy by the dominant culture, whether colonial or postcolonial, the unequal relations between written and oral culture cannot be minimized. The long historical *durée* of such asymmetry accounts for the two questions posed by Jonathan Draper in the southern African context: "How do the oral forms and rituals themselves survive and mutate in a rich interaction with the new possibilities opened up by the literate colonial context? . . . How do traditional oral forms provide resources for memory in the face of the atrocities of apartheid in the process of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission or in the face of the social catastrophe of AIDS?" (2003: 3). But we should bear in mind that to stress the resiliency of the oral form does not imply being bound to traditional knowledge focused on the past and with little dynamism in its evolution. Even without mentioning the new communication technologies, new oral traditions are always emerging, in both rural and urban contexts, responding to the demands of adaptation or contestation of the ever-changing forms through which modern capitalist, colonial, and patriarchal domination go on reproducing themselves.[20]

4

WHAT IS STRUGGLE? WHAT IS EXPERIENCE?

Types of Struggle

Given the centrality, in the epistemologies of the South, of the struggles against domination, exclusion, discrimination, and repression, it is important to specify what is meant by struggle. To be adequately answered, this question requires a complex exercise in intercultural translation. The phenomenology of struggle implies a broad range of issues, none of which can be easily addressed at a transcultural level. How does struggle distinguish itself from other social practices? When does it start and when does it end? Who are the parties in the struggle and on which side are they? What are the objectives of the struggle and the means to attain them? In this chapter, rather than trying to answer these questions, I highlight the structural features of the social fields whose fault lines may give rise to practices that may be socially and culturally constructed as struggles.

In Eurocentric social theory, Marxism excluded, the topic of social struggle and resistance has always been treated as a mere subtopic of the social question, the privileged focus being on social order rather than on social conflict. In contrast, a profound reflection on the topic was carried out by political organizations—parties and social movements—against capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy, a reflection that included different forms of struggle, types of organization, objectives, alliance policies, relations with the state, and so on.

The difficulties of Eurocentric critical sociology in this domain is clearly apparent in the work of Pierre Bourdieu, no doubt its most brilliant representative throughout the twentieth century. These difficulties have theoretical and epistemological roots. The presence of structuralism and structures of domination was so strong that it ended up eliminating the very notion of subject or social actor. Bourdieu understood the problem and tried to solve it by means of the concept of *habitus*, which tries to reconcile social constraints (the structures) with the individual's freedom and capacity to improvise. By "habitus" Bourdieu means basically the way structures become embodied and endogenous in individuals.[1] Habitus is, simultaneously, both the interiority of exteriority and the exteriority of interiority. The possibility of struggle remains prey to this conceptual scheme, since, as Bourdieu amply stresses in his work, the oppressed themselves actively contribute to their own domination; the world is organized in such a way that, in order to function well, the structures need the complicity of those who internalize them (Bourdieu 2003). Thus, any struggle must begin with the struggle against oneself. Because it was so difficult for him to theorize struggle, resistance, and revolt, when Bourdieu decided toward the end of his life to intervene actively in political struggles, he was forced to recognize a certain contradiction between his sociology and his political practice, something that was often regretted and severely criticized by several of his collaborators.[2]

The difficulty Bourdieu felt in reconciling his theory with social struggles does have a deeper root, a root that is actually common to all Eurocentric social science based on the epistemologies of the North. As I stressed in chapter 2, the problem is the epistemological privilege granted to social sciences as a scientific knowledge that is completely distinct from the other ways of knowing that circulate in society. The more distinct, the more powerful it is to unveil the structures of power. Any contamination with other kinds of knowledge affects the rigor of sociology and its capacity to disclose what is hidden. The problem with this conception is that what is distinct is distant and that, while what is distant can indeed come closer, it is never as a neighbor offering help but rather as a technician come to interfere. Under such conditions, unthinkable are the ecologies of knowledges, the intellectuality of the rearguard, and the artisanship of practices. What Bourdieu ends up showing, *à contre coeur*, is that no new theory of revolution is needed; what we need is to revolutionize theory—and that is not possible without revolutionizing epistemology.

As I stressed above, there are two general kinds of possible struggle, those that address abyssal exclusions and those that address nonabyssal exclusions. However, and as I also underlined, at the level upon which the struggles are constructed and experienced by those participating in them, the diversity of

struggles is immense. What is meant by fighting against the domination of capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy? Many organizations today claim to combat domination but are in fact, consciously or unconsciously, its very agents. Their overwhelming presence gives rise to what has been called the NGO-ization of the struggles, a massive intellectual and political fraud.[3] The knowledges, discourses, and repertoires promoted by international nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), rather than emerging from the struggles, impose themselves from the outside and override the lived experience of the social groups that are in truth struggling. However strident their denunciations of injustice and suffering, they tend to conceal the causes thereof and to privilege the kinds of struggle that do not affect the regimes of domination. They offer packages of slogans and pseudo-solutions, almost always formulated in a language that is very distant from the lived experience of the oppressed. Their objective is to proffer as the liberation or emancipation of the oppressed what ends up being, in fact, a greater dependency of the oppressed vis-à-vis the hegemonic agendas of the organizations. Such agendas and their agents consider themselves as providing all the relevant explanations and solutions. They are not at all interested in listening to what the oppressed peoples have to say about their condition and resistance. In a word, they are totally hostile to the idea of the ecologies of knowledges and intercultural translation. They refuse the artisanship of practices, seeing them rather as a threat to their predefined programs and terms of reference, and their conceptions of goals, governance, leadership, monitoring, support, and results. International NGOs are today the main agents of this epistemological and political fraud.

The struggles against domination sustained by the epistemologies of the South are those that transform any margin of freedom, however small, into an opportunity for liberation, while accepting the risks involved in such a transformation. They do so less by choice than by necessity. To transform minimal freedom into liberation implies the realization that the limits of liberty are neither natural nor fixed; they are rather unjustly imposed and susceptible to being displaced. They are, in a word, contested fields. To win or lose a struggle ends up being always a displacement of limits. Thus, there must be a distinction between hegemonic and counterhegemonic freedom. The former is heteronomous freedom, a freedom authorized by whoever has the power to define its limits. It is exerted insofar as the necessity to act within its established limits is accepted. In order not to run risks, authorized freedom rests always short of what its limits would allow if pressed. On the contrary, counterhegemonic freedom is autonomous and emancipatory. It acknowledges the force but not the legitimacy of limits, and so acts toward displacing them, putting maximum

pressure on them in order to overcome them whenever possible. The above-mentioned NGO-ization of struggles aims to circumscribe the exercise of freedom to hegemonic freedom.

The struggles of the oppressed assume an infinite number of forms. The most obvious ones are the struggles explicitly and deliberately organized by social groups, organizations, and movements to put an end to or reduce a given case of oppression considered unjust. Such struggles are, in general, easily delimited in time and space, and their protagonists are easily identifiable, as are those against whom they fight, and the terms of confrontation are clear for the parties involved. This general type of struggle unfolds in many subtypes according to their temporal and spatial scales and horizons, their levels of confrontation, the kinds of leadership involved, the kinds of narratives legitimating them, the peaceful or violent nature of the struggle, and so on and so forth. Different subtypes require and generate different kinds of knowledge.

There are, however, other forms of struggle that cannot be easily distinguished from the daily life of oppressed social groups. These don't involve direct confrontation or open and declared forms of resistance and, for that reason, are rarely recognized as political. James Scott (1985: 198) rightly calls them "everyday forms of resistance," when confronting material domination; hidden transcripts, when confronting status domination; and dissident subcultures, when confronting ideological domination.[4] They do not involve organization, let alone confrontation; they are anonymous, conducted by nobody and everybody; nobody knows for sure when they begin and end. They are the "silent struggles" that James Scott also talks about when he studies the behavior of peasants under strong repression, whenever direct confrontation would be suicidal. That there is no confrontation does not mean that there is complicity, consent, or unawareness that the situation is unjust. Quite the opposite: an awareness of injustice is very present, as are conflicts of value and meaning, which have their expression in forms of passive resistance such as foot-dragging, dissimulation, false compliance, pilfering, feigned ignorance, slander, and sabotage.[5] In such contexts, the struggle aims to deceive those in power, for example, by neutralizing them by resorting to devices that make them think that their power is not contested.

Such forms of struggle also presuppose knowledges that support them and give them meaning, such as, for example, the awareness of unjust suffering, of the arbitrariness of power, and of frustrated expectations; the critical analysis of the actual situation; deciding on how to resist in the concrete context by pushing opposition to the limit without direct confrontation; carefully pondering past situations and how they evolved; and anticipating what may happen according to action to be taken or not taken. All of these require the application

of complex, experienced knowledges closely linked to the lifeworlds of those for whom to live is to engage in struggle or otherwise not survive.

These two general kinds of struggle assume and generate different kinds of knowledge, but the struggles themselves must not be viewed as being unrelated. In the life of the social groups that resist oppression, there is a time for active and confrontational struggles and a time (probably the longer one) for passive and nonconfrontational struggles; and there is still a time when passive struggles patiently prepare active struggles. The nature of the practices of struggle determines the kinds of knowledges to be mobilized and the articulations between them. In the infrapolitical, not overtly confrontational, struggles, knowledges are like knowing traps, catching only those that do not belong to the subordinate, struggling groups. They disguise any confrontation or nonconformist purpose below the appearance of acquiescent practices and hyperconformist reverence, religious rituals, festivals, storytelling, and so on and so forth. The codes for the interpretation of these performative knowledges are kept inside the group as conditions for survival.[6]

Knowledges and Ideas in Open Confrontational Struggles: Gandhi and the National Liberation Struggles in Africa

Open, confrontational struggles may be of very different kinds. Each kind requires or privileges a certain way of knowing about the current society and the society for which one fights, about enemies or adversaries, as well as about the collectives engaged in the struggle themselves. In the course of the last century, one noticeable distinction was that between peaceful and armed struggle; it contributed to divide the groups fighting against capitalist and colonial domination. This is not the place to go into the characteristics or merits and demerits ascribed to each of these two kinds of struggle. I just want to point out that they mobilize and generate different kinds of knowledge and that opting for one or the other sets in motion different cognitive constructions. I select two instances that are, to my mind, quite revealing of the different cognitive processes underlying each of the two kinds of struggle: Gandhi's struggle, on the one hand, and the liberation movements in Africa, on the other.

Gandhi's nonviolent struggle (ahimsa) is based on the ideas of noncooperation, boycott, disobedience, and the knowledge of and truthfulness to self (*satya*); that is to say, it is based on claiming a representation of the world endogenously generated and, thus, at the antipodes of the one imposed by colonial power.[7] Colonial power, in itself, is an abuse of power. Therefore, boycott, noncooperation, and disobedience are not mere fighting strategies; they are

rather rights—more than rights, they are duties. They do represent the claim of a natural right that opposes and must prevail over positive right. The epistemological dimension of such a strategy—let's not forget that Gandhi identifies his struggle as a continuous experiment with truth and designates the movement as *satyagraha*—resides in the construction of a transformative ethic that aims at transforming the oppressor.

In the light of the epistemologies of the South, the utopian nature of Gandhi's project amounts to this: after having recognized the abyssal line, hence, the exclusion of the Indian masses according to the logic of appropriation/violence, Gandhi proposes a double and reciprocal self-negation: on the one hand, a self-negation of the oppressor, insofar as the oppressor is given the opportunity of not being treated by the Indian masses as an irreducible enemy so long as the lies underlying oppression are acknowledged; on the other, a self-negation of the Indian people who, in spite of being abyssally excluded, are urged to fight as if exclusion were not abyssal and to "forget" the appropriation/violence to which they are subjected by invoking a different kind of regulation (their own laws) and a different kind of emancipation (self-rule), since the type of regulation/emancipation proposed by the colonizer only applies in the metropolis. Gandhi has no doubt whatsoever that the Indian masses are subjected to forms of abyssal exclusion; what he proposes, however, is that the colonized decolonize themselves in order to fight the colonizer efficiently, a gesture that implies the self-decolonization of the colonizer as well. According to Gandhi, colonizing appropriation must not be met with the expropriation of the oppressor, nor must the violence of the oppressor be met with the violence of the oppressed. Nonetheless, the apparent symmetry of self-negation hides the huge moral superiority of the oppressed; in spite of being abyssally excluded, the oppressed hold weapons that are not only ethically superior to those of the oppressor but also far more efficacious. In chapter 10 I come back to the cognitive construction of the Gandhian struggle by analyzing the remarkable exercise in intercultural translation carried out by Gandhi, which illustrates beautifully one of the basic ideas of the epistemologies of the South.

The struggles for liberation in Africa illustrate another cognitive construction of struggle that was extremely influential throughout the twentieth century. The struggles in Africa were part of a broader process that included the collapse of the golden age of Europe in the maelstrom of the two world wars (1914–18 and 1939–45) and the following wave of decolonization in Africa, Asia, the Caribbean, and other parts of the world. The realignment of powers caused by the emergence of these new global actors resulted in a seminal event that

heralded, articulated, and mobilized the prospect of a new decolonial order of the world: the Bandung Conference. Taking place on April 18–24, 1955, the Bandung Conference included twenty-nine countries, fifteen from Asia (Afghanistan, Burma [today Myanmar], Cambodia, Ceylon [today Sri Lanka], the People's Republic of China, the Philippines, India, Indonesia, Japan, Laos, Nepal, Pakistan, the [then] Democratic Republic of Vietnam, [then] South Vietnam, and Thailand); eight from the Middle East (Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Persia [today Iran], Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, and Turkey); and only six from Africa (Gold Coast [today Ghana], Ethiopia, Egypt, Libya, Liberia, and Sudan). These figures reflect the fact that a large part of the African continent was still under European colonial domination. The Bandung Conference was the first meeting bringing together African and Asian states, most of which had only recently earned their independence. The objective of the conference was to promote Afro-Asian economic and cultural cooperation in order to oppose every form of colonialism and neocolonialism, a cooperation grounded on political and institutional, but also cultural and spiritual, unity. The formerly colonized peoples gathered together to chart the future of a new global political power called "the Third World."[8] The conference convened different currents of the same liberation movement at different stages of development and brought together countries with distinct political regimes, from monarchy to socialism. It provided a first attempt at a concerted strategy for the world's peripheral social system and heralded both a distinct globalism and an alternative network of solidarity that constituted the first version of South-South solidarity. The conference's major legacy was the possibility of imagining another world beyond the duality of capitalism/communism and the active search for a decolonial alternative. Chakrabarty captured this context very eloquently:

> Ideas regarding decolonization were dominated by two concerns. One was development. The other I will call "dialogue." Many anticolonial thinkers considered colonialism as something of a broken promise. European rule, it was said, promised modernization but did not deliver on it. But there was another side to decolonization that has received less scholarly attention. Anticolonial thinkers often devoted a great deal of time to the question of whether or how a global conversation of humanity would genuinely acknowledge cultural diversity without distributing such diversity over a hierarchical scale of civilization—that is to say, an urge toward cross-cultural dialogue without the baggage of imperialism. Let me call it the dialogical side of decolonization. Decolonization was

not a simple project of cultivating a sense of disengagement with the West. There was no reverse racism at work in Bandung. (2010: 46)

Focusing more specifically on the struggles for liberation in Africa, even though they differ widely, it is possible to identify some common features. Like Gandhi, many of the leaders had a Eurocentric education, but, unlike Gandhi, they were not much concerned with criticizing its presuppositions. They were more interested in identifying the kinds of knowledge it provided that might be used in a counterhegemonic way. Many of them adopted Marxism and socialism as guiding principles and tried to adapt them to African realities, which were, of course, very different from those that had been the basis for the inquiries of Marx and the European socialists. The most common strategy was to combine Marx's and other ideas of Western thought with selected ideas of African thought as they conceived of it. Julius Nyerere would then say that *ujamaa*, the Tanzanian version of African socialism, was the result of an articulation between Western philosophy and African humanism. Nyerere is highly critical of the logic of social conflict (class struggle) underlying Marxism and European socialism. According to him, such logic is understandable in societies that experienced two major revolutions—agrarian and industrial—but makes no sense in Africa, where the concrete foundation of socialism is the extended family. Says Nyerere, "'*Ujamaa*,' describes our socialism. It is opposed to capitalism, which seeks to build a happy society on the basis of the exploitation of man by man; and it is equally opposed to doctrinaire socialism which seeks to build its happy society on a philosophy of inevitable conflict between man and man" (1967: 170).[9] Regarding democracy, Nyerere also emphasizes the need to overcome Eurocentric notions, using an argument that is very similar to the one used in the last decades by the indigenous peoples of Bolivia and Ecuador. Says Nyerere, "To the Anglo-Saxon in particular, or to countries with an Anglo-Saxon tradition, the two-party system has become the very essence of democracy. It is no use telling an Anglo-Saxon that when a village of a hundred people have sat and talked together until they agreed where a well should be dug they have practiced democracy. The Anglo-Saxon will want to know whether the talking was properly organized. He will want to know whether there was an organized group 'for' the motion, and an equally well organized group 'against' the motion" (1967: 105).

Kwame Nkrumah, in turn, theorized his political philosophy of liberation as being the outcome of a mixture of Western political philosophy (Marxism), Islam, and traditional African culture.[10] He called the intellectual attitude that would preside over such a mixture philosophical consciencism: "Consciencism

is the map in intellectual terms of the disposition of forces which will enable African society to digest the Western and the Islamic and the Euro-Christian elements in Africa, and develop them in such a way that they fit into the African personality. The African personality is itself defined by the cluster of humanist principles which underlie the traditional African society" (1970: 79). But Nkrumah is far more skeptical than Nyerere regarding the possibility of constructing African socialism on the basis of an idealized conception of African society prior to the presence of the European colonialists—a society of harmonious, communal, classless life. According to him, "there is no historical or even anthropological evidence for any such society. I am afraid the realities of African society were somewhat more sordid" (1973: 440). Political and epistemological inspiration for the construction of African socialism must not come from the structure of traditional society but from its spirit, the spirit of communalism. He then makes an important epistemological distinction: "In short, an anthropological approach to the 'traditional African society' is too much unproven; but a philosophical approach stands on much firmer ground and makes generalization feasible" (1973: 441).

Léopold Senghor, who, like Nkrumah, was very knowledgeable about Western thought, is very explicit both about how selective he is in adopting it and about his criteria in doing so. His purpose is to absorb whatever may be useful for the Senegalese people's struggle for a better life while at the same time preserving African values, which he sums up with the concept of négritude.[11] Négritude, according to Senghor, "is the set of economic, political, intellectual, moral, artistic, and social values of the peoples of Africa and Black minorities of America, Asia, Europe, and Oceania" (1971: 3–26). On such epistemological bases, Senghor defines his version of African socialism as a "happy mixture of African Socialism and spiritual traditionalism" (Skurnik 1965: 353).[12]

Another important example is that of Amílcar Cabral. Like Senghor and Nkrumah, Cabral is far from rejecting the European, colonialist culture entirely or as a question of principle, but he does submit it to a hermeneutics of suspicion aimed at taking from it whatever may be useful to fight effectively against colonialism and go on to build a new society. In the Seminar of Members of the African Party for the Independence of Guinea and Cape Verde, which took place in November 1969—one of the best manuals for popular insurgent education I know—Cabral had this to say about the struggle against colonial culture: "We must work hard, comrades, to banish from our heads colonial culture. Whether we like it or not, in the city or in the jungle, colonialism stuck many things in our heads. Our work must be to get rid of what is rubbish and leave what is good. Because colonialism does not have only things that are no good. We must

be capable of fighting colonial culture while keeping in our heads those aspects of human and scientific culture that the tugas brought to our land and went into our heads as well" (1975: 72).[13]

Cabral is perhaps the African leader who thought most deeply about the cognitive demands of the liberation struggle, about the knowledges born of the liberation struggle and the knowledges that, though produced in other contexts, could be used to the advantage of the struggle.[14] One of his most remarkable texts is "The Weapon of Theory," which is the title of his address to the First Tricontinental Conference of the Peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, held in Havana in January 1966. Cabral starts out by noting that, even though the topic of struggle is central to the conference program, the program makes no reference to a very important struggle, the struggle against our own weaknesses. He adds: "our experience has shown us that in the general framework of daily struggle this battle against ourselves—no matter what difficulties the enemy may create—is the most difficult of all, whether for the present or for the future of our people" (1969: 91). The difficulty of the struggle resides in the scarce knowledge of the economic, social, and cultural contradictions of the peoples engaged in the struggle and, more broadly, their scarce knowledge of the contextual reality in which the struggle occurs. Cabral again: "We also know that on the political level our own reality—however fine and attractive the reality of others may be—can only be transformed by detailed knowledge of it, by our own efforts, by our own sacrifices. . . . National liberation and social revolution are not exportable commodities" (1969: 92). In an eloquent formulation—*avant la lettre*—of the epistemologies of the South, Cabral stresses that the knowledge born of struggle is the most precious of all, for it is the one in which the relation between theory and practice is most complex: "This opinion is the result of our own experiences of the struggle and of a critical appreciation of the experiences of others. To those who see in it a theoretical character, we would recall that every practice produces a theory, and that if it is true that a revolution can fail even though it be based on perfectly conceived theories, nobody has yet made a successful revolution without a revolutionary theory" (1969: 93). Cabral stresses that, if the struggle must always have an ideology, the truth is that the available ideologies are all Eurocentric and are based on histories and realities totally different from the African ones. Hence the need for a constant theoretical vigilance that submits ideological references to the constant control of reality.

> We believe that a struggle like ours is impossible without ideology. But what kind of ideology? I will perhaps disappoint many people here when

> I say that we do not think ideology is a religion. . . . Moving from the realities of one's own country towards the creation of an ideology for one's struggle doesn't imply that one has pretensions to be a Marx or a Lenin or any other great ideologist, but is simply a necessary part of the struggle. . . . We needed to know them [Marx, Lenin, etc.], as I've said, in order to judge in what measure we could borrow from their experience to help our situation—but not necessarily to apply the ideology blindly just because it's a very good ideology. . . . Our desire to develop our country with social justice and power in the hands of the people is our ideological basis. Never again do we want to see a group or a class of people exploiting or dominating the work of our people. That's our basis. If you want to call it Marxism, you may call it Marxism. That's your responsibility. . . . But we are absolutely sure that we have to create and develop in our particular situation the solution for our country. (Cabral 1971: 21)

Another general feature of the African struggles has to do with the abyssal line as well. They seem, at first, to side with Gandhi's position. They take for granted that the abyssal line separating the metropolitan from coloniality will disappear following political independence and that, once the liberation struggle starts, the struggle will continue on the basis of the abyssal line's progressive self-negation. As a consequence, priority was given to peaceful struggle and dialogue grounded on the recognition of the rights of colonized peoples. In a collection of essays edited by Aquino de Bragança and Immanuel Wallerstein, they write in their introduction:

> All the national liberation movements in Portuguese and southern Africa started off by seeking to achieve change peacefully, by the pure route of dialogue and persuasion. All without exception found after a while that this route was foreclosed to them by those who held power. The violence of conquest was repeated in the violence of suppression of protest. Each movement paid its price, found its adherents massacred in the course of a public demonstration or a strike. Each took stock and made the analyses of the nature of their colonial situation. Each concluded that the only road to national liberation open to them was the road of armed struggle. It was not that they rejected dialogue. Rather they found regretfully that it was only via armed struggle that one day a real dialogue of colonizer and colonized would be possible, a dialogue rendered possible by the equalizing impact of military combat. (1982: 33)

The case of the struggle for the liberation of Guinea-Bissau led by Amílcar Cabral is particularly enlightening in this regard. According to Cabral:

> We tried during the years of 1950, 1953, 1954, 1955 and 1956 to convince the Portuguese Government that it was necessary to change. In that moment, even we didn't think about independence. We hoped in that moment to change, to have civil rights, to be men, not treated like animals in general, because the Portuguese divided us into two groups, the indigenous people and the *assimilado* people. . . . We received, as answer, only repression, imprisonment, torture. . . . We didn't want, absolutely not, to resort to violence, but we realized that the colonial Portuguese domination was a situation of permanent violence. Against our aspirations they systematically answered with violence, with crimes, and we decided in that moment to prepare ourselves to fight. We have organized and developed in the liberated regions, our party, our political organization, our administration, and in this moment we can say that our country is like a state of which a part of the national territory is yet occupied by the colonial forces. The Portuguese people are progressively realizing that colonial wars are not only against the African people, but also against their own interests. (1982: 63)[15]

In the case of the struggle against apartheid, and in view of the nature of South Africa's white regime, the African National Congress (ANC), the main political force against apartheid, adopted a strategy based on the assumption that the exclusion of the large Black majorities was nonabyssal in nature and so the struggle against it could be conducted according to the logic of regulation/emancipation. The regime's brutal response forced the ANC to change its strategy.

Albert Lutuli, a leader of the ANC, comments on the Rivonia Trial (June 12, 1964) in the following terms:[16]

> Sentences of life imprisonment have been pronounced on Nelson Mandela, Walter Sisulu, Ahmed Kathrada, Govan Mbeki, Dennis Goldberg, Raymond Mhlaba, Elias Motsoaledi and Andrew Mlangeni in the "Rivonia trial" in Pretoria. Over the long years these leaders advocated a policy of racial cooperation, of goodwill, and of peaceful struggle that made the South African liberation movement one of the most ethical and responsible of our time. . . . But finally all avenues of resistance were closed. The African National Congress and other organizations were made illegal; their leaders jailed, exiled or forced underground. The government sharpened

> its oppression of the peoples of South Africa using its all-white Parliament as the vehicle for making repression legal, and utilizing every weapon of this highly industrialized and modern state to enforce that "legality." . . . No one can blame brave just men for seeking justice by the use of violent methods; nor could they be blamed if they tried to create an organized force in order to ultimately establish peace and racial harmony. (1982: 40)

Concerning this as well as other topics regarding the epistemologies of the South, Fanon's thought has been extremely relevant. This is not the place to discuss the theme of violence in Fanon, which has given rise to one of the most intense debates in Western critical thinking.[17] As I mentioned above, the importance and topicality of Fanon's thought are that it allows us to continue to think and act creatively on the basis of the concept of interruption, that is to say, the interruption of an abyssal disorder that can only be confronted efficaciously from the point of view of its radical negation. Such radical negation is as present in Fanon as it is in Gandhi.[18] Not very many people have commented on it, but it is not by chance that in the first pages of *The Wretched of the Earth* (Fanon 1968: 37), in order to assert the radicality of interruption, Fanon resorts to a biblical phrase rather than to a remark by some Eurocentric intellectual: "The last shall be first and the first last" (Matthew 20:16). And he adds, "Decolonization is the putting into practice of this sentence. . . . For if the last shall be first, this will only come to pass after a murderous and decisive struggle between the two protagonists" (Fanon 1968: 37). According to Fanon, decolonization is an act of culture, an assertion of human identity, a demand of the ontological dignity of the colonized thing. As such, Fanon's position is close to Amílcar Cabral's call for armed struggle. According to Cabral, armed struggle bespeaks cultural resistance and ontological dignity: "by our armed resistance, and by running life-threatening risks every day, we negate our condition of second-class, if not third-class, Portuguese, or the condition of Portuguese dogs which the foreign colonialist Portuguese wanted to impose on us" (1975: 108).

In this section, in which I deal with knowledges that are present in concrete social struggles as they occur, it is instructive to learn how Fanon's theory was received by some liberation movements. I limit myself here to liberation movements against Portuguese colonialism.

After experiencing at first hand, as a psychiatrist in Algiers, the violence of French colonialism in Algeria, Fanon resigned in 1956 from the hospital where he worked and joined the Algerian Front de Libération Nationale (National Liberation Front in English). He was in contact with other leaders of the liberation movements, and his work was well known to some of them. His

theory was viewed by all of them as defending violence as the main resistance strategy for the colonized subject. According to them, Fanon was taking sides among the different liberation movements without a detailed knowledge of the specific context of the different African colonies held by the Portuguese. As a result, many of the movement leaders had reservations about him, as indeed did many other progressive intellectuals in Africa. For example, the fact that Fanon gave priority to UPA (the Union of Populations in Angola) out of the various other organizations struggling against Portuguese colonialism in Angola was highly controversial. Later renamed FNLA (Frente Nacional de Libertação de Angola / National Front for the Liberation of Angola), UPA was then led by Holden Roberto. For Fanon, the UPA symbolized the struggle of the Black revolutionary peasantry. Aquino de Bragança, a leading member of the anticolonialist movement exiled in Algiers, refers, rather sarcastically, to "Frantz Fanon's para-scientific song" (1976: 6). Sérgio Vieira, in his book of memoirs, sums up the main criticisms of Fanon:

> In the FEANF (Fédération des étudiants d'Afrique noire en France / Federation of Black Students from Africa in France), we discussed Fanon's texts in 1962 and 1963. In some of the discussions, there were present African leaders and intellectuals like Paul Vergès from Réunion, Aimé Césaire from Martinique, Cheik Anta Diop from Senegal, all anti-colonialists, anti-fascists and leaders of progressive and communist forces. There was a general unanimity in the rejection of Fanon's theses. Amongst the main criticisms levelled against him, we could highlight the following: 1. He considered oppressed society as a single whole in revolt against the foreign oppressor; 2. He ignored the class contradictions within indigenous society (for example, when important sectors of the leading elites allied themselves with the invaders and occupiers in order to consolidate their personal power or that of their ethnic group, clan and family); 3. He underestimated the extent to which the children of colonists would often side with the revolt, rejecting the oppressor; 4. He considered violence in itself to be a panacea, method, and solution for problems. (2010: 242–43)

These remarks by Vieira clearly show the kind of strategic reading that movement leaders used to give the theories and authors they discussed. But they also reveal the polemics generated by Fanon's ideas and political practice, even among those who shared his anticolonial struggle. If we bear in mind the five phases of the debate about Fanon's ideas proposed by Lewis Gordon (1997a: 33), a profound connoisseur of Fanon's work, it becomes clear that the simplistic readings of Fanon, such as we find in Vieira's analysis, were to

be overcome only very slowly.[19] Today, Fanon, together with Gandhi, Cabral, Senghor, Nkrumah, and Nyerere (to refer only to the leaders of liberation movements mentioned in this section), provides an eloquent testimony to the horizons opened by the epistemologies of the South.

Knowledges and the Unfolding of Struggles

More generally with regard to the knowledges that emerge from social struggles, there are other distinctions to be made as a result of the power relations that ground a given struggle. The groups that fight against domination must handle three kinds of knowledge: their own knowledges, which sustain and legitimize their struggle; the knowledges the dominant groups generate and activate in order to ensure the reproduction of their power; and the knowledges generated or mobilized by other movements or social groups with which articulations and alliances based on the ecologies of knowledge are possible. The knowledges that are mobilized in an active and confrontational struggle are a mere selection of what the group knows of the struggle and the power it faces. The criteria underlying the said selection constitute, themselves, a subaltern kind of knowledge, and indeed a particularly precious and zealously kept knowledge. Knowledge gets expressed in narratives and discourses that are oftentimes double; that is to say, they have two versions: one version exists in the public domain of confrontation; the other circulates within the group and within its relations with the struggle's allies.[20] The same kind of doubleness may appear, under other forms, in the interactions aimed at potential alliances. Throughout the global South many social groups (indigenous people, peasants, women, Dalits, etc.) resort to the narrative of human rights in public discourse as a way of being understood by publics that do not share their cultural universe, as a way of building bridges and alliances with other movements, and even as a way of engaging with the state's judicial or administrative bureaucracies. Inside the group itself, different narratives are utilized and are often expressed in a different language.

The discrepancy between public or external discourse and private or internal discourse may vary widely and according to the conditions of struggle. For instance, the discrepancy may diminish drastically, or even disappear, at moments of more intense struggle, as when internal discourses that have been held privately over a long period end up exploding in the public field of confrontation. Such are the moments of greatest visibility and intensity of political and ideological confrontation when conflicting diagnoses and contradictory solutions on the themes under dispute become part of the field of contention. In such situations, claiming cognitive justice is crucial. In order to consolidate

this advanced level of confrontation and struggle, the group or movement that has attained it must avoid the temptation of considering itself singular or exceptional and use its momentary protagonism to create alliances with other social groups involved in less advanced processes of struggle or resistance. The aim is to promote dialogues and exchanges with other experiences and knowledges with a view to identifying affinities and potentiating active solidarity. Therein lie the ecologies of knowledges.

Knowledges-in-struggle are both the products and the producers of struggles that are in a constant process of reconstruction. It is wrong to consider them as being stably and univocally linked to the struggles. Knowledges that strengthened the struggles in the past may weaken them in the present. What is important is to bear in mind that, according to the epistemologies of the South, the concrete value of knowledges depends on the results they bring about at a given point in time and space. This is not to say that the evaluation of the results is not an act of knowledge as well. But the knowledges that are then summoned to perform such an evaluation are not the same ones as those that led to the results in question; they are the knowledges that correspond to the new moment or context of the struggle. For the same reason, the distinction between technical application (ethically and politically neutral) and edifying application (ethically and politically committed) that has dominated some of the debates in the critical philosophy of science does not make sense when viewed from the perspective of the epistemologies of the South.[21] Every valid knowledge mobilized for the struggles, be it scientific or nonscientific, does have a technical dimension; but that is relevant only to the extent that it efficiently furthers the ethical-political commitment underlying the knowledges engaged in the struggle.

The ecologies of knowledges are collective cognitive constructions led by the principles of horizontality (different knowledges recognize the differences between themselves in a nonhierarchical way) and reciprocity (differently incomplete knowledges strengthen themselves by developing relations of complementarity among one another). Only thus is cognitive justice achieved inside the different social groups that resist oppression, as well as in the relations between them. In the initial stages of the processes of articulation between social struggles (and the ecologies of knowledges that accompany them), such cognitive justice is probably no more than an aspiration. But the process will only advance to the extent that the aspiration becomes reality, that is, as the unequal relations of cognitive power are gradually replaced by relations of shared authority. Global cognitive justice, which is the objective of the epistemologies of the South, is a credible aspiration—an aspiration worth fighting for—only if

it guides the practice here and now, inside the social struggles, in the relations within and among social groups fighting against domination. The lived experience of the ends for which one struggles must start in the means one uses to achieve them.

What Is Experience?

If, as I claim throughout this book, all knowledge is embodied, it is unacceptable to ascribe to experience a status inferior to that of theory. The phrases "having experienced," "having been there"—whether referring to an event or a condition—point to a testimonial conception of truth and an immediate and intense relation with facts. Even if objectively analyzed, such facts derive their relevance from the way in which they are experienced by a person, a community, or a social group. Experience is as much the subjective life of objectivity as it is the objective life of subjectivity. As a living gesture, experience convenes as a whole everything that science divides, be it body and soul, reason and feeling, ideas and emotions. Thus conceptualized, experience cannot be entirely transmitted, nor can it be totally apprehended. The more intensely lived it is, the more difficult it is to be understood. The limits of intelligibility and transmissibility are socially and politically important, since they limit the exercise of ethics and the politics of care, that is to say, of active solidarity, reciprocity, and cooperation.

What enables intelligibility and transmissibility is translation. Translation allows one to relate a given experience to others, whether familiar or relatively unfamiliar. As we shall see in greater detail in chapter 10, by gradually converting clusters of differences and distance into clusters of similarities and proximity, translation is an act of intermediation that allows one to turn the strange into the familiar, the far into the near, the alien into the common (Santos 2014: 212–35). Active solidarity often implies effort and risk and in such cases only the clusters of similarity/proximity can activate ethical imperatives ("since this concerns me, I must get involved"). Conversely, the clusters of difference/distance are used socially to neutralize any possible disquiet from not being willing to run risks ("I don't have to get involved with something that doesn't concern me").

The social experiences of injustice and oppression caused by capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy are always corporeal experiences; however, their main manifestations may involve physical, mental, emotional, spiritual, or religious dimensions. They tend to be lived with greater intensity once they include resistance and struggle against injustice and oppression. In very unequal and unjust societies such as ours, the greater the intensity of the oppression, the harder it is for oppressed groups to communicate the suffering and the

emotions that accompany their experience of oppression in such a way as to arouse active solidarity. Herein resides the major dilemma of the epistemologies of the South: communication and the sharing of knowledge are crucial for strengthening the struggles against the oppression caused by capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy because they deepen and broaden solidarity and cooperation among those engaged in struggle and their allies. However, the harder the experience of oppression, the more difficult it is to share; in other words, the solidarity and cooperation called for tend to be most scarce precisely when they are most needed in order to strengthen the struggles against oppression. Given the constitutive intertwining of capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy, liberation is possible only when isolation is superseded by reciprocity, solidarity, and cooperation among social groups that are differently but conjointly oppressed. At a time when there is so much diversity both in the experiences of oppression and in the struggle against oppression, intercultural and interpolitical translation is a precondition for such supersession.

The concept of experience calls for reflection. In its broadest sense, experience is a practice, a state of mind, a feeling that one can have direct knowledge of things (eating, enjoying a landscape, believing in gods, etc.). In this sense, experience may be defined without reference to a specific subject experiencing or living it. The concept of experience that is relevant for the epistemologies of the South is thicker: experience as lived experience. Regarding lived experience, it is not possible to distinguish the experience itself from the subject that lives it. Let us identify, in Sarukkai's (2012: 35) wake, two kinds of lived experience: lived experience in itself, without choice, and lived experience as substitution. The former kind of lived experience, the strong sense of lived experience, is the experience of a person who lives it without having the choice of not living it, that is to say, experience lived as necessity or inevitability. The experience of the poor as lived by the poor is lived experience in this sense. The vicariously lived experience is the experience of a person who can choose between living it or leaving it whenever so desired. If a given person, not being poor, wishes nonetheless to live the life experience of a poor person (e.g., as to food, clothing, conviviality), that person's experience of poverty is lived as substitution. What distinguishes the two kinds of experience is the existence, or not, of freedom. Existentially, we face two kinds of experience, but it does not follow that only the experience lived without option is authentic. Depending on the circumstances, level of commitment, or risks involved, the experience vicariously lived may or may not be authentic. When it is not authentic, it is a form of dilettantism.

The experience lived by those subjected to capitalist, colonialist, and patriarchal domination is an experience lived in the strong sense of the word, since those living it have no choice but to live it while they remain victims of oppression. To be sure, in society, necessity always has as its limit the human capacity to overcome or avoid it, as long as such capacity can be exerted. Nevertheless, resistance and struggle are not to be understood as exercises in freedom in the struggle to end oppression. Only those who do not live oppression in their flesh and blood could imagine that resisting oppression is a supreme act of freedom. Resisting and fighting oppression are often as much a necessity as living or experiencing oppression. The experience of necessity may be lived in different ways: either as the inevitability of suffering oppression or the necessity of interrupting it. What distinguishes the victim of oppression from the person or group resisting victimization is not the choice between necessity, on the one hand, or will, on the other; it is almost always a choice between two kinds of necessity. Exercising choice in this case is an extremely contingent act; only after the choice has been made does its necessity become apparent.

From the point of view of the epistemologies of the South, the vicariously lived experience is relevant only to the extent that it forms the basis for an active solidarity with social groups fighting oppression. Such solidarity may be exerted by individuals or social groups that do not feel themselves to be the direct victims of oppression (for example, the rearguard intellectual, the postabyssal researcher) or that are not victims of the specific form of oppression undergone by the social groups with which they show solidarity (for example, the solidarity of urban or LGBT women toward peasants or indigenous peoples). The kind of solidarity that underlies the articulation between social groups combines experiences lived through necessity with vicariously lived experiences. The form of solidarity that involves sharing struggles and, therefore, risks is genuine only when it is based on experiences that are lived with authenticity.

ONE OF THE MOST enlightening debates on the value of lived experience, the problem of its transmissibility, and the impact it may have on theoretical construction took place between two well-known Indian social scientists: Gopal Guru and Sundar Sarukkai (2012).[22] The debate focused on the lived experience of the Dalits (a caste of untouchables) and the conditions for constructing a social theory on its basis. This debate is of the utmost importance for the epistemologies of the South. The Dalits represent one of the cruelest forms of abyssal exclusion, for it is exclusion based on the supposed subhumanity of

the excluded group, its innate impurity. The abyssal line that places the group's experience on the other side of the line is an ever-changing articulation between internal colonialism and religion, together with an increasingly strong presence of capitalism, particularly considering the land conflicts that aim to expel the Dalits from their lands so as to open the way to megaprojects—water, mining, farming, or other.[23] According to Guru, himself a Dalit, India is an extremely unequal country whose inequality, at the epistemological level, is reflected in the institutional hierarchies that pronounce what theory is and who is allowed to theorize. To his mind, " 'the apex-court' in social science with its full bench in Delhi keeps ruling out subaltern objections as absurd and idiosyncratic at worst and emotional, descriptive-empirical and polemical at best" (Guru 2012a: 13–14). Guru thus concludes, "social science practice in India is still exclusive and undemocratic in character. It is self-serving and self-satisfying as well. It lacks a genuine egalitarian character" (2012a: 13). Such intellectual inequality feeds on the life experiences of social groups such as the Dalits, tribal peoples (the Adivasi), and other "backward" castes. The exclusion to which these groups are subjected deprives them of the one crucial condition—freedom—that would allow them to think and build theory on the basis of their own experience. Without the freedom to get out of the immediate context of experience, it is impossible to give meaning to such immediacy at an abstract level. Thus, the capacity to construct theory in India was left to the higher castes, the twice born.[24] According to Guru, "Dalits and tribals are thus denied the intellectual conditions that are necessary for developing more reflective capacities. It is frustrating, if not tragic, for Dalits to languish in raw empiricism" (2012a: 18). Such a situation results in the epistemological isolation of the Dalits. Hence, the theories that have been developed by non-Dalits are a form of epistemological imperialism, for they are constructed from outside the lived experience of the Dalits and with no clue as to the need for freedom inhabiting their experience. Such theorization, which Guru designates as posterior epistemology (constructed from the outside and assuming the existence of the Dalits as a given) ends up socially isolating the Dalits even more, to the extent that it deprives them of the possibility of ever becoming the protagonists of an egalitarian epistemology. Such isolation, as well as the reproduction of subalternity it reproduces, has decisive political effects. According to Guru: "This externality hardly enables the Dalits to secure theoretical advance for their revolutionary understanding of politics. . . . For Dalits to realize doing theory as an inner moral necessity, [they] must make a conscious moral choice to use their sense of freedom for understanding and reflecting on the Dalit experience. They should treat this freedom to walk out from the Dalit

experience as the initial condition for achieving theoretical heights in their reflections" (2009: 27–28).

Sarukkai, in his turn, calls into question the idea of the intransmissibility of lived experience underlying Guru's position, in other words, the idea that only the Dalits can adequately theorize their own lived experience, thus holding a kind of moral right, or copyright, over the theorization of their condition. To accept such a position would entail denying the Dalits the possibility of theorizing the experience of non-Dalits. The issues of authenticity, authority, and the authorization of theory have been raised in other contexts and can be formulated in this way: "Who really has the right to theorize in the social sciences?" (Sarukkai 2012: 30). This question poses two others, one on the relation between experience and theory, and the other on the distinction between the outsider and the insider. Sarukkai shows that in the majority of situations theory is not, nor can it be, based on lived experience; by the same token, we do not have to be untouchable to pronounce untouchability a crime. Sarukkai distinguishes between experience-ownership and experience-authorship: we are owners but not authors of our experience, just as we are owners of books without being their authors. Owning something does not imply having unlimited power over that which we own. That is why taking for granted, as Guru does, that only the owners of a given experience are allowed to theorize it means to neglect everything that we do not control about the experience we own. According to Sarukkai (2012: 45), Guru's position is the opposite of that of Habermas, for whom separation vis-à-vis experience is one of the conditions of theory. On the other hand, however, it is obvious that Habermas's theories of the public sphere and communicative reason are deeply related to the German experience of Nazism and the ethical-political imperative that it never happen again.

All in all, Guru believes that there is no other lived experience but the experience that is lived as a necessity and that it is not transmissible to anyone who does not live it directly. On the other hand, concerning the Dalits, the necessity to which they are subjected via caste domination is such that no freedom is allowed to them to reflect theoretically on their condition. According to Guru, the Dalits try to make up for the impossibility of theory with poetry, which is particularly brilliant in the case of Maharashtra. However, as he says, "Poetry has no conceptual capacity to universalize the particular and particularize the universal. It does not have that dialectical power. By contrast, theory demands clarity of concept, principles, and the open examination of one's own action to see whether it is justified. Poetry helps the Dalit in making connections through metaphors, but not through concepts. It is theory that is supposed to do that. It makes connections through concepts and also helps in illuminating

the meaning that is embedded in complex reality" (Guru 2012a: 23). Besides suggesting a kind of identitarian essentialism that may lead to isolation, Guru's position points to a heroic conception of theory. Furthermore, in a most questionable mode, it empties poetry of any emancipatory potential. Such a position reflects the cruel social exclusion to which Dalits are subjected and the apologetic, if not hypocritical, nature of the theorizations about the Dalits that have prevailed in India. What perhaps remains less clear are the resistance movements of Dalit organizations against discrimination and the alliances they go on building with other non-Dalit but equally excluded groups, such as tribal groups or Adivasi. In such alliances there is the possibility of the transmissibility of lived experience, of the co-ownership of experience, and of intercultural translations, which make possible another relationship between experience and theory, precisely the relationship that is of greater interest to the epistemologies of the South.[25]

By focusing on abyssal exclusions, the epistemologies of the South tread a field of experiences of profound exclusion hardly transmissible and hardly understandable, particularly by people inhabiting the metropolitan side of the abyssal line and being thereby socially trained to view all exclusions as nonabyssal. As I have been arguing, the difficulty is an epistemological one, since abyssal thinking, predominant today, excels in rendering nonexistent, irrelevant, or unintelligible all that exists on the other side of the abyssal line. But it has many other dimensions. First, very often oppressed groups are existentially (in everyday life) closer to the oppressors than to other oppressed groups undergoing other types of domination. Oppression operates by creating relations of false reciprocity between the oppressor and the oppressed, inverted solidarity, and self-destructive cooperation. Such is the way oppression gets naturalized. The experience of the struggle alone permits one to overcome this condition. The epistemologies of the South are not to be found by oppressed groups on some forgotten shelf of the colonial library, so brilliantly analyzed by Mudimbe (see chapter 6); they are a tool that is created and constructed in the very process of the struggle. The difficulty in understanding and in making the experience of exclusion be understood as something unfair and against which it is imperative to fight resides in the fact that the epistemologies of the North ceaselessly labor to negate the possibility of abyssal exclusion by converting it into a natural or deserved condition, a state of affairs determined by fate or, still more perversely, a form of inclusion.

The second difficulty with regard to building active reciprocity, solidarity, and cooperation concerns the identitarian essentialism that often goes with the experience of exclusion and the struggle against it. Recognizing that, at a

deeper level, the experience of exclusion cannot but be shared by people who suffer or have suffered it directly, in their own skins, as it were, does not preempt the possibility of the ethics of care. Identitarian essentialism occurs only when the intransmissibility of existential experience becomes an obstacle to politically active reciprocity, solidarity, and cooperation, that is to say, when the existential experience is seen as demanding, besides epistemological and ontological autarchy, political autarchy as well. Political autarchy implies a refusal to forge the alliances capable of boosting the fight for liberation. Maximizing autarchy is the other side of epistemic solitude, the degree zero of the epistemologies of the South.

The third difficulty in building active solidarity stems from the self-reflexive and highly political decision on the part of the abyssally excluded social group to appropriate the abyssal exclusion as its own deepest identity, therefore refusing any kind of inclusion. This attitude and the experience that goes with it cannot be adequately captured by the dichotomy of exclusion/inclusion. It has nothing to do with false consciousness (taking exclusion for inclusion); it is rather an appropriation of the abyssal line, not to supersede it, but rather to negate it in a double sense: not wanting to be excluded by it and not wanting to be included as a result of its erasure. The point is to assume the sociology of absences as one's own, and proclaim or demand invisibility, absence, and silence (in this case, the opposite of being silenced). In epistemological terms, does this attitude entail the radical negation of the epistemologies of the South or its utmost confirmation? This is an undecidable problem for the epistemologies of the South, since it confronts them with an antinomy: on the one hand, they do not imagine social life outside the dichotomy of oppression/liberation and the struggles it calls for; on the other hand, they refuse the idea of general criteria by means of which general types of struggle are defined and abstract hierarchies are established among them. In light of this an autonomous, self-reflexive decision not to struggle cannot but be a form of struggle. The epistemologies of the South cannot therefore resort to the solution to this antinomy provided by modern Eurocentric thought, a solution memorably formulated by Rousseau in *Du contrat social*: if the general will is the expression of freedom, the individual who rebels against the general will must be forced to be free.[26] This means that whoever has the prerogative of defining freedom has the right to impose it against any alternative conceptions of freedom. This explains why for Western-centric modernity alternative ways of conceptualizing social emancipation are seen as leading the way to chaos.

5

BODIES, KNOWLEDGES, AND CORAZONAR

Knowledge and Corporeality

The epistemologies of the South deal with knowledges present in or emerging from the resistance to and the struggle against oppression, knowledges that are, therefore, embodied in concrete bodies, whether collective or individual. This embodied character of knowledge poses many challenges.[1] The epistemologies of the North are grounded in the idea of the rational subject, a subject that is epistemic rather than concrete or empirical. Kant, the author of the most monumental treatise in the Western philosophy of subjectivity, underscores emphatically this distinction when he writes, in the epigraph to *The Critique of Pure Reason*, "de nobis sibi silemus" (about ourselves we say nothing). That is to say, the separation of subject from object, rendered fundamental since Descartes, is possible only on the condition that the only relevant subject is the epistemic subject, not empirical ones. The latter must be silenced, not only because they are subjected to the contamination of the object, but also because they are themselves easily convertible into someone else's objects.[2]

According to the epistemologies of the South, embodied knowledge comes alive in living bodies (*Leib* and not *Körper*, to use an enlightening distinction in the German language), the ones conducting the struggles against oppression; they are the bodies that suffer with the defeats and rejoice with the victories.[3]

Both individual and collective bodies are social bodies.[4] Collective bodies, as social groups or classes, castes, sects, peoples, or nations, are the bearers of the struggles but, ultimately, those who suffer or rejoice are the individual bodies. According to Das, "the violence of the Partition was unique in the metamorphosis it achieved between the idea of appropriating a territory as nation and appropriating the body of the women as territory" (2007: 52). In a similar way, commenting on political violence in Colombia, Michael Taussig states, "A body is the ultimate territory and a chopped up corpse adrift in the river is the absolute denial of such territory, the deepest possible exile of the soul. Thus does deterritorialization achieve its most definitive state of nonbeing. Could this be why the counterforce claiming territory as mythical power is now every day ascendant in Colombia, after two decades of paramilitary violence aimed at dismembering both land and body?" (2012: 513).

Even though we think and know with the body, even though it is with the body that we have perception, experience, and memory of the world, the body tends to be seen as a mere support for or tabula rasa of all the valuable things produced by human beings. This is particularly so as regards Eurocentric knowledge, whether scientific or not, in view of the cultural, Judeo-Christian presuppositions underlying it, saturated as such presuppositions are with the sharp distinction between body and soul. The body of emotions and affects, of taste, smell, touch, hearing, and sight, does not enter the epistemological narrative, even after Spinoza definitively criticized such an exclusion as irrational and stupid. The epistemologies of the North have great difficulty in embracing the body in all its emotional and affective density, without turning it into one more object of study. They cannot conceive of the body as an ur-narrative, a somatic narrative that precedes and sustains the narratives of which the body speaks or writes. The fact that the latter narratives are the only ones that are epistemologically relevant is premised upon the concealment of the somatic narrative that grounds them. The body thus necessarily becomes an absent presence.[5]

Corporeal emancipation or subversion becomes impossible, even when the body speaks of emancipation and subversion. Indeed, particularly in core capitalist societies (and in all the little Europes around the world), a perverse emancipation of the body dominates today. This is the body that is obsessively cared for so as to maximize its vitality and performance. Culturism, preventative medication, jogging, radical sports, massive marathons, the gym industry—such are some of the dominant ways of emancipating the body. This enhanced physicality of the body twists the dialectic of the vital and human dimension of the body in favor of the physical, by means of which a new humanism of the

body emerges. This new humanism reproduces in a new way the same invitation to barbarity as did its forefather, European Renaissance humanism. The latter arrogated the right to define what is human, thereby justifying the exclusion of the majority of the world's population for not being truly or totally human. The highly processed new humanism of the body, while subjecting the body to the monopoly of techno-corporeal knowledge and the logic of the value-added (the capitalist production of capitalist bodies), allows for bodies to be hierarchized in work and leisure according to the greater or lesser way they detach themselves from the body/mind equation. Herein resides a perverse anti-Cartesianism: instead of the mind being embodied, the body becomes the letting go of the mind.

The epistemologies of the South cannot accept the forgetting of the body because social struggles are not processes that unfold from rational kits. They are the product of complex bricolages in which reasoning and arguments mix with emotions, sorrows and joys, loves and hatreds, festivity and mourning. Emotions are the door to and the path of life in struggle. And bodies are as much at the center of the struggles as the struggles are at the center of the bodies. The bodies are performative and thus renegotiate and expand or subvert the existing reality through what they do. As they act, they act upon themselves; as they say, they say of themselves and to themselves. Mobility and immobility, silence and the cry, all are vital energies that inscribe marks on the bodies, marks that stay beyond the struggles and their successes. Resisting bodies are far more than the struggle, and the struggle, in turn, encompasses much that is generally believed to be absent from it, be it dance, theater, music, sleep, love. Bodies mobilize different skills in different struggles or at different moments of the same struggle: now skills of the legs, now hand, ear, voice, or nose.

Bodies are in everything but never in the same way. The anatomical codes are to a certain extent unfathomable, even though neuroscience tries to prove the opposite. This corporeal difference remains outside the epistemic or theoretical gaze. The latter is not interested in the constant reinvention of the body. On the contrary, it is interested in its deinvention so that what it says or does is predictable and intelligible. If struggles happen, that is because there are bodies happening for the struggles. No matter how emphatically epistemic and theoretical, surveillance demands foresight, planning, methodology, and results; bodies are happenings, now latent, now patent, now dull fires, now blazing irruptions, now unfathomable withdrawals, now bright fulgurations. And they always leave a huge emptiness, before and after the happening. Thus, deep down, struggles are always unpredictable, whether they happen or do not

happen, and their results are as uncertain at the beginning as at the end. But precisely because bodies cannot help but happen and be there, the struggles go on, clearing paths, often on top of the ruins of past struggles.

The Dying Body, the Suffering Body, and the Rejoicing Body

Among the infinite possibilities of corporeal difference, the epistemologies of the South are interested in three types of bodies: the dying body, the suffering body, and the rejoicing body. These are not abstract states of being. They account for the main condensations of the impact of unequal social relations upon racialized, sexualized, and commodified bodies.

The dying body is the body of the provisional end of the struggle. But it is also, almost always, the body that continues to fight in another living, fighting body. Martyrdom is the utmost potency of the dead body in struggle. It is also the event that confers more dignity to all those who struggle or those who have solidarity with the struggle. Martyrdom is thus an embodied knowledge even unto the extinction of the body, but without any inkling of self-destruction. Quite the opposite, it is self-construction by other means. The survivors carry both the lives and the deaths of the martyrs, claiming as heirs what the body has done and been, and what now it can neither be nor do. The dying body may be directly involved in the struggle or may rather be one of its references. This does not mean that, in the latter case, the loss is necessarily minor. In the context of orality, the accumulated knowledge and wisdom run the risk of being lost in the deaths of those who have held them. Many fighting against oppression do so in just such a context.

The suffering body is the one that calls for more attention because it is the body that survives and perseveres in the struggle in spite of the suffering. Two kinds of suffering concern the epistemologies of the South: unjust suffering caused by oppression, and self-imposed suffering (such as a hunger strike) involved in acts of resistance and struggle and with the expectation of bringing unjust suffering to an end. The epistemologies of the South face here the problem of the trivialization of suffering and hence its devalorization as an embodied knowledge that strengthens the struggle against oppression. If for the oppressors and their allies the drama of the death of the oppressed is a banal event, say, collateral damage or a one-day media drama, the nonfatal suffering of the oppressed, if at all visible, is seen as the human condition. The trivialization of suffering occurs today far beyond the context of struggle. It seems to have become the most common expression of indifference vis-à-vis the suffer-

ing body. The other side of this indifference is the medicalized body that avoids suffering by compulsively swallowing painkillers.

The trivialization of human suffering in our time and the consequent indifference with which we face the other's suffering—even if its presence to our senses is overwhelming—has many causes. Relevant factors are, no doubt, the impact of the society of information and communication—the repetition of visibility without the visibility of repetition—and the aversion to suffering induced by its medicalization. However, at a deeper level, the trivialization of suffering resides in the categories we use to conceptualize it. For the modern Western cultural tradition, suffering is, above all, a declassifying and deorganizing of the body. Once separated from the soul, the body is degraded for being constituted by human flesh. As a consequence, the conceptualization of human suffering is encapsulated in abstract categories—whether philosophical or ethical—that devalue the visceral dimension of suffering, its visible mark of experience lived in the flesh.[6] The flesh, both the flesh of pleasure and the flesh of suffering, is thus deprived of its bodily materiality and hence of the instinctive and affective reactions that it can provoke, the intensity of which lies in their being beyond words, beyond reasonable argument or reflective evaluation.

The epistemologies of the South conceive of indifference toward the struggles of the oppressed as one of the most deep-rooted kinds of ignorance produced by the epistemologies of the North in our time. In contrast, the ecologies of knowledges occurring in the context of struggles aim to make suffering known without mediations, turning it into a reason for sharing the struggle or for otherwise having active solidarity with it. In order to achieve such a goal, they privilege a direct, dense, and intense access to suffering flesh, in the antipodes of the access made possible by medical science, an access constituted by epistemological (subject/object), categorial, and professional distances. It is, moreover, a practical access that, unlike medical access, does not seek a balance between understanding and intervention. It gives absolute priority to intervention, to the detriment of understanding.

Regarding suffering in the struggle, the epistemologies of the South do not distinguish between knowledge, ethics, and politics. The politics of sharing or solidarity with the struggle are not possible without an ethic of care. But unlike what happens in religion (whenever religion assumes an active ethic of care), the epistemologies of the South combine the immediate experience of suffering with its politicization. As conceived of by the epistemologies of the South, suffering is the opposite of victimization; it is the existential experience of violence and injustice in light of values that, of course, have been defeated,

but also values that are viscerally alive and comforting. Expressing this idea brilliantly, Tagore spoke for the voice silenced by the empire in this way: “Our voice is not the voice of authority, with the power of arms behind it, but the voice of suffering which can only count upon the power of truth to make itself heard” (2007: 498).

The counterhegemonic potential of the epistemologies of the South resides in the articulation they strive for between the visceral engagement in a succoring gesture or unconditional care and the political struggle against the root causes of suffering in our societies, the prevalence of capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy. To a large extent, the trivialization of human suffering results from the normalized discourse of modern science and its strong statistical component, which reduces to the anonymity of numbers the horror of human degradation and unjust suffering. The destabilizing presence of suffering is thus neutralized, and loses thereby the possibility of grounding the radical will and the militancy to fight against the state of affairs that produces unjust suffering in a systematic way. By valorizing the concrete narrative of the victims' suffering and their struggle against oppression, the ecologies of knowledges may contribute to turn unjust suffering into an intolerable presence that dehumanizes both the oppressed and the oppressors, as well as all those bystanders who, believing themselves to be neither oppressed nor oppressors, consider unjust suffering a problem that does not concern them.

The third body privileged by the epistemologies of the South is the rejoicing body, which revels in pleasure, feasting, laughter, dance, singing, and eroticism, all of them celebrating the body's joy. Social struggles are not just death and suffering; they are also joy and mirth, happiness with victories, whether small or great, during breaks to restore strength, or even at difficult moments to revivify the spirit and go on fighting. Dancing and singing have crucial epistemological value for the epistemologies of the South. Due to their Judeo-Christian presuppositions, the epistemologies of the North are permeated by ideologies of guilt and melancholia. They are particularly reluctant to valorize the cognitive dimensions of the feast and joyful celebration, unless they occur in socially regulated contexts, such as weddings or calendared festivities, whether religious or not. An aversion to potentially explosive visceral reactions is evident for the sake of equilibrium, neutrality, and the distance that concrete bodies must maintain to facilitate the work of the epistemic subject. For these epistemologies, only the poet is permitted to be crazy enough to think that excess leads to the palace of wisdom. On the contrary, the epistemologies of the South take joy, mirth, celebration, and festivity to be expressions of the vital force demanded by the struggles against oppression. They are also statements of dignity on the part of

all those who constantly suffer numberless indignities in unjust societies such as the ones we live in. The performative character of many of the knowledges harbored in the ecologies of knowledges strengthens the renegotiation, or even subversion, of reality, which is necessary to continue the struggle.

At this juncture, dance and song by both mourning bodies and rejoicing bodies must be summoned to exemplify the epistemological resources left untapped by Northern epistemologies. Their epistemological value resides in the ways in which they intensify grief and joy, reenergize bodies and affections, and infuse communication and communion with spiritual or erotic dimensions that strengthen the willingness to share struggles and risks. Dance, in particular, deserves special attention in this regard as it is one of the most complex forms of lived, experiential, bodily knowledge. The living body is particularly animate and alive in dancing. It reenacts the primordial or foundational experience of movement as a way of knowing the world through the tactile-kinesthetic experience of our bodies. Such bodily knowledge has a nonlinguistic, nonpropositional character that may expand proximity and familiarity and even strengthen trust far beyond the possibilities of linguistic exchange. This nonlinguistic, nonpropositional character, combined with the intensity and intentionality of the movement, endows dance with a specific ambiguity, an openness of meaning that, depending on the context, may be usefully transgressive in building intense intimacy or in breaking repressive codes of correct behavior.[7] The tactile-kinesthetic experience of our bodies has been extensively discussed by Sheets-Johnstone (1998, 1999), who considers that such an experience is an epistemological gateway leading the way to understand ourselves and the world through movement. This kind of bodily knowledge has been widely discussed in the research on dance, giving rise to an epistemology of dance.[8] According to Parviainen, "The dancer wrestles with sensations and images of movement, its meaning, quality, shapes, and textures, struggling to capture some half-grasped or intuitive complexity of visual-kinetic form. Although the concept of 'bodily knowledge' has been around for a long time in dance practice and dance research, the intuition of bodily knowledge is not yet articulated adequately" (2002: 13).

On Unjust Suffering

The current synthesis of modern domination usually known as neoliberalism has as its major feature the capacity to separate as much as possible the occurrence of suffering from the feeling of injustice behind it. This separation aims to create indifference before someone else's suffering and resignation before

one's own. Such indifference and resignation are the basic components of the new fatalism hovering today over capitalist, colonialist, and patriarchal societies. More insidious still is the attempt to create the above separation by means of monocultural concepts of justice devoid of the ethical judgment necessary for crucial dimensions of suffering. Such was Fanon's harsh criticism of Jean-Paul Sartre's *Black Orpheus*: "Without a *nègre* path, without a *nègre* future, it was impossible for me to live my *negreness*. Not yet white, no longer all the more so black, I was damned. Jean-Paul Sartre had forgotten that the *nègre* suffers in his body quite differently from the white" (Fanon 1968: 138). In this sentence there are still traces of the cry that according to Fanon precedes any calmer demand for recognition. The cry is the original sound of the abyssally excluded, the first move toward resistance. In his insightful phenomenology of the cry, Nelson Maldonado-Torres argues that in Fanon the cry, linked both to shouting and weeping, "is the revelation of someone who has been forgotten and wronged . . . the 'return of a living subject' who impertinently announces his presence and who by doing so unsettles the established formations of meaning and challenges dominant ideological expressions" (2008: 133).

The dialectic oppressed/oppressor that underlies the epistemologies of the South is not without problems when confronted with the changing conditions under which dying and suffering bodies interrogate us in our time. On the one hand, their exponential proliferation seems to contradict the official transcript of our time, an age that has supposedly found technical solutions for every avoidable illness and unnecessary death. On the other hand, the proliferation of irregular wars, high-tech mass-killing machinery, mercenary and paramilitary personnel for hire, and nondeclared states of exception are leading to an epochal condition in which most victims of violence cannot possibly be viewed as active participants in any conflict opposing oppressors and oppressed. They are generally viewed as innocent victims and their death or suffering is considered particularly unjust precisely because they are perceived as not being active protagonists in the conflict. The death and suffering endured by the victims of terrorism and of drone bombings, by undocumented migrants crossing borders, by the growing mass of environmental refugees, and by the recurring massacres of churchgoers, schoolteachers, students, and shopping mall consumers by lone gunmen are probably the most glaring cases from our time that come to mind.

To attribute to capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy the root causes of the conflicts causing such sacrifice of life and limb does not seem to suffice because the generality, the scale, and the time frame of such causes do not convincingly account for the specific horror and seemingly chaotic contingency of the

consequences. Nor does it help much adding up other root causes such as the media-induced culture of violence, bigotry, or religious fanaticism. The horror of the consequences is always more concrete than the horror of the causes and that is why the latter always appear less horrible. The concept of American imperialism is too civilized and too simplistic to express the feeling of revolt and rage before weddings and funerals transformed into rivers of blood by murderous drones.

There are many different layers of factors accounting for the immense and tightly woven fabric of social and political relations at the level of which violence occurs. As the main building blocks of the Western-centric modern era, capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy reconfigured many other preexisting ways of being and doing (such as religion, economies, cultures) that, by themselves, contributed to a constant reinvention of capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy. Today, both the long duration of capitalist, colonial, and patriarchal civilization and the apparent easiness with which the anticapitalist, anticolonial, and antipatriarchal struggles are disarmed and neutralized contribute to a messy *Zeitgeist* in which capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy appear as causes as much as consequences. Herein lies the banalization of horror and the indifference before suffering, that is, the evacuation of any political or ethical judgment about it. This explains in part at least why it has become so difficult to identify the enemy in some concrete way and to formulate alternatives to the current state of affairs, no matter how repugnant and morally debased it appears to most people.

The epistemologies of the South are a contradictory component of this *Zeitgeist*. As such, they confront it in two seemingly opposing ways. On one side, by means of the abyssal line, they radicalize ethical and political judgments of suffering. As there are abyssal and nonabyssal exclusions, there are abyssal and nonabyssal forms of suffering. This distinction does not refer to the intensity of the suffering experienced by the collective or individual body. It refers to the indifference with which suffering is inflicted, indifference meaning both coldbloodedness and impunity. Abyssal suffering is socially and politically indifferent suffering, suffering inflicted upon peoples and sociabilities inhabiting the other side of the line. Such is the suffering the denunciation of which became the life task of Fanon (1967a, 1968).

On the other hand, the epistemologies of the South start from the consequences, from the dead and suffering bodies and from the immediacy of the demand of care, including the care for the families and social groups most intensely affected by the violence against bodies. The immediate and unconditional care for those in need comes first and before any judgment about the

political or ethical evaluation of the occurrence. This is another instance in which recognition comes before cognition.

The movement from consequences to causes constitutes a pedagogy that gradually reconstructs suffering or death as ethical and political artifacts. The ethical and political reconstruction of suffering or death is how the epistemologies of the South address the dialectics of oppressed/oppressor. It is a kind of pedagogy of the oppressed built upon concrete events, which proceeds via the inquiry into just or unjust suffering/death; into innocent or guilty suffering/death; into who is oppressor and who is oppressed; into who is oppressed in the current context but may be oppressor in another context, and vice versa; into what it means to be innocent in a severely polarized world; into what it means to be complicit out of ignorance, distraction, self-centered egotism, interest, and so on.[9] This is an open-ended pedagogy that may end up questioning the limits of the dialectic oppressor/oppressed by showing fields of practice in which the dialectic does not apply or in which, rather than pure polarizations, there are different and mixed oppressor/oppressed identities.

The pedagogical work called for by the epistemologies of the South must address the complex intertwining of the different modes of domination in order to avoid simplistic or abstract conceptions of oppression that do not relate to the lived experience of dying and suffering bodies and of the social relations that ground the social and political meaning of their lives. Strong explanations and narrations lie not in elegant theories but rather in destabilizing and mobilizing accounts that, on the basis of reasoned ecologies of knowledges, speak to the concrete experiences of concrete social groups in such a way as to strengthen their struggles against oppression. By addressing the complexity and deceitful opacity of the mechanisms of oppression, the epistemologies of the South do not trivialize oppression or unjust suffering. On the contrary, they seek to deepen the ethical and political evaluation of lived experiences as intolerably unjust and susceptible to being reversed by political resistance. They also seek to amplify the meaning of suffering lives so that intergroup intelligibility increases and alliances among them are made possible.

At the core of unjust suffering and the resistance and struggle that often go with it is a question that has defeated Western-centric modern knowledge, not just scientific but also philosophical and theological knowledge: why, after so many atrocities committed in the modern period, from the fifteenth century to the present day, so much suffering, so much destruction of life and cultures, so much humiliation of memories and experiences, so much negation of the aspiration to a better, dignified life, people go on resisting, refusing to give up the struggle for human dignity and a better life?

Well aware that I cannot provide an answer to this question, in the following section, however, I bring into the discussion some factors that may help us understand human resilience.

Warming Up Reason: Corazonar and Intimate Sufficiencies

Although it is the existential basis for denouncing domination, unjust suffering, in itself, cannot spark resistance. What sparks resistance is a triple discovery: that the oppressor has weak spots; that there are paths, no matter how narrow, to fight against oppression; and that there is some capacity to tread those paths. Herein lies the hope (the opening up of an opportunity) and the joy (the capacity to benefit from it) without which no resistance is possible. Suffering, in itself, is joyful only to the ascetic or the masochist. Hope and joy are the vital signs among oppressed groups that injustice can be overcome, that suffering caused by oppression is avoidable, and that the suffering certain to result from the struggle against oppression is rewarding. Unlike fear and sadness, hope and joy are the existential preconditions of resistance.[10] They are the vital energy behind the reasoned inquiry into the sociology of emergences. In social struggles, joy and revolt frequently go together; joyful moments best express the value of solidarity and underwrite the hope to win. Paraphrasing Spinoza (1888), I would say that joy is the emotion that increases both the individual's and the collective's desires to persist.

The corporeality of knowledge that mobilizes struggling individuals and groups implies that knowledge is never mobilized only on the basis of reasons, concepts, thoughts, analyses, or arguments. However important these may be to formulate the terms of the struggle and the means to conduct it, they, by themselves, do not turn into action, particularly if action involves existential risk, unless they are not soaked in emotions, affections, and feelings. The latter are indispensable for converting resistance into an imperative or an unavoidable challenge. Active commitment always occurs in affective, emotional contexts. Social struggles are wagers; they cohabit more or less comfortably with unknowns. If everything had to be known and weighed before starting, nothing would ever start. Without *docta ignorantia* (learned ignorance) there is no *docta spes* (learned hope) (see Santos 2014: 109–11). Rational arguments wrenched from the imperatives of the struggle are passive constructions (however eloquent) that justify both action and inaction. No matter how strong the grounds for nonconformity, rage, despair, and revolt, they are never strong enough to activate the material vitality of the struggle against the unjust condition causing them. Only when seen from the outside is the struggle conceivable as the

expression of a necessary will (determinism). Inside, the struggle is always contingent upon the construction of a will that sustains the necessity to fight. Once engaged, the struggle becomes an option without an option. In the process doubts are experienced (as cautionary reflection) rather than suffered (as motives for giving up). In a sense, there is no docta spes without *docta desperatio* (learned despair).

This does not mean that concepts (arguments, theories) have little relevance in the materialist, vitalist, and creative conception of struggle underlying the epistemologies of the South. Quite the opposite: they are an undeniable condition of the efficacy of the struggle. In order to be so, however, they have to be warmed up in the fire of emotions and affects, a fire that turns reasons to act into imperatives to act. Warming up reason is the process whereby ideas and concepts go on awakening motivating emotions, creative and empowering emotions that increase the determination to struggle and the willingness to run risks. Such awakening occurs to the extent that the ideas and the concepts, and even the theories, are associated either with destabilizing images of repugnance and outrage or with images of an alternative, dignified life, images that are realistic because they are accessible and are therefore bearers of hope.

Warming up does not dispense with ideas, concepts, and theories; it just turns them into vital problems and challenges, lived experiences of expectations close at hand, either to fight against or to fight for. Without such warming up, concepts as well as reasons and arguments would be always insufficient to launch the struggle. Martha Nussbaum is right when she says that the story of emotions "is the story of judgments about important things, judgments in which we acknowledge our neediness and incompleteness before elements that we do not fully control" (2004: 184). Warming up brings about a new quality, a quid, the reason without reasons that pushes the reason with reasons into the struggle. This explains why, from the perspective of the epistemologies of the South, an absolute distinction between rationality and irrationality, between unthinking forces and thoughts and evaluations, is untenable. Warming up concepts means changing latency into potency, absence into emergence, the unreachable into the right at hand. The emotions that warm up reason are emotions with an object and an objective. They involve both the identification of a state of affairs and a strongly felt evaluation of it. They invest objects with special value. Thus, warming up reason goes together with warming up ethics, the two preconditions for active indignation, the moment at which what has so far been tolerated becomes intolerable, must be overcome, and can be overcome.

It is too late in our time to leave this change to the laws of history. This stance does not imply spontaneity without causes or inconsequential volun-

tarism. It is the only progressive stance in a time that credibly proclaims that there is no alternative. We live at a time in which a new and massive type of fetishism of commodities takes hold of both individual and collective subjectivities. It is built on two complementary features of objectification. On the one hand, in a world in which labor without rights dominates the horizon of productive life, the self is bound to promote itself as a commodity, a lone entrepreneur, a precarious worker that experiences its precariousness with autonomy—as a businessperson whose main business is to sell himself or herself. The ideal type of entrepreneur is someone whose individual self has both use value and surplus value: The same subjectivity divided in two, one that exploits and the other that is exploited. On the other hand, if one sees oneself as a commodity, one is bound to see others as rival commodities. In order to succeed in the competition, one must mobilize one's qualities as a capitalist, a colonialist, and a patriarchal subject as a way of enhancing one's own surplus value. Under such circumstances, nobody conceives of himself or herself as so utterly oppressed as being entirely deprived of the potential for surplus value, that is, for exploitation. Accordingly, social life is experienced as a sea of merchandise, both human and nonhuman merchandise.

More than ever before, capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy are becoming the default subjectivity of objectively oppressed subjects, both individuals and collective subjects, with no other option than imagining themselves as either rewarded oppressors or deserving oppressed. In such a gulag of falsely autonomous individuality, subjectivity is one of the objective conditions against which it is necessary to fight. The interruption of fetishism is more than ever a self-interruption. The struggle against oppression starts with and against the individual or collective subject. Unsettling self-fetishism means destabilizing subjectivities. Such destabilizing can only be achieved by warmed-up reason, reason with emotions, affections, and feelings.

Corazonar is what I call the warming up of reason. A reason that has been *corazonada* provides intimate sufficiencies (Arboleda 2002: 417) for going on fighting oppression against all odds. Both concepts—corazonar and intimate sufficiencies—emerge from the struggles of indigenous and Afro-descendent peoples in Latin America. I resort to them due to their potential to enlighten and strengthen struggles. They offer clues to help answer the question of resilience in an epochal context characterized by much defeat and extremely unequal power relations. I worked with them as an exercise in the sociology of emergences. I explain and expand symbolically both concepts in the following.

Corazonar is a concept used by indigenous peoples in the Andean region of Latin America. An Ecuadorian social scientist, Patricio Guerrero Arias, has

conducted extensive research with the people of Kitu Kara, an indigenous group whose territories surround the city of Quito, on the centrality of the concept of corazonar in the indigenous cosmovision.[11] It is an innovative study that very much traces the demanding paths of the epistemologies of the South. According to Guerrero Arias:

> The peoples of Kitu Kara present el corazonar as a spiritual and political proposal. Such a proposal differs from the ones proposed by Marxist analyses on some social movements which have been more concerned with structural and socio-economical changes. Corazonar proposes, rather, the healing of being. . . . From the point of view of corazonar it follows that one of the most perverse expressions of coloniality is that it has colonized four dimensions, powers or forces—*sayas*, as they are called in the Andean world. Humanity has woven life out of these *sayas*: affection; the sacred dimension of life; the feminine dimension of existence; and wisdom. All these forces should be colonized so as to achieve absolute dominion of life. (2016: 13)

The spiritual dimension is very central to the concept of corazonar but in a way that converts it into a non-Western-centric form of insurgent energy against oppression and unjust suffering.[12] Guerrero Arias emphasizes how the spirituality underlying the Andean corazonar differs from a New Age type of spirituality.[13]

Conceiving corazonar as an emergence is to see in it the expression of the alchemical hybrid of emotions/affects/reasons, the feeling/thinking inscribed in social struggles.[14] In this light corazonar is very similar to the idea of *sentipensar* (feeling-thinking) proposed by the Colombian sociologist Orlando Fals Borda.[15] It signifies how the fusion of reasons and emotions occurs, giving rise to empowering motivations and anticipations. The heart guides reason, whether to enjoy or change the world, a world made up of humans and nonhumans. Neither is the heart a mere human organ, nor is reason Cartesian rationality, nor has spirituality to be understood in the specific way that indigenous peoples use it to express the constitutive presence of a transcendent world in the immanent world. Corazonar means to experience the misfortune or unjust suffering of others as one's own and to be willing to join in the struggle against it, even to the point of running risks. It means doing away with passivity and strengthening active nonconformity before injustice. Corazonar never means that emotions cause a loss of control. On the contrary, emotions are the vital energy impelling good reasons to move into reasoned action. Corazonar produces a zooming effect by means of which a remote and alien world becomes a close and familiar one.

Corazonar is an expanded way of being-with, for it increases reciprocity and communion. It is the revitalizing process of a subjectivity that involves itself with others by selectively stressing whatever helps to strengthen sharing and being co-responsible. Corazonar does not fit the conventional dichotomies, be they mind/body, inner/outer, private/public, individual/collective, or memory/anticipation. Corazonar is a feeling-thinking that brings together all that is separated by dichotomies. It aims to be instrumentally useful without ceasing to be expressive and performative.

Corazonar is the act of building bridges between emotions/affections, on the one hand, and knowledges/reasons, on the other. Such a bridge is like a third reality, that is to say, a reality of meaningful emotions/affections and emotional or affective ways of knowing. Actually, corazonar is both the bridge and the river it bridges, since the mix of emotions/knowledges keeps changing as corazonar evolves together with the struggle. As corazonar evolves, either warming up or cooling off may occur, but there is always change.[16] Corazonar is always an exercise in self-learning, since changing one's understanding of the struggle goes hand in hand with changing one's self-understanding. Corazonar means to assume an enhanced personal responsibility for understanding and changing the world.

Corazonar cannot be planned. Either when initiating a struggle or joining an ongoing struggle, it occurs in a fathomless way. It occurs in social relations by means of interactions that enhance the perception of injustice and socialize the risks so as to minimize them. There are, however, contexts that favor or hinder its occurrence. At the sociocultural level, corazonar presupposes the anticipation that risk sharing be accepted in the social group. In other words, far from being reactive, it is creative agency aimed at problem solving. It presupposes a latent familiarity that increases as it becomes explicit. Such familiarity often includes shared memories of oppression and unjust suffering. Sharing may be facilitated by local, territorial belonging, but it can also occur through deterritorialized belongingness. Corazonar is not philanthropy, for philanthropy lies in the hierarchy of subjectivities; at bottom, philanthropy is an exercise in egotistical condescension.

Once reason is sufficiently corazonada, the oppressed group is endowed with an unshakable determination to go on struggling against overpowering enemies, even if the chances of winning are slim. Such strong determination has been rendered eloquently by Santiago Arboleda with the concept of intimate sufficiencies. In his study of the Afro-descendent people of Colombia, Arboleda uses the phrase to explain how the Afro-Colombian communities on the Pacific Coast persevere in the will and joy to fight in spite of the colonial

violence exerted against them for hundreds of years. This violence continues today and is experienced in many different forms, from racism to the illegal and violent expulsion from their lands, from massacres to the systematic rape of women by armed actors. According to Arboleda:

> "Intimate sufficiencies" are a set of internal supplies to be found in collective memory, a stock of meanings to be resorted to at critical moments for the construction of life strategies. They are, thus, an input shaping a social and cultural force of collective memory. Going back to memory does not entail an anachronistic return to the past; it is rather a way of releasing the power of our ways of thinking, doing, and naming with a view to carving, plowing, and finally clearing alternative paths vis-à-vis the official institutions, which is a valid way to rethink how to relaunch the social movement. (2002: 417)

The intimate sufficiencies represent a form of resistance that involves reexistence. It consists of, on the one side, the radical denunciation of an absence historically and ideologically produced by the abyssal line to create the terra nullius of colonial appropriation and violence, and, on the other side, the emergence of a boosted identity and political agency out of an exercise of "conscientization," to use Paulo Freire's expression. By means of this conscientization, unforgettable memories unsettle suppressed history, thereby generating an enhanced conception of the present as both urgent and of long duration—the long past of the present as the guarantee of a dignified future here and now. Societies are divided between those that do not want to remember and those that cannot forget. Intimate sufficiencies are the expression of the strength accruing to those who are able both to live and to relive the present.

Meaning and Copresence

Corazonar and intimate sufficiencies call for a complex articulation between sharing meaning and being copresent in the specific context of struggle. I have been stressing that meaning does not necessarily involve conceptual language and that narrative and storytelling may be even more powerful tools to make social experiences separated by time, space, and culture mutually accessible, intelligible, and relevant. It is, however, necessary to go beyond this and to show that sharing risks often involves particularly intense moments of copresence, moments in which presence precedes meaning.

Presence is the thingness or materiality upon which meanings are built. It refers to bodies, signs, sounds, and materials in their nonsemantic capacity,

that is, in their direct or immediate access to our senses. It is a form of being that, as Gumbrecht rightly states, "refers to the things of the world before they become part of a culture" (2004: 70). It is through meaning that things become culturally specific and often also incommensurable or unintelligible to other cultures. In my view, such things are not outside a culture; they are rather inside but in a different, noncultural way. They have a prerepresentational capacity for being outside thought and consciousness, while grounding thought and consciousness. They are material and operate at the level of instinct, emotion, affect. As Nietzsche's Zarathustra puts it, "Behind thy thoughts and feelings, my brother, there is a mighty lord, an unknown sage—it is called Self; it dwelleth in thy body, it is thy body. There is more sagacity in thy body than in thy best wisdom" (Nietzsche 2016).

Of the authors that have drawn our attention to the nonsemantic dimensions of interaction and communication, Gumbrecht (2004: 79) is the most eloquent in counterposing cultures that are dominated by presence (presence-cultures) and cultures that are dominated by meaning (meaning-cultures). Of course, in all cultures there is presence and meaning, but the emphasis on one or the other varies across cultures. Modern Western culture and the epistemologies of the North it grounds is a meaning-culture.[17] On the contrary, the epistemologies of the South privilege interculturality. Non-Western cultures are best understood as presence-cultures.

In intercultural exchanges specifically, the role of presence is to propitiate the generation of a sense of commonality, of culturally indifferent diversity, and of immediate evidence. A bundle of mutilated bodies in a killing field, the skinny body of a child about to die of hunger, the cry of a woman over the dead body of her young son, the sight of a man's or woman's naked body, an ecstatic movement or posture, the body's movements, the smells, the instruments and the ingredients in the performance of a ritual, all these presences are endowed with a power that seems relatively autonomous in relation to the meanings that may be attributed to them.

This page intentionally left blank

Part II

POSTABYSSAL METHODOLOGIES

This page intentionally left blank

6

COGNITIVE DECOLONIZATION: AN INTRODUCTION

In this chapter I deal with methodological issues. I discuss what I call the second degree of separation between the epistemologies of the South and the epistemologies of the North, beginning with two major problems. The first is how to decolonize knowledge and the methodologies by which it is produced. Since colonialism is a cocreation, however asymmetrical, decolonizing entails decolonizing both the knowledge of the colonized and the knowledge of the colonizer. The second is how to develop postabyssal, hybrid concepts and theories, along the lines of a decolonized mestizaje in which the mixture of knowledges, cultures, subjectivities, and practices subverts the abyssal line that grounds the epistemologies of the North. This topic is further discussed in chapters 7, 8, and 9.

If modern Western science has been a key instrument in expanding and consolidating modern domination, interrogating it from the perspective of the epistemologies of the South involves questioning its colonial character (producing and hiding the abyssal line that creates zones of nonbeing), its capitalist character (the global commodification of life through the exploitation of two noncommodities: labor and nature), and its patriarchal character (the devaluation of the lives and social labor of women on the basis of their devalued social being). As a matter of fact, decolonizing the social sciences makes little sense if it does not involve depatriarchalizing and decommodifying them as well. Focusing specifically on the colonial character of modern sciences may, however,

be justified in order to highlight the false universality at the root of the multifaceted epistemicide committed by modern science.

I have been arguing that the theories produced by the Eurocentric social sciences are ethnotheories characterized by producing and reproducing abyssal lines between metropolitan sociability and colonial sociability, and by making such lines invisible. What is their analytical value and for whom is it valuable? At a very general level, the answer has already been given in previous chapters when describing the conditions under which modern science can be a part of the ecology of knowledges generated in the social struggles of oppressed groups against domination. Specifically concerning the social sciences, the epistemologies of the South call for a kind of theoretical and methodological work with both a negative and a positive character. The negative dimension consists in the deconstructive unveiling of the Eurocentric roots of the modern social sciences on the basis of which the sociology of absences can be conducted. The positive dimension is twofold: on the one hand, one has the production of scientific knowledge geared to engage with other kinds of knowledges in the ecologies of knowledges that social struggle calls for, in other words, that is open to being validated by the double criterion of trust I mention in chapter 2; on the other hand, one has the identification, reconstruction, and validation of nonscientific, artisanal knowledges emerging from or utilized in struggles against domination. Both positive tasks aim at laying the ground for the sociology of emergences.

On Decolonizing and Depatriarchalizing

As I have been arguing, although both colonialism and patriarchy existed long before capitalism, they were profoundly reconfigured by it. Throughout this book, the term "colonialism" is used in its broadest sense to signify one of the two modern, Eurocentric modes of domination based on ontological deprivation, that is, the refusal to acknowledge the other's full humanity.[1] The other mode is patriarchy. These two modes of ontological deprivation work together. The dominant tendency of capitalism has been to undermine women's position as a whole. By combining European and African patriarchal ideologies, applied colonial policies tried to create new work relations and gender ideologies capable of guaranteeing the subalternization of women. As stressed by Silvia Federici, "For Marx, the wage hides the unpaid labor that workers perform but what Marx does not see is how the wage has been used to organize hierarchies that divide labor, beginning with gender as well as racial hierarchies" (Echevarria and Sernatinger 2014).

Analyses of the relation between patriarchy and colonialism reveal the tensions in gender relations in colonial contexts. According to Mies, with the arrival of colonialists "everything changed, as they brought their baggage of misogynous beliefs and restructured the economy and political power in ways that favoured men. Women suffered also at the hands of the traditional chiefs who, in order to maintain their power, began to take over the communal lands and expropriate the female members of the community from land and water rights" (1986: 230). The representation of African women as oversexed and the need to control their sexuality are core features of modern, colonial ideologies of domination. In colonial discourse, female bodies symbolize Africa as a conquered space. The supposed hyperfertility and sexual depravity of African women and men turned Africa into an object of colonial desire and contempt at one and the same time, that is, into a wild space in need of being legally controlled (Schmidt 1991; Magubane 2004). Linked to this violent transformation of gender roles, the colonial state imposed restrictive rules that significantly changed the family structure, while introducing new forms of patriarchal power. The immediate consequence of these new powers was, in Oyéronké Oyewùmí's words, "the exclusion of women from the newly created colonial public sphere" (1997: 123). The radical alteration of precolonial power structures led to the subordination, and even invention, of customary laws, which became part and parcel of a political model of decentralized despotism. As stressed by Mahmood Mamdani, "the model was monarchical, patriarchal, and authoritarian" (1996: 37). It is therefore not surprising that it would be unthinkable for the colonial government to acknowledge female leaders among the peoples it colonized (Meneses 2010). This perverse association of colonial authority with local male authorities (embodying the corpus of traditional/indigenous power structures) has produced a power/knowledge nexus filled with the silence of exclusions, erasures, distortions, and arbitrary fictions about women in contemporary political history.

Colonialism did not end with the end of historical colonialism based on foreign territorial occupation. Only its form changed. Indeed, as has been happening since the sixteenth century, capitalism cannot exert its domination except in articulation with colonialism. Likewise, the term "decolonization" does not concern political independence alone, but rather an ample historical process of ontological restoration, that is, the recognition of knowledges and the reconstruction of humanity. It includes, of course, a people's inalienable right to have their own history and make decisions on the basis of their own reality and experience (see Cabral 1976: 221–33; Césaire 1955; Smith 2012: 212; Ngũgĩ, 1986). Moreover, it aims to eliminate the abyssal line that continues to separate

metropolitan sociability from colonial sociability, subjecting the latter to forms of radical, abyssal exclusion. To account for the continuation of colonialism after the end of historical colonialism in the Latin American context, Aníbal Quijano (1991) has proposed the concept of "coloniality," which has become a cornerstone of the decolonial project.[2] As far as I am concerned, however, no new term is really needed. Just as capitalism has assumed very different forms throughout the past five centuries, in spite of which we go on identifying it as capitalism, I see no need for a new term to point out the historical mutations of colonialism and the possible horizons of decolonization. I see no reason to limit the concept of colonialism to a single variant, namely, the historical colonialism characterized by foreign, territorial occupation. As a matter of fact, the articulations between historical colonialism and capitalism, in the various time-spaces of modernity, gave rise to several forms of colonization, including settler colonialism, colonialism of economic exploitation, deportation colonies, and so on.[3] This is why, to my mind, instead of distinguishing colonialism from coloniality, we should rather characterize the different forms that colonialism and decolonization assume over the course of time.[4]

The term "decolonial turn," coined by Maldonado-Torres, shows that the decolonization of Eurocentric thinking or, more precisely, of the social sciences is a multisited and old phenomenon.[5] Actually, the idea of decolonization has always accompanied the dominant thinking as a subaltern or marginal stream. Of course, this idea was not always identified by the term "decolonization," even if its goal was to question to a certain (very limited) extent the legitimacy of the colonial enterprise. Bartolomé de las Casas (1484–1566) or António Vieira (1608–97) are pioneering examples. To label them centuries later as Eurocentric is a kind of easy, because anachronistic, criticism. On the other hand, in contemporary postcolonial studies we can often trace insidious colonial representations, for example, through the uncritical use of a homogenous and monolithic idea of Africa (mainly represented by ethnic and racial identities), an idea created by the colonial library (Mudimbe 1988: 16). As Linda Smith remarks, objects of research perpetuate the colonial relation: "being researched is synonymous with being colonised" (2012: 102). To give visibility to other libraries and other knowledges is one of the goals of the epistemologies of the South. The Islamic library, for example, contains knowledges that Ousmane Kane describes as "non-Europhone," since they are based on other epistemological orders and other "spaces of meaning" (2012: 3).[6] With the same goals in mind, Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui maintains that the project of indigenous modernity "can emerge from the present in a spiral whose movement is a continu-

ous feedback from the past to the future—a 'principle of hope' or 'anticipatory consciousness'—that both discerns and realizes decolonization at the same time" (2012: 96).

Decolonizing thinking has assumed many forms in response to the specificities of the articulation between capitalism and colonialism on different continents and at different historical moments. It is not my purpose here to go over all its facets. I simply intend to underscore some of the more relevant aspects in order to show in which ways the epistemologies of the South are a part of this tradition. In chapter 4, I submit that the resistance of national liberation movements to historical capitalism gave rise to a remarkable number of non-Eurocentric, mestizo, or hybrid knowledges, which have in common the fact that they were all born in the struggles or with the objective of being used in them. Such resistance opened horizons far beyond political independence. Fanon captures well the ultimate horizon of decolonization as being the construction of a new humanity capable of escaping the logic of the unending repetition of colonial epistemicide: "Colonialism is not satisfied merely with holding a people in its grip and emptying the native's brain of all form and content. By a kind of perverted logic, it turns to the past of oppressed people, and distorts, disfigures, and destroys it" (1968: 210).

In the 1930s, Aimé Césaire, together with other Black intellectuals, created the concept of négritude.[7] The emergence of négritude in literary circles in Paris represented a political space of identitarian struggles resulting from the French colonial situation. Négritude, as a political and cultural demand, amounted to the refusal of colonial domination, a domination characterized by conquest, slavery, deportation, cultural and spiritual denial, political oppression, and economic exploitation—all of this, of course, legitimized by the supposed superiority of the white race and the excellence of European civilization (Meneses 2010, 2016). Such an intellectual challenge generated a radical political program capable of bringing about decolonization in the context of that time, dealing with such diverse questions as assimilation, creolization, racialization, and colonialism.

According to Ngũgĩ (1986), decolonization consists in the search for a liberating perspective aimed at facilitating self-understanding ("seeing ourselves clearly") after centuries of submission, dismemberment, and alienation. The concept of dismemberment captures not only physical fragmentation but also the epistemological colonization of the mind, as well as the "cultural decapitation" that resulted in profound forms of alienation among Africans. As Ngũgĩ stresses,

> The dismemberment of Africa occurred in two stages. During the first of these, the African personhood was divided into two halves: the continent and its diaspora. African slaves, the central commodity in the mercantile phase of capitalism, formed the basis of the sugar, cotton and tobacco plantations in the Caribbean and American mainland. If we accept that slave trade and plantation slavery provided the primary accumulation of capital that made Europe's Industrial Revolution possible, we cannot escape the irony that the very needs of that Industrial Revolution—markets for finished goods, sources for raw materials, and strategic requirements in the defense of trade routes—led inexorably to the second stage of the dismemberment of the continent. . . . Just as the slave plantations were owned by various European powers, so post-Berlin Conference Africa was transformed into a series of colonial plantations owned by many of the same European powers. (2009: 5–6)

In the same direction, Valentin Mudimbe (1994) also shares this denunciation of identitarian and civilizational deconstruction to the point of affirming that "the geographical expansion of Europe and its civilization . . . submitted the world to its memory" (1994: xii). The insidious presence of colonial knowledge is beautifully portrayed in Cheikh Hamidou Kane's novel *L'aventure ambiguë*. In this novel, first published in France in 1961, Kane reflects on the power of the colonial schools that rendered the conquest a lasting one: "the cannon compels the body and the school bewitches the soul" (1963: 49). Kwasi Wiredu, in turn, defends his proposal for a "conceptual decolonization of African philosophy" and explains his position thus: "By decolonization, I mean divesting African philosophical thinking of all undue influences emanating from our colonial past. The crucial word in this formulation is 'undue.' Obviously, it would not be rational to try to reject everything of a colonial ancestry. Conceivably, a thought or a mode of inquiry spearheaded by our erstwhile colonizers may be valid or in some way beneficial to humankind. Are we called upon to reject or ignore it? That would be a madness having neither rhyme nor reason" (1998: 17).[8] Paulin Hountondji, whose intellectual trajectory is an eloquent example of the complex relations between Eurocentric and African knowledge, criticizes the extroversion of the producers of knowledge in the periphery and their dependency vis-à-vis outside sources of authority. He proposes the concept of endogenous knowledge, which combines the idea of the active and autonomous production of knowledge in African societies with the idea of its dissemination and relevance beyond the contexts in which it emerges. In his own words: "Things should also happen in Africa, therefore, and not always or exclusively

outside Africa. Fairness to the Black continent demands that all the knowledge accumulated throughout centuries on different aspects of its life be shared with the people who live there. It demands that adequate measures be taken to facilitate a lucid, responsible appropriation by Africa of the knowledge available, the discussions and interrogations developed elsewhere. Such appropriation should go hand in hand with a critical re-appropriation of Africa's own endogenous knowledges and, beyond, a critical appropriation of the very process of knowledge production and capitalization" (Hountondji 2009: 9–10).[9]

Achille Mbembe brilliantly characterizes the exercise of political power in Africa after the independences by proposing the concept of postcolony. The concept designates a form of correspondence, or even transparency, between modes of being, knowing, and exercising political power. The postcolony is no more than a new kind of colonialism that comes after historical colonialism. "To be sure, the postcolony is chaotically pluralistic, yet it has nonetheless an internal coherence. It is a specific system of signs, a particular way of fabricating simulacra or re-forming stereotypes. It is not, however, just an economy of signs in which power is mirrored and imagined self-reflectively. The postcolony is characterized by a distinctive style of political improvisation, by a tendency to excess and a lack of proportion as well as by distinctive ways in which identities are multiplied, transformed and put into circulation" (Mbembe 1992: 3–4).

Focusing on the contemporary characteristics of the state in Africa, Ndlovu-Gatsheni writes, "There is a lot that constituted good governance co-existing uneasily and tendentiously with bad governance. So, post-colonial African dictators are not justified in claiming to be ruling according to African tradition. Eurocentric scholars are also wrong in trying to justify postcolonial crises of governance on the basis of pre-colonial way of doing things in Africa. Perhaps the crisis of governance in postcolonial Africa has more to do with the legacy of late colonialism" (2008: 86). The palimpsest of power structures resulting from an overlapping of various political and juridical cultures characterizes many contemporary postcolonial realities.[10] As Mbembe stresses, the weight of colonial legacies in various postcolonial contexts results in "necropolitics," described as an exercise of power aimed mainly at "the generalized instrumentalization of human existence and the material destruction of human bodies and populations" (2003: 14). In my own terms, necropolitics, that is to say, the persistent dehumanization of vast portions of the population, reflects the persistence of abyssal political thinking; situated on the other side of the line, these populations represent spaces of exception, inhabited by subhumans.

In Asia, decolonizing thinking has had multiple manifestations. One of the better known is the one represented by the South Asian Subaltern Studies Group,

created in India in the 1970s under the leadership of Ranajit Guha (1982). Its major objective was to analyze critically not only the Indian colonial historiography undertaken by Europeans, but also Eurocentric Indian nationalist historiography, as well as orthodox Marxist historiography.[11] Over the course of years, Subaltern Studies produced an impressive set of studies that had remarkable influence far beyond India. For example, in the early 1990s, U.S.-based Latin American intellectuals created the Latin-American Subaltern Studies Group. In the tradition of Indian subaltern studies, Shahid Amin (2015, 2018) has been proposing an important historical revision concerning the newly resurgent divide between Indian-Hindu and Pakistani-Muslim, while debating the possibilities and limits of the idea of plurality and diversity. While commenting on the emergence of a school of Indian social sciences, Sujata Patel (2014) studies the trajectory of various Indian scientists to highlight the construction of alternative theories of modernity grounded in an anticolonial, nationalist sociological imagination.

Another strand of decolonizing thinking has been developed by Syed Alatas. Alatas denounces the weight of colonial legacy in contemporary education, a legacy that produces "captive minds," an "uncritical and imitative mind dominated by an external source, whose thinking is deflected from an independent perspective" (1974: 692). On the basis of a profound knowledge of Eurocentric social sciences, Alatas shows their deficiencies in understanding non-Western societies; at the same time he stresses the wealth of Islamic knowledge, particularly the knowledge produced in south and southwest Asia (see also Alatas 1993, 2006c; Elst, 2001). Together with other scholars, Alatas has been committed to developing a sociological (epistemic and ethical) project that is capable of disclosing the colonial foundations of European social thought and retrieving non-Western epistemologies (Alatas and Sinha 2001: 319–29; Alatas 2006c: 786–87). In a different, though convergent, strand, in the 1970s Ali Shariarti (1979) was already arguing for the construction of an Islamic sociology (see also Ba-Yunus and Ahmad 1985).

Latin America has a long tradition of anticolonial and postcolonial thinking. The most distinguished scholars in this tradition are Roberto Retamar, Rudolfo Kusch (1998–2003), Paulo Freire (1970, 1985), Orlando Fals Borda (2009), Darcy Ribeiro (1996), Pablo González Casanova (1969, 1996, 2006), Aníbal Quijano (1991, 2005), and Enrique Dussel (1995, 2000, 2002, 2005, 2008).[12] The last two are better known today for their role in the formation of the important research program designated as Grupo Modernidad/Colonialidad.[13] Walter Mignolo, Arturo Escobar, Ramón Grosfoguel, Nelson Maldonado-Torres, Catherine Walsh, and María Lugones are some of the scholars in this strand of research.

According to Mignolo, "Because decoloniality's point of origination was the Third World, in its diversity of local histories and different times and Western imperial countries that first interfered with those local histories . . . border thinking is the epistemic singularity of any decolonial project" (2013: 131).[14] Another crucial concept is Dussel's "transmodernity." Dussel speaks of "the resurgence of a recent potentiality in many of the cultures blinded by the dazzling 'brightness'—in many cases only apparent—of Western culture and modernity. . . . From this omitted potentiality and altering 'exteriority' emerges a project of 'trans'-modernity, a 'beyond' that transcends Western modernity (since the West has never adopted it but, rather, has scorned it and valued it as 'nothing') and that will have a creative function of great significance in the twenty-first century" (2002: 221). By emphasizing the existence of a long tradition of indigenous and Black critical thinking that is rarely recognized by Latin American scholars and leftist intellectuals, Catherine Walsh (2002, 2008, 2009) traces the way in which indigenous Andean and Afro-descendent peoples changed the "geopolitics of knowledge."

Equally important is the concept of the "coloniality of being," developed by Maldonado-Torres (2007: 249–70), to which I refer in chapter 4. Ontological deprivation occurs through two fatal inscriptions: race and gender. María Lugones (2003, 2007, 2010a) proposes the "gender modern/colonial system" as something far broader than Quijano's "coloniality of power." She finds the latter "too narrow an understanding of the oppressive modern/colonial constructions of the scope of gender. Quijano's lenses also assume patriarchal and heterosexual understandings of the disputes over control of sex, its resources, and products. Quijano accepts the global, Eurocentered, capitalist understanding of what gender is about" (Lugones 2010a: 370).

Sylvia Wynter, in turn, denounces in the following way the racist ontology underlying the modern Eurocentric project present in American contexts: "Black Africa together with the dark-skinned poorer peoples assimilated to its category have been made to function within the terms of our present biocentric conception of the human as well as of its related 'formulation of a general order of existence' . . . as the actualized embodiment no longer of the human made degenerate by sin and therefore fallen to the status of the apes, but of the human totally dysselected, barely evolved and as such intermediate between 'true' humans and the primates" (2003: 325). The Caribbean Philosophical Association has played a crucial role in promoting the decolonizing revision of the different philosophical and social science traditions via the lens of creolization.[15] Besides the work of Wynter and Maldonado-Torres, already cited, the work of Édouard Glissant (1989, 2009, 2010), Lewis Gordon

(1995a, 2000, 2007, forthcoming), Jane Gordon (2005, 2014), and Paget Henry (Henry 2000; Gordon, J., Gordon, L., Kamugisha and Roberts, 2016) is particularly relevant.[16]

In the context of decolonial Europe, Grosfoguel has been advancing a decolonizing perspective articulating Islam and feminism: "Muslim religious identity today constitutes one of the most prominent markers of superiority/inferiority along the line of the human. Muslims are constructed in North America and Europe today as 'barbarians,' 'backward,' 'uncivilized,' 'violent,' 'terrorist,' 'abusive of children, women and gay/lesbians,' 'un-adaptable to European values,' etc. I said 'one of the most prominent markers' because in these two regions of the world color racism continues to be of great importance and entangles itself in complex ways with religious racism" (2016b: 11).[17]

Molefi Asante has lately retrieved the concept of Afrocentricity, first advanced by Nkrumah in the 1960s. Asante refurbished the concept with a specific philosophical meaning in his 1980 book *Afrocentricity: The Theory of Social Change*. According to Asante:

> The Afrocentric paradigm is a revolutionary shift in thinking proposed as a *constructural* adjustment to black disorientation, decenteredness, and lack of agency. The Afrocentrist asks the question, "What would African people do if there were no white people?" . . . Afrocentricity becomes a revolutionary idea because it studies ideas, concepts, events, personalities, and political and economic processes from a standpoint of black people as subjects and not as objects, basing all knowledge on the authentic interrogation of *location*. (2009)[18]

Situating the Epistemologies of the South

The proposal of the epistemologies of the South is part of this vast current of decolonizing thinking. Some of its more distinct features help us to understand more precisely its relation to said current and grasp its specificity more easily.

First, modern colonialism is a mode of domination that works in close articulation with two other modes of modern domination: capitalism and patriarchy. This means that, like capitalism and patriarchy, colonialism has also, historically, assumed different forms. To be sure, historical colonialism, including foreign territorial occupation, was its more obvious form. However, even when it lasted (and it still exists residually to this day), other forms existed, namely in Europe, such as racism and discrimination against certain social groups (the case of the Roma, among others) or against certain regions (for example, the

peoples of the Balkans and of southern or eastern Europe).[19] In any case, to study and fight historical colonialism as if it were a completely autonomous mode of domination may contribute to worsening the other modes of domination, which, in turn, will end up reinforcing colonialism in general. In order to be consistent and efficacious, decolonizing thought and action must be likewise anticapitalist and antipatriarchal. According to the epistemologies of the South, decolonizing thought and action won't be an efficacious cultural intervention if they are not an intervention in political economy as well. The work of Arturo Escobar (2005, 2008, 2010, 2011) as a whole represents one of the most convincing articulations between the two kinds of intervention.

Second, even when the analysis is focused on historical colonialism alone, we must take into account that historical colonialism assumed different features in different regions of the world. The Latin American bibliography on decolonization focuses exclusively on the conquest of the New World. Both Quijano and Dussel take the moment of the conquest and colonization of Latin America as being constitutive of Eurocentric modernity. To be sure, historical colonialism also spread in Africa and Asia, having assumed different features there. To the extent that such differences are considered relevant, different kinds of colonialism give rise to different kinds of postcolonialism. For example, while the Atlantic Ocean became globalized because of European expansion, the Indian Ocean had been a globalized space long before European navigators reached it.[20] Some strands of Latin American thought may run the risk of turning the New World into an alternative centrality (transmodernity) and thus of falling into the trap of Eurocentric modernity. The elective affinities between Latin American decolonial thinking and the epistemologies of the South become particularly evident whenever both approaches avoid turning alternative, territorial centralities into sites of new epistemological master narratives. The only centrality acknowledged by the epistemologies of the South has no center: it is the centrality of the struggles against capitalist, colonial, and patriarchal domination wherever they may take place.

Third, because of the centrality of the struggles, epistemologies of the South are effective and flourish in the social fields where the struggles take place and thus outside the sites of academic debate. Of course, such struggles can also occur in the academic world and can even be very violent. Given the nature of academic knowledge as a separate practice, however, such struggles, seen from the point of view of the epistemologies of the South, will end up having little epistemological relevance if they fail to cross the barriers separating them in order to join other social struggles. Those adopting the epistemologies of the South know very well that knowing-with, instead of knowing-about, requires concrete

participation in social struggles and being prepared to run the risks that may result from such participation. From this perspective, academic disputes are very low-intensity struggles as compared to the struggles engaging social groups that are the direct victims of capitalist, colonialist, and patriarchal violence.

Fourth, epistemologies of the South valorize, in particular, the cognitive diversity of the world, while attempting to construct procedures capable of promoting interknowledge and interintelligibility. Hence the importance given to such concepts as ecologies of knowledges, ecologies of classification, ecologies of scales, ecologies of temporalities, ecologies of productivity (Santos 2014: 188–211), as well as to such procedures as intercultural translation and the artisanship of practices. Knowledges are thus understood to have distinct identities, articulations between them resulting from the needs and objectives of the social struggles. Mignolo proposes the concept of border thinking as a general feature of decolonizing thought. Even though I don't disagree with this conceptualization, I rather stress that it is ultimately up to the specific dynamics of the social struggles to determine the kinds of ecologies of knowledges they resort to in each case. In light of this, I venture to say that the most crucial general feature to be ascribed to the knowledges participating in and emerging from them is that they are committed to the struggles of the oppressed social groups.

Fifth, the celebration of diversity and the search for new cognitive articulations to render social struggles more efficacious call for dialogues and interactions between counterhegemonic knowledges, whether they are postabyssal scientific or artisanal knowledges. Rather than the polarization or dogmatism of absolute opposition, so frequent in academic disputes, the epistemologies of the South call for establishing bridges between comfort and discomfort zones, between the familiar and the strange fields of domination and of struggle. As Angela Davis once said, "walls turned sideways are bridges" (1974: 137). This stance is not specific to the epistemologies of the South. What is specific about epistemologies of the South is that they form bridges between knowledges born of different epistemologies, both scientific and artisanal knowledges. But this same stance is also crucial in the more restricted ambit of academic knowledge, inviting the recognition of interlinked stories.[21] This is how I read the proposal advanced by Gurminder Bhambra (2007, 2014).[22] According to her, "connected sociologies . . . point to the historical connections generated by processes of colonialism, enslavement, dispossession and appropriation, that were previously elided in mainstream sociology in favour of narrower understandings, as well as to the use of 'connections' as a way of recuperating these alternative histories, and, therefore, sociologies. . . . The past and its sociological forms of

misrecognition, I argue, continue to constrain our ability to imagine different futures" (Bhambra 2014: 3).[23]

Last, the centrality of the social struggles against domination leads the epistemologies of the South to be as concerned with the criticism and deconstruction of dominant knowledge as with the construction of alternative, transformative knowledges, such as postabyssal, scientific knowledges. Decolonizing thought has been mainly deconstructive, often indebted to Foucault's and Derrida's Eurocentric deconstruction. Epistemologies of the South propose nonextractivist methodologies, on the basis of which postabyssal, scientific knowledge is built. In this regard, epistemologies of the South engage in dialogue with two positions that have recently defended the emergence of the South as the center of production of academic knowledge. I mean Raewyn Connell's proposal of a Southern theory and Jean and John Comaroff's theory from the South. Both these proposals define the South primordially as a geographical south, not as an epistemic South, as proposed by the epistemologies of the South.

According to Connell (2007), Southern theory is an internally much-varied, decolonizing, theoretical constellation. While unveiling the hidden geopolitical assumptions of northern social theory, starting out from the empirical and theoretical experience of colonial and postcolonial societies, it formulates new analytical and theoretical proposals. Adopting the lenses of Southern theory, such concepts and realities as class, disability, work, family, and management gain new light and allow for the identification of new problems and new approaches to old problems. Just as I have been arguing that epistemologies of the South are not the inverted image of epistemologies of the North, Connell states, "We cannot oppose this by treating Southern theory as if it were a distinct set of propositions, an alternative paradigm to be erected in opposition to the hegemonic concepts. We don't want another system of intellectual dominance" (2014: 218). Like Bhambra, Connell aims at an internal intervention in the field of the social sciences. Artisanal knowledges are included, to the extent that the methodological innovations proposed by Southern theory give them more visibility, by putting them at the service of the construction of a better scientific knowledge.

Jean Comaroff and John Comaroff's (2012) *Theory from the South* starts from the idea that, with the turn of the dynamism of global capitalism toward the east and south, future hegemonic thinking will come from those regions rather than from the north and the west, as until now. Such a displacement is maintained on the basis of two arguments. On the one hand, "modernity in the south is not adequately understood as a derivative or a doppelganger, a callow copy or

a counterfeit, of the Euro-American 'original'" (2013: 17). On the other hand, "contrary to the received Euromodernist narrative of the past two centuries . . . there is good reason to think that, given the unpredictable under-determined dialectic of capitalism-and-modernity in the here and now, it is the south that often is the first to feel the effects of world-historical forces, the south in which radically new assemblages of capital and labor are taking shape, thus to prefigure the future of the global north" (2013: 18).

I am not sure that the epistemological or political nature of such a transformation is adequately characterized by the Comaroffs. The South they have in mind is perhaps the South of the dynamism of global capitalism? On the other hand, the South of the epistemologies of the South is the anti-imperial South, the nongeographical South made up of the struggles of numberless populations of the geographical south and north against the domination of capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy. They call themselves epistemologies of the South because, historically, the populations of the global South were the ones that most severely suffered the expansion of modern domination from the north and west. For these populations, the migration to the south of the dynamism of global capital is not necessarily good news.

On Building the Epistemic Anti-imperial South

The methodological issues raised by the epistemologies of the South are very complex, if for no other reason than because the cognitive work called for by these epistemologies must be carried out both inside conventional research institutions and outside them, in the social fields in which the resistance against capitalist, colonialist, and patriarchal domination is taking place. While carried out in conventional research institutions, such work is bound to be looked upon with suspicion and be considered a nonrigorous, politically motivated, and therefore unreliable kind of research. At a time when the old common sense of research institutions, based on curiosity and disinterest, is being replaced by the new common sense that measures the relevance of knowledge by its market value (its usefulness for solvent social demands), the methodological tasks called for by the epistemologies of the South will be either fiercely resisted or utterly discarded as not belonging. Indeed, the postabyssal researcher is at the antipodes of the consultant. The latter is someone whose knowledge has a specific utility with a price tag and for which there is a solvent demand. The postabyssal researcher is someone for whose knowledge there is a huge and urgent but nonmarketable demand; his or her knowledge is useful for social

groups who cannot imagine having to pay for it or, if they had to, would not be able to afford it.

Is the hegemony of the epistemologies of the North linearly tied up with the fate of global capitalism? Is the visible erosion of such hegemony an irreversible historical process? Is it a symptom of inertia or rather of anticipation? Is it a cycle or a mere wave? What might be the epistemological impact of the dislocation of the dynamism of global capitalism to the east, as seems to be the case nowadays with the rise of Asia? Could modern science, the ultimate icon of the epistemologies of the North, consort with cultural imperatives that, from the point of view of Eurocentric culture, cannot but be seen as harboring unacceptable levels of instrumentalization and a lack of rigor? Are, indeed, the new forms of instrumentalization all that different from the ones typical of the Eurocentric culture with which science has always cohabited? Is Freud's unconscious, recognized today by many as a scientific breakthrough, less arbitrary than the divine inspiration to which Ibn Khaldun (1958) ascribes the discovery of the new science in *The Muqaddimah*?

As the hegemony of the epistemologies of the North cannot be analyzed in isolation from global capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy, the call for the epistemologies of the South is likewise intimately linked, as I have been stressing, to the social struggles against capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy. For the past forty years they have been gradually calling into question the cultural assumptions and the conceptual and theoretical patterns underlying the epistemologies of the North. Many cultural premises and political agendas emerging from such struggles in different regions of the world include ways of conceiving of the relations between society and nature, the individual and the community, and immanence and transcendence that are foreign to those held by the epistemologies of the North.

The historical process of epistemological decolonization, besides being a long-term process, is an unequal and asymmetrical process as concerns both fields of knowledge and world regions. The work of epistemological decolonization implies distinct social and cultural processes in regions that were the victims of historical colonialism, on the one hand, and in regions that were responsible for colonization, on the other. However crucial, this distinction is rarely addressed by decolonial literature. In the regions subjected to European colonialism, the epistemologies of the North, as well as Eurocentric culture in general, started out by being an imposition that gradually, partially, and unevenly was endogenized by means of different forms of appropriation, selective and creative borrowing, hybridization, and so on. Such processes permitted

the counterhegemonic use of Western-centric knowledges, as witness the contributions of modern science, Marxism, and Western philosophy to the national liberation movements of Africa and Asia and, more recently, to alternative conceptions of democracy, human rights, and constitutionalism. The limits of this counterhegemonic use (both state centered and grassroots centered) to generate alternatives to capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy are more evident today than ever before.[24] The results are not brilliant, to say the least, as global domination is today more aggressive than ever. Neoliberalism, the monocultural economic logic fueling the articulation between capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy, seems to fear no enemies any longer, if for no other reason than because it is today capable of resorting to the monotony of war whenever the monotony of economic relations (Marx) does not suffice. The counterhegemonic use of Western-centric ideas is delivering less and less promise and energy to social groups in their struggle against domination.

This is, however, only one side of the story. As I mentioned above, in the past half-century the geopolitical displacements with regard to the dynamics of the social struggles against capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy have been increasingly corroding the hegemony of the epistemologies of the North. New or previously suppressed problematics have permeated political, scientific, and educational communities inspired by a variety of anti-Western, East-centric, South-centric, indigenous-centric repertoires of social and individual life, nature, spirituality, and good living. The innermost *Geist* of Western-centric power structures in our time is probably this strange combination of a sense of undisputed power and raw domination with a sense of the irreversible erosion of authority and hegemony.

In Europe and North America (the latter, once cleared of indigenous people and worldviews), the hegemony of the epistemologies of the North has deeper cultural roots. However, the struggles for the recognition of cultural diversity, as well as the migratory fluxes following the independences and later as a result of neoliberal economics, war, and climate change, have been gradually destabilizing the epistemological and monocultural hegemony by sneaking in new problematics and new kinds of epistemological approaches. The reaction has been swift. The censorial tools take many different forms: ranking educational institutions according to capitalist criteria of excellence; the positivistic and monocultural formatting of syllabi and scientific and professional careers; disciplining and silencing rebel scientists; books banned in the upbringing of young people for ideological reasons, whether religious or not; control of scientific creativity by invoking strict criteria of economic utility or academic per-

formance (for instance, publications evaluated according to so-called impact factors rather than by their innovative character).

In the global North, the hegemony of the epistemologies of the North is more deeply entrenched and the interests in preventing its erosion are more organized. Moreover, the global North is where there is greater convergence between the epistemologies of the North and dominant Eurocentric culture, and where broader social groups benefit directly or indirectly from capitalist, colonialist, and patriarchal domination. Accordingly, the suppression of the subaltern knowledges that are based on premises other than those underlying the epistemologies of the North is more radical.[25]

In the twentieth century, Carl Jung was, after Joseph Needham, the European intellectual who best tried to understand Eastern thought and who best illustrates the difficulty in decolonizing Eurocentric thinking in the global North. This is how Jung expresses the difficulties he encountered in trying to fully understand the Chinese text titled *The Secret of the Golden Flower*, which he and the sinologist Richard Wilhelm had published and commented upon:

> A thorough Westerner in feeling, I cannot but be profoundly impressed by the strangeness of this Chinese text. It is true that some knowledge of Eastern religions and philosophies helps my intellect and my intuition to understand these things up to a point, just as I can understand the paradoxes of primitive beliefs in terms of "ethnology" or "comparative religion." This is of course the Western way of hiding one's heart under the cloak of so-called scientific understanding. We do it partly because the *misérable vanité des savants* fears and rejects with horror any sign of living sympathy, and partly because sympathetic understanding might transform contact with an alien spirit into an experience that has to be taken seriously. (Wilhelm and Jung 1999: 82)

The limits of a potentially decolonizing gesture are quite patent in Jung's solution. Confronted with what is at stake, Jung feels the need to revisit the specificity of Western culture before opening himself to diversity:

> It is not for us to imitate what is foreign to our organism or to play the missionary; our task is to build up our Western civilization, which sickens with a thousand ills. This has to be done on the spot, and by the European just as he is, with all his Western ordinariness, his marriage problems, his neuroses, his social and political delusions, and his whole philosophical disorientation. . . . Therefore it is sad indeed when the European departs from his own nature and imitates the East or "affects" it in any way. The

> possibilities open to him would be so much greater if he would remain true to himself and evolve out of his own nature all that the East has brought forth in the course of the millennia. (Wilhelm and Jung 1999: 84)

Jung's explicitly Eurocentric proposal—unabashedly Eurocentric since it is quite sure of what it means to be genuinely European—is totally unaware of the arrogance involved in claiming European authenticity by turning other cultures into raw material. With the advent of colonialism, the loyalty of the West to itself was nothing more than its arrogance in creating victims cavalierly, hurting efficiently, and appropriating everything that was strange to itself, that was subject to its power, and that might be utilized. The other side of such an orgy of arrogance and power is the difficulty in acknowledging the other, in deeply listening to and learning with and from the other, in recognizing the unknown as a challenge even before knowing it, in risking a certain defamiliarization with one's own ways (one's comfort zone) for the sake of a wider familiarity with the world's diversity.

When we consider the colonized world as perceived by the colonized, the difficulties in decolonizing knowledge and culture are equally serious but different. Writing during World War I, Rabindranath Tagore and Dasgupta affirm:

> We in the East believe in personality. In the West you have your admiration for power. . . . What is the harvest of your civilization? You do not see from the outside. You do not realize what a terrible menace you have become to man. We are afraid of you. And everywhere people are suspicious of each other. All the great countries of the West are preparing for war, for some great desolation that will spread poison all over the world. And this poison is within their own selves. . . . Their minds are filled with mutual suspicion and hatred and anger and yet they try to invent some machinery which will solve the difficulties. . . . They have efficiency, but that alone does not help. Why? Because man is human while the machinery is impersonal. Men of power have efficiency in outward things; but the personality of man is lost. You do not feel it, the divine in man, the divinity which is humanity. (2009: 168–69)

Further down, alluding to Western aggression (at that time identified with imperial Europe):

> The sphere of Europe's success has long attracted our attention, but where Europe has failed is in the depths, at the very root, and so this has been kept hidden from us. The greed of Europe which forced opium down China's throat does not die with the death of China; its poison

> is everyday entering into the vitals of Europe's own life. . . . History is a record of sudden surprises which have overwhelmed nations too sure of their inviolable superiority to moral laws. (Tagore and Dasgupta 2009: 176)

In a gesture that seems to be similar to Jung's, Tagore and Dasgupta also warn against the danger that the East might be tempted to imitate the West. But the reasons invoked are radically different. The gesture amounts now to an act of self-defense against an invading, aggressive way of thinking. "This has been the effect of the teaching of the West everywhere in the world. It has roused up a universal spirit of suspicious antipathy. It incites each people to strain all resources for taking advantages of others by force or cunning. This cult of organized pride and self-seeking, this deliberate falsification of moral perspective in our view of humanity, has also invaded with a new force men's minds in India" (Tagore and Dasgupta 2009: 183).

Given the hegemony still enjoyed by the epistemologies of the North and the Eurocentric culture associated with them, the greatest challenge facing the epistemologies of the South is to render credible and urgent the need to recognize the epistemological diversity of the world in order to enlarge and deepen world experience and conversation. We are facing long-term historical processes. Moreover, there is danger that the narcissism that characterizes the way the epistemologies of the North look down on other epistemologies will be confronted by the inverted and rival narcissism of the epistemologies of the South. To break the vicious circle of such a dualism is at the core of the epistemological work carried out in this book. I would like to conceive of this epistemological task as corresponding to the task undertaken, at another level, by Frantz Fanon as he defines it at the beginning of *Black Skin, White Masks*: "The white man is sealed in his whiteness. The black man in his blackness. We shall seek to ascertain the directions of this dual narcissism and the motivations that inspire it. . . . Concern with the elimination of a vicious circle has been the only guideline for my efforts" (1967a: 11–12).

The possibility of mutual enrichment among knowledges and among cultures is the raison d'être of the epistemologies of the South. In the process, new time-spaces may be created, bringing about subaltern, partial, emergent, and insurgent cosmopolitanisms that spring from cross-fertilization. Rather than an undifferentiated contemporaneity, it becomes possible to think of multiple forms of being contemporaneous. The flatness or unilayeredness of simultaneity may thus be articulated with the thickness or multilayeredness of contemporaneity.[26]

Epistemological Imagination

C. Wright Mills dedicated one of his most brilliant analyses to the theme of the sociological imagination. According to him, the sociological imagination "in considerable part consists of the capacity to shift from one perspective to another, and in the process to build up an adequate view of a total society and of its components. . . . It is this imagination, of course, that sets off the social scientist from the mere technician" (Mills 2000: 211). Mills goes on to give examples of the different ways in which the sociological imagination can be put to work. They all concern the creative use of the methods of conventional sociological research. The sociological imagination partakes of a kind of playfulness that permits us, among other things, to ask surprising questions and combine apparently incongruous perspectives and scales. Mills is quite eloquent in this regard: "Since one can be trained only in what is already known, training sometimes incapacitates one from learning new ways; it makes one rebel against what is bound to be at first loose and even sloppy. But you must cling to such vague images and notions, if they are yours, and you must work them out. For it is in such forms that original ideas, if any, almost always first appear" (2000: 212). Further down, when dealing both with the general question of method and the question of specific research methodologies, I shall have the opportunity to underscore the wisdom of Mills's advice to the young social scientist. However, the creative stance Mills encourages is totally confined to the existing methodologies and thus does not question them; thus, it takes for granted the epistemological presuppositions underlying the Eurocentric social sciences, that is to say, the epistemologies of the North. And this in spite of the fact that Mills is critical of positivist empiricism. As I show in chapter 11, Orlando Fals Borda goes much further than Mills in questioning the epistemological and methodological premises of Eurocentric social sciences.

The work toward decolonizing the Eurocentric social sciences, to which the epistemologies of the South invite us, forces us to preempt Mills's sociological imagination with the epistemological imagination. The epistemologies of the South are, negatively, a moment of interruption; positively, they are a moment of imagination. We have, therefore, to establish with precision the historical time of the epistemologies of the South. It is basically a time of epistemological imagination aimed at refounding the political imagination. Whereas the sociological imagination aims at an internal critique of the Eurocentric social sciences, the epistemological imagination takes off from an external critique in order to render the ecologies of knowledges and postabyssal science credible and efficacious. Ultimately, the purpose is to strengthen the social struggles against domination.

The epistemological imagination calls for new ideas, surprising perspectives and scales, and relations between concepts or realities conventionally not relatable. I highlight the following operations of the epistemological imagination:

1. To compare or contrast scientific and artisanal knowledge in order to imagine the different concerns each of them conveys and the different interests each of them serves or may serve. Such an exercise of imagination allows one to identify possible instances of cooperation or competition between the two kinds of knowledge. The concrete hermeneutics of practical concerns and interests will pragmatically yield the relative validities, the hierarchies between knowledges, and the possibilities and limits of hybridization among them.
2. To imagine surprising perspectives. The epistemologies of the South encourage surprising perspectives, what Kenneth Burke calls, after Nietzsche, "perspectives by incongruity" (1954: 69), that is to say, perspectives that merge or relate categories that are conventionally mutually exclusive.[27] One of Burke's examples is Veblen's concept of trained incapacity (in which training contradicts capacity) to explain to what extent technical or scientific specialization may lead to the inability to understand something that, though obvious to the layperson, remains outside the limits of specialization. The epistemologies of the South resort to such surprising perspectives to formulate their fundamental concepts. For example, the concept of the sociology of absences brings together two seemingly incompatible realities, that is to say, to study in social reality what apparently does not exist there. By the same token, the concept of the sociology of emergences has to do with studying what is not yet reality, or is reality only potentially. Furthermore, the concept of the ecology of knowledges imagines relations between knowledges that, according to conventional system theories, would be possible only between elements of the same totality; on the contrary, the ecology of knowledges imagines them as autonomous knowledges engaged in processes of fusion or hybridization. The concept of intercultural translation itself conventionally suggests forms of intelligibility between the same or similar ideas in different languages, whereas in the epistemologies of the South it actually refers to ideas that are often very different and may, or may not, be expressed in the same language.[28]
3. To imagine, and open to further verification, the different ways through which different kinds of knowledge may contribute, whether

positively or negatively, to a given social struggle as seen from the point of view of the different parts involved. The contributions in question may be direct or indirect, explicit or disguised as their opposite, unconditional or conditional, treacherous or perverse, entailing much collateral damage or none, always available or only available at given times and spaces, and so on.

4 To imagine, on the basis of seemingly unrelated historical data, differences and even contradictions between positions conventionally deemed to be on the same side of a given social struggle. The impertinence of the historical record, itself reviewed in an impertinent manner, is crucial to arouse the epistemological imagination. The same record can be used to jointly analyze very different struggles in order to see to what extent they either potentiate or neutralize one another.

5 To imagine forms of learning combined with forms of unlearning. Keeping in mind that, among the many disguises of unilateral imposition and epistemological one-sidedness, tolerant openness, superficial curiosity, and philanthropic solidarity are the most insidious and efficient.

6 To imagine subjects where the epistemologies of the North see only objects. To imagine absent subjects where there are absent knowledges, or else knowledges produced as absent by the abyssal line. To imagine that absent knowledges probably signify social struggles that did happen but of which there is no trace in the canonical histories.

7 To imagine new cartographies of the abyssal line, to identify new invisible divisions between metropolitan sociability and colonial sociability. To try to imagine a New Age colonial sociability invading metropolitan sociability, possibly new disguises for age-old exclusions. To view the maps of social exclusion in the process of being redrawn as nonabyssal exclusions slide into abyssal ones. To imagine the abyssal line as it crosses the ideas and emotions of the postabyssal researcher while she takes part in the construction of ecologies of knowledges capable of enabling oppressed social groups.

8 To imagine the consequences of not separating life from research. Turning the postabyssal social researcher into a craftsperson who uses the methodological tools creatively to the point of always managing to build her own method. To imagine the risks and frustrations that the postabyssal researcher may run, as she is aware that to know according to the postabyssal logic (knowing-with and not knowing-about) always entails warmed-up reason, that is, corazonar (chapter 5).

To imagine the self-training and self-education needed to put effortlessly into practice the idea that the autonomous work of the postabyssal social researcher is always the result of sharing. It is the result of an epistemic *minga* (chapter 7).

9 To imagine civilizational questions circulating underground, remaining unanswered and never surfacing in the debates on technical issues and options within the limits of modern science. To ask why a given problem is relevant or even crucial for a given body of knowledge and not at all for another body of knowledge. To conduct this imaginative exercise between scientific knowledge and artisanal knowledge. To imagine situations in which the opposition between the context of discovery and the context of justification is less dilemmatic than it appears to be according to the northern epistemologies. To distinguish between intimate conviction and externally induced persuasion, for instance, whenever abyssal science persuasively shows that all the profound questions are irrelevant because they are unanswerable by science.

10 To imagine the quest for ecological stances against monopolistic ones beyond the ecologies of knowledges. Since the epistemologies of the South aim to oppose ecologies not only to the monoculture of rigorous knowledge (science) but to all the different Eurocentric monocultures in general, the epistemological imagination must include not only ecologies of knowledges but also ecologies of social classifications, of scales, of temporalities, and of productivity (Santos 2014: 188–211).

11 To imagine the absences that cannot be captured by the sociology of absences, the emergences that never go beyond potentiality, or never stop being anticipated ruins. To imagine the epistemologies that will be coming after the epistemologies of the South to face the social and political problems the epistemologies of the South identified but did not solve, or problems that they didn't even identify, in spite of their importance recognized only now, ex post facto.

Decolonizing Methodologies

How is it possible to produce credible and reliable knowledges by means of methods that have little to do with the ones that modern science privileges? The colonialist nature of the methodologies developed by the abyssal modern sciences resides in the fact that they are all designed according to the logic of extractivism. By this I mean the cognitive dimension of the same extractivism

that characterizes capitalism and colonialism, as well as patriarchy.[29] The idea of intellectual or cognitive extractivism was strongly impressed on me by Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui in our conversation in el Valle de las Animas in the Andean cordillera in 2013.[30] According to Cusicanqui, extractivism might be present in some rather surprising contexts (see Grosfoguel 2016a: 38–40). The concept of methodological extractivism is directly inspired by the concept of cognitive extractivism proposed by Betasamosake Simpson, an indigenous intellectual of the Mississauga Nishnaabeg nation, in Canada, and by the concept of epistemic extractivism put forward by Grosfoguel. According to Simpson, "It's the idea that traditional knowledge and indigenous peoples have some sort of secret of how to live on the land in a non-exploitive way that broader society needs to appropriate. But the extractivist mindset isn't about having a conversation and having a dialogue and bringing in indigenous knowledge on the terms of indigenous peoples. It is very much about extracting whatever ideas scientists or environmentalists thought were good and assimilating them. . . . Put it onto toilet paper and sell it to people. There's an intellectual extraction, a cognitive extraction, as well as a physical one. The machine around promoting extractivism is huge in terms of TV, movies, and popular culture" (Klein 2013). Grosfoguel (2016a: 39) further remarks that, as regards epistemic extractivism, the theory that is appropriated emerges as if "originally produced" by the global North, whereas the peoples of the global South appear as if they simply provided the inputs and experiences that are immediately appropriated by the North and refashioned as sophisticated theories.

Extractivist methodologies are geared to extract knowledge in the form of a raw material—relevant information—that is provided by objects, whether human or nonhuman. Extraction is unilateral: those extracting are never extracted, so to speak; rather, they control the process of extraction. Extraction may be intensive or extensive but it always assumes that the sources of extraction are available up to their total exhaustion; what is of no interest to the extracting process is irrelevant and can be discarded as useless, as trash or chaff, and, ideally, no research time should be wasted on it. Such methodologies are not decolonizable, even though, as I show below, in certain circumstances the knowledges they produce may be resignified or reconfigured and utilized for counterhegemonic purposes. Decolonizing methodologies consist of every process capable of producing trustworthy, reliable knowledge in a nonextractivist way, that is, through cooperation among knowing subjects rather than through subject/object unilateral cognitive interactions. I call them antiextractivist or postextractivist methodologies (more on this in chapter 7).

The question of method raises different issues in the case of knowledges born in struggles and in the case of knowledges used by struggles, even if not born in them.

Knowledges Born in Struggles

As concerns knowledges born in struggle, the construction of knowledge is the cognitive dimension of the very construction and development of the struggle. The evaluation of such knowledge is a component of the overall evaluation of the struggle itself and its processes, methods, and results. This does not mean that such knowledge has no validity beyond the specific struggle. On the contrary, the knowledges born in a specific struggle may be used in other struggles to the extent that they are considered useful. Indeed, we cannot understand the social struggles in the modern period without taking into account this vast learning process.

The knowledges born in struggle are the reflex of action and a reflection on the action itself at one and the same time. Among many other facets, this reflex with reflection makes possible a complex view of the historical present whereby a deeper understanding of the current state of affairs of a given struggle emerges. A reflexive present is a triple present: the past as present, the present as task, and the future as present. The past as present is the memory and history of the lived experience of the struggle for a better life, that is to say, the present conceived of as the challenge to break with a past of domination and injustice. In sum, the past as present is what makes it possible to live the present under protest. The present as task is the self-reflective, critical evaluation of the here and now, the struggle as a realm of contingency and ambiguity. Do the current struggles constitute progress or regress vis-à-vis previous struggles? Are they defensive struggles (consolidating victories) or offensive struggles (expanding demands)? Do they break with the status quo or reproduce it? Are the changes real or simply cosmetic? Where is the demarcation line between resistance and desistance? The future as present is the present as a project, the expectation that rupture or success will prevail over continuity or failure, that the risks involved in the struggle will be manageable. This is the present as conceived by warmed-up reason, reason corazonada, endowed with the intimate sufficiencies that point to success (chapter 5). The ways these different conceptions of the present interact determine the specific mix of fear and hope in the struggles of the oppressed, fear calling for resignation, hope calling for rebellion.

Knowledges to Be Used in the Struggle

To be sure, the question of method, as an autonomous question, is relevant only in the case of knowledges to be used in a concrete struggle, even though they were not generated in it. Two distinctions must be made. The first one distinguishes between knowledges that were generated in other struggles, in other times and places, and knowledges produced outside the context of struggle but which, in certain circumstances, may be of use in a given concrete struggle. The second distinction is between scientific and nonscientific knowledges as they may both participate in the ecologies of knowledges. Defined positively, nonscientific knowledges are artisanal knowledges. They are practical, empirical, vernacular, popular knowledges, knowledges that in spite of their many differences have one feature in common: they were not produced separately, as a knowledge practice separated from other social practices.

The distinction between knowledges produced in struggles and knowledges used in struggles may become problematic in view of the aforementioned difficulty in defining what constitutes a struggle, or what is, or is not, part of a concrete struggle. The farther away in space, time, or culture, the more difficult it becomes to determine whether a given knowledge was produced as part of a struggle, if for no other reason than because, with the temporal, spatial, and cultural distance, it becomes increasingly problematic to distinguish between struggle/resistance, as an event well limited in time and space, and struggle/resistance as a normal way of life. On the other hand, the distinction between scientific and artisanal knowledge may also be problematic, mainly because the ecologies of knowledges affect both scientific and artisanal knowledges by turning them into hybrid knowledges whose epistemological identity transcends their original epistemological status. Bearing these caveats in mind, let us look at some specific situations.

Artisanal knowledges of one's own to be mobilized in concrete struggles. The national liberation struggles of the recent past, as well as the present struggles of peasants and indigenous peoples on different continents, have often resorted to ancestral knowledges whose origin and historical relevance are important to the extent that they serve the objectives of the struggle. Such knowledges are selected, resignified, and even reinvented in the very process of struggle mobilization. The trust placed in such knowledges derives from their real or imagined potential for strengthening the struggle at hand. Such potential is generally anchored in two ideas. On the one hand, such knowledges belong to the groups in question; they are part of their past as present. Through such

knowledges the groups in struggle become cognitive subjects and cease to be the objects of those alien knowledges that have been used to justify their subjection and oppression. From subjection to subjectivity—such is the path of hope against fear that knowledges of their own permit them to tread. On the other hand, oftentimes such knowledges are reinvented to refer to a past time of dignified life, a life that now may be retrieved under new conditions; such knowledges are thus crucial for reclaiming dignity. Ancestral knowledge has a performative dimension; it implies imagining a past that asserts itself as a project. A knowledge of one's own means representing the world as one's own. In other words, authorship of knowledge is a precondition for authorship of the world.

Artisanal knowledges produced in previous struggles, whether one's own or another's. These are knowledges that emerged (or are taken as having emerged) in social struggles that took place somewhere else or at some other time. Such knowledges may be taken either as a reference (notions of what must be accepted) or as a counterreference (notions of what must be rejected) regarding the present struggle. That is to say, they strengthen the concrete struggle for which they are mobilized because they justify either what needs to be done or what must be avoided. Depending on the context in which such knowledges are mobilized, they are subjected either to a hermeneutics of hyperadherence (pertinence is selectively highlighted) or to a hypersuspicion (inapplicability is selectively highlighted), depending on whether the aim is to justify continuities with previous struggles or, on the contrary, to justify breaks with previous struggles. Social movements and leftist parties are usually prey to this double hermeneutics. The memory of the struggle is, in general, a struggle for memory.

Scientific knowledges not produced in the context of struggle but used in concrete struggles. This is the situation in which modern science and modern scientists most frequently recognize themselves. The naive consciousness of modern science and scientists conceives of scientific knowledge as an incessant, curiosity-propelled quest directed by rules and methods that are autonomous and specific to this kind of knowledge, and over which scientists believe they have full control. Such consciousness goes on reproducing itself, even if social studies of science have continued to show that said curiosity, far from being unconditional, is in fact influenced by social, economic, and political interests, and that scientists work, in general, in institutional contexts that are largely beyond their control.[31]

The use of existing scientific knowledge in social struggles is very frequent. Given the internal pluralism of science, various subaltern social groups gain access, in however unequal a manner, to scientific knowledge that may be useful for the struggles in which they are involved. As I mention in chapter 2, such knowledge is always utilized in the context of the ecologies of knowledges and must fulfill the twofold criterion of trust: it is an autonomous knowledge based on the competent and bona fide usage of specific methodologies; it is a useful knowledge in light of the objectives of the social struggles in which it will be deployed.

Scientific knowledge produced in the context of struggle as part of the ecologies of knowledges. In this case, scientific knowledge is specifically produced in view of a concrete struggle at hand and with the purpose of strengthening the position of whatever group uses it. Perhaps more than ever, dominant social groups today resort to scientific knowledge in order to consolidate and strengthen their positions in socially contested issues.[32] Subaltern and dominated social groups have less capacity to conduct scientific research with a view to strengthening their struggles; still, such a possibility does exist, due mainly to alliances with scientists who show solidarity. The ecologies of knowledges do not consist in simply adding up different kinds of knowledges; rather, they are fields of production for new, hybrid knowledges, as well as new modes of articulating different knowledges by recognizing their mutual incompleteness and partiality. Science produced as an integral part of the ecologies of knowledges must combine its autonomy, which must be preserved, with a willingness to be subjected to a triple decolonizing hermeneutics: the hermeneutics of partiality; the hermeneutics of the abyssal character of that partiality; and the hermeneutics of the tension between trust and autonomy. Decolonizing modern science consists in exercising this triple hermeneutics.

The hermeneutics of partiality implies taking into account the partial nature of scientific knowledge, that is to say, recognizing that, like any other way of knowing, science is a system of both knowledge and ignorance. Scientific knowledge is partial because it does not know everything deemed important and it cannot possibly know everything deemed important. Moreover, it conceives of its progress as a process of actively destroying other, rival knowledges while refusing to consider if such destruction is an unconditional human good or rather a human good or a human bad depending on criteria that are external to science. Within the scope of the ecologies of knowledges, science must be confronted with the need to separate its methodological autonomy from its claim to exclusive epistemological validity (the only valid or rigorous knowledge).

Only thus can science productively interact with other knowledges. The issue is not that all knowledges are to be considered equally valid. The issue is to allow other knowledges the possibility of engaging in the social struggles on their own merit, that is, with no need to be validated by science. Since no social struggle is built exclusively on the basis of science, no social struggle is scientific (as opposed to nonscientific struggles).

The second decolonizing hermeneutics respects the abyssal nature of partiality. It consists of reflecting on the logic that historically presided over the partiality of science. Such partiality did not occur in an anarchic way. It was geopolitically constructed to found and reproduce the abyssal line between metropolitan society and sociability and colonial society and sociability. Modern science, together with modern law, thus became the main modern producer of absences, actively producing invisible, irrelevant, forgotten, nonexisting realities. At its core, decolonizing science consists in exploring the possibility of science actively engaged, together with artisanal knowledges, in identifying and denouncing the abyssal line so as to render credible the production of postabyssal knowledges, among them, postabyssal science. In the end, the success of the struggles against capitalist, colonial, and patriarchal domination will be measured by their success in generating hegemonic, postabyssal ways of knowing.

The third hermeneutics respects the tension between trust and autonomy; that is to say, it concerns the way in which science, once it has become a part of the ecology of knowledges, must learn how to engage with other knowledges. This tension is almost aporetic insofar as trust is constructed with a postabyssal epistemological horizon in view, whereas autonomy results from a practice that is firmly entrenched in abyssal thinking. It is not reducible to the tension between objectivity and neutrality as formulated by modern critical theories (see chapter 2). It is instead far more complex since the ecologies of knowledges imply negotiations between different degrees and kinds of trust provided by different knowledges.

The autonomy of science is an original feature of science, understood as a practice that is functionally specific in light of the methods it uses and that, by implication, is separated from any other practice. The ecologies of knowledges represent a double challenge to the methodological autonomy of science. On the one hand, science can only play a useful role in social struggles if it remains a methodologically autonomous knowledge. For instance, the critical and solidary distance often required of scientific knowledge in social struggles would not be possible without the methodological autonomy of science. Otherwise, we would run the risk of ending up in Lysenkoism.[33] On the other hand, the methodology that grants the autonomy of abyssal science (methodological

autonomy coupled with epistemological exclusivity) must be profoundly reconstructed if science is to be understood in postabyssal terms (methodological autonomy without epistemological exclusivity). In other words, it is possible to produce science inside the ecologies of knowledges, but certainly not according to the exclusive logic of abyssal modern science. The solidarity of science (and scientists) with social struggle and science's articulation with other knowledges entail the rejection of some methodologies, the critical reconstruction of others, and the invention of still others. As regards the social sciences, this topic is dealt with in detail in the following sections, as well as in the following chapters.

Postabyssal and Postextractivist Methodologies

A Chinese proverb states: "If the wrong man uses the right means, the right means will act the wrong way." This proverb gainsays the epistemologies of the North. According to the epistemologies of the North, method is almost everything, while the subjectivity of whoever uses that method is almost nothing; or, worse still, subjectivity is an obstacle to the right use of the method. The epistemologies of the South are closer to the Chinese proverb, even though they do not disregard methodologies. But they do keep in mind at all times that the social construction of the agents in a struggle is a political act that precedes, exceeds, and conditions the use of methodologies. In other words, the epistemologies of the South firmly resist methodological fetishisms.

The logic of abyssal thinking works through a centrifugal movement. The world is a given, an object consisting of both human and nonhuman entities, which can be appropriated by the subject of knowledge provided that he or she uses adequate methods and proofs. This relation is inherently asymmetrical, as the object cannot possibly appropriate the subject that knows it. The methodological fetishism underlying abyssal thinking consists in believing that, just by complying with the methodologies, the truth about the object is obtained, and that it is the only relevant truth. It is an unwarranted belief since the methodologies only provide us with those answers about the world that correspond to the questions asked by them in the first place, and such questions are only a fraction of those that could possibly be asked. Indeed, we perceive the world as seemingly complete only because our questions about it are always very limited. Abyssal science ignores this "perceptive faith," as Merleau-Ponty (1964b: 49) called it.

Totally different is the logic of postabyssal thinking, anchored as it is in a centripetal movement. In this case, the world is a collective project (not

a given), a horizon of possibilities. Such possibilities are not equally shared due to the inequalities of power and knowledge generated by capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy. Both the struggle for the recognition of other ways of knowing and the criteria for the validation they merit are constitutive of the struggle for a more equitable distribution of the possibilities for sharing and transforming the world. The asymmetries in such a distribution change with the changes in power and knowledge relations. The fact that we can today characterize dominant ways of thinking as abyssal and denounce the cognitive injustice they generate is indicative that some such changes may be occurring. They are a first step toward postabyssal ways of thinking. In a world still dominated by capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy, postabyssal thinking and authority (that is, unequal power relations transformed into relations of shared authority) point to a utopian horizon. However, rather than being an abstractly imagined condition with no bearing on current affairs, as was the case with modern utopias, they are guiding principles for social and political action and become embedded in concrete struggles. The successes here and now of such struggles in confronting the abyssal line and in diminishing the inequalities of power and knowledge relations are concrete utopias, confirmations of the not-yet. In sum, they constitute a sociology of emergences. The methodologies guided by the principle of postabyssal thinking, rather than striving for complete and exclusively valid knowledges, strive for incomplete knowledges and for the elucidation of rival criteria for validation, thus making critically visible the processes by which large portions of the world's population have historically been prevented from representing and transforming the world as a project of their own. Herein lies the sociology of emergences.

For the epistemologies of the South, there are three basic questions concerning method: (1) how to produce scientific knowledge that may be used in social struggles in articulation with artisanal, practical, and empirical knowledges; (2) how to bring artisanal, empirical, and practical knowledge into dialogue with scientific, erudite knowledge; and (3) how to construct the ecologies of knowledges constituted by all these different knowledges.[34] The first two questions are closely related, since the construction of the ecology of knowledges in contexts of resistance or struggle always entails the mutual provocation of the two different kinds of knowledge. They question one another on issues of relevance and language; the ecology of knowledges unfolds according to the rhythm of such interpellations and how, through their interplay, hybrid knowledges emerge, knowledges with a new identity of their own. Such interpellations are neither symmetrical nor fixed. In the initial phase of the construction of the ecologies of knowledge, two typical situations tend to occur. On the one hand,

scientific knowledge tends to have an exaggerated idea of its own relevance and is hardly sensitive to the difficulty participants not trained in science have in understanding its language.[35] On the other hand, artisanal knowledge tends to exaggerate its analytical capacity by turning retrospective visions (what worked or occurred in the past) into prospective visions (the present as the past of the future), thus losing critical distance vis-à-vis the new conditions and demands of the struggling present, here and now.[36]

The domain pertaining to each of the knowledges in question keeps changing according to the vicissitudes of the struggles themselves. We must bear in mind that, when we speak of the mobilization of knowledges in the processes of struggle, we easily fall into an anthropomorphic fallacy. Obviously, knowledges do not get mobilized on their own; they are mobilized by the different groups that take part in the struggles, their relative weight depending on many factors other than cognitive pertinence.[37] It is equally important to bear in mind that the social scientists engaged in social struggles do not mobilize only scientific knowledges (often, not even predominantly). They also mobilize artisanal knowledges that they also master. Such a twofold cognitive capacity may be positive but can also be a source of misunderstandings. It is liable to be misunderstood when, for instance, the social scientist, in order to strengthen her position, presents as scientific what is actually artisanal knowledge, or, to stress her belonging to the group in struggle, presents as artisanal what is indeed scientific knowledge.

In view of the importance of the third question—concerning the construction of the ecologies of knowledges—for the epistemologies of the South, it is given more detailed attention in the next section.

The Contexts of the Ecologies of Knowledges

As I have been arguing, the ecologies of knowledges are no idle intellectual exercise; they serve to strengthen concrete social struggles against domination. In other words, they exist to increase the probabilities of success. The concrete set of knowledges brought about by the ecologies of knowledges cannot but be always on the move—open, porous, incomplete, reversible. The concept of ecologies of knowledges calls for dialogic interactions. But such interactions occur only at the moments and under the conditions allowed by the struggles. As I mentioned above while analyzing the concept of struggle, social struggles are not always organized; in reality, they are often indistinguishable from the life experience of those who are involved in resistance under conditions of extreme precariousness and who must fight for survival. We need to distin-

guish two moments in the action in struggle: action as position and action as movement.[38]

Action as position is the moment at which it becomes possible and necessary to reflect and evaluate the struggle at hand: its successes and failures; the assessment of the means used by the groups engaged in struggle and their adversaries; changes in the social, political, and cultural contexts in which the struggle occurs; the issue of privileged alliances, languages, and narratives and the outcomes thereof; lessons to be taken for the future, and so on and so forth. It is a moment of reflection used to evaluate, plan, position, share, and organize alliances. Its time is, in general, a slow time when compared with the time of action as movement, which is the actual active moment of the struggle, the set of actions of defense and attack, daily meetings and reports on the development of the struggle with its surprises and improvising. Its time is, in general, faster than the time of action as position.

It would be too simplistic to assume that the ecologies of knowledges are constructed at moments of action as position and put into practice at moments of action as movement. To be sure, the dialogues, negotiations, and translations underlying the ecologies of knowledges require minimal conditions to reflect, convene, meet, and get ready. But the truth is that social struggles resist grand plans, rebel against simplicity, and their practices often forge ahead of the theories that are supposed to give them meaning. Even though the moments of action as position are a privileged time-space for the construction and evaluation of the ecologies of knowledges, the truth is that the latter go on dynamically doing and undoing themselves throughout both moments.

However, the distinction between action as position and action as movement is particularly important today, due to the revolution in the technologies of information and communication and the new possibilities for global solidarity it has made possible. Such a revolution has brought about a profound transformation as regards the struggles' time-spaces. At any moment of a given social struggle, action as position may occur miles away from the struggle's physical place; action as movement, in turn, may be multisituated on different continents.[39] The distinction between action as position and action as movement is particularly meaningful in the case of scientific knowledge integrating the ecologies of knowledges, because the production of scientific knowledge is premised upon methodological conditions whose fulfillment may be incompatible with action as movement. Postabyssal science may be utilized in any of the moments of the struggle, but it can be produced only at moments of action as position. The work of the epistemologies of the South aiming to retrieve and unleash the potential of science for the construction of ecologies of

knowledges calls for a culture that valorizes the moments of action as position as well as alliances with postabyssal scientists, be they members of the group in struggle or outsiders in active solidarity with the struggle.

In chapter 12, I mention a specific instance of ecologies of knowledges in which science, ruled by the epistemologies of the South, is simultaneously produced and used in constant interaction with other knowledges: the workshops of the Popular University of Social Movements.

The Methodological Question of Artisanal Knowledge in the Ecologies of Knowledges in Processes of Struggle

As I have already said, the creation of artisanal knowledge, because it is not a discrete knowledge, does not arouse a specific question of method; it is the cognitive dimension of the social practices of struggle. It is, therefore, only in the context of the construction of the ecologies of knowledges that some specific questions of method are posed. The distinction between the two moments of knowledge in struggle—action as position and action as movement—is less relevant in the case of artisanal knowledges than in the case of scientific knowledges. Nonetheless, as I suggest in the following, there are many kinds of artisanal knowledges that do not work in the same way in both moments.

Being often a performative kind of knowledge, artisanal knowledge cannot be evaluated without reference to who formulates it and in what context. Being often a collective or common knowledge, its individualized mobilization always depends on the authority and effectiveness of whoever mobilizes it. In truth, there is really no knowledge but rather a cluster, a mix of knowledge/knower. Two kinds of mix may be identified: mirror knowledge and prism knowledge.[40] Mirror knowledge is the comforting mix that envisions the present as the ratification of the past, and the future as the present that has not yet happened. It is comforting because it constructs the reality of the struggle by privileging answers, certainties, and confirmations. Furthermore, it tends to homogenize both times and spaces. Prism knowledge, on the contrary, assumes the incompleteness of what is already known and constructs the reality of the struggle as highly varied or faceted, thus privileging novelty, rupture, and questionings. It tends to stress the differentiation of times and spaces. It views the present as constituting a certain, perhaps relative, discontinuity with the past, thus as something requiring new cognitive investments expressing themselves in doubts, questions, and critical distance vis-à-vis mirror knowledge. Therein lies its disquieting nature.

Once integrated into a context of struggle, artisanal knowledge undergoes change. The ecology of knowledges amounts to a cognitive work of composition that privileges prism knowledge. It constructs itself by composing new configurations of knowledge by means of linking, mixing, and interpreting different kinds of knowledges, both scientific and artisanal. Composition comes about through dialogue and argumentation between the different groups interested in converging in the same struggle or in articulating different struggles. Composition implies an increase in the heterogeneity of the knowledges being considered, which in turn may increase uncertainty. Confronted with heterogeneity and uncertainty, mirror knowledge tends to assume a reactive, rather than cooperative, attitude. The different knowledges carry different narratives, languages, and histories; they privilege different challenges and threats, identify different enemies, and envision different futures. All of this amounts to a world of questions and incompletenesses, which mirror knowledge faces with difficulty. On the other hand, prism knowledge thrives on the emergence of new realities, perspectives, and challenges. At moments of action as movement, prism knowledge adjusts itself better to the requirements of the ecologies of knowledges, thus contributing more efficaciously to the struggle's success.

As mentioned above, from the point of view of the epistemologies of the South, the questions of method are particularly relevant regarding postabyssal scientific knowledge. Postabyssal science is a mestiza science, produced in dialogue with artisanal knowledges according to a logic of mutual incompleteness. Postabyssal science is, as yet, an aspiration, a research program that, if assessed in the light of the dominant paradigm (the epistemologies of the North), is definitely utopian. The scientists who put their stakes on it are prey to a double stigmatization: first, because they are not real scientists in the eyes of their peers in the academy; second, because they are not considered true fighters by the protagonists of the social struggles. The scientists' wager is professionally, politically, and existentially demanding because it requires that the scientist assume different identifications, all of them oppositional. On the one hand, the social struggles are neither centers for social research nor libraries (whether physical or virtual), and the scientist knows, as a scientist, that her status there tends to be secondary or, at least, devoid of any privilege. Having been most probably trained as an abyssal scientist (a superauthor of a superknowledge), she must undergo much self-unlearning in order to be able to participate efficiently in the struggle she may be involved in. On the other hand, the status of a postabyssal scientist integrated into scientific communities and institutions

dominated by the epistemologies of the North tends to be very precarious and vulnerable to much hostility and marginalization. The less the internal pluralism of science, the greater the hostility and marginality. Of course, the postabyssal scientist can choose to leave the dominant epistemic and institutional field, but such a gesture comes at significant personal cost.[41] This is the reason why being a postabyssal scientist implies an altogether extremely precarious existence. Chapter 7 elaborates on this.

7

ON NONEXTRACTIVIST METHODOLOGIES

The Oaxaca Commune

I have been arguing that the credibility and usefulness of the epistemologies of the South depend less on sophisticated theoretical elaborations than on the practices of the social groups and movements that utilize them in their struggles against capitalist, colonialist, and patriarchal domination. The fight of the people of Oaxaca in 2006, among many others, bears witness to the effectiveness of the epistemologies of the South. I take the liberty of citing here at length the words of Gustavo Esteva, a brilliant rearguard intellectual, a proponent of the epistemologies of the South in Latin America, and one of the participants in the Oaxaca struggle. The title of the narrative, *Cuando hasta las piedras se levantan* (When even the stones rise) is eloquent enough:

> From June to October 2006, there was no single police officer to be seen in the streets of Oaxaca, a city of 600,000 inhabitants, not even to control the traffic. Unable to go to their offices, the governor and his officials were meeting secretly in hotels or private homes. The APPO [Spanish acronym for Popular Assembly of the Oaxaca Peoples] had set up permanent sit-ins at every public building, radio station, and public and private television stations under its control. When the governor started sending his henchmen to launch guerrilla attacks against the sit-ins during

> the night, barricades were put in place to resist the attacks. More than 1000 barricades were mounted every day at 11 pm around the sit-ins or at critical crossroads, and dismantled again every morning to allow for free circulation. In spite of these attacks, according to a human rights organization, during those months there were fewer crimes in Oaxaca (murder, assault, robbery) than in any other similar period for the past ten years. Unionized workers, members of APPO, performed many services, such as trash collection. . . . On November 25, the Federal Preventive Police (PFP), supported by the Army and the Navy, launched an attack of brutal repression, the worst in the history of Oaxaca, including mass violations of human rights and such acts that can be legitimately described as State terrorism. The authorities believed that such an intimidation strategy, together with the incarceration of the alleged leaders of APPO, would liquidate the movement and serve as a warning to the entire country. (Esteva, Valencia, and Venegas 2008: 21)[1]

In their analysis of the Oaxaca Commune, in which they actively participated, Gustavo Esteva, Rubén Valencia, and David Venegas give a fine example of knowledge born of struggle, in this case, the struggle of the Oaxacan people against the authoritarianism of the Mexican state. Their writing itself is polyphonic, combining personal reflection and exchanges between the authors (one of them in prison), all of them members of VOCAL (Voces Oaxaqueñas construyendo autonomía y libertad [Oaxacan Voices Building Autonomy and Freedom]). In her prologue to the narrative, Norma Giarraca captures very well the idea of the epistemologies of the South in action:

> The way in which we, Latin Americans, approach new movements challenges the old dichotomies of researcher-researched; subject-object; structure-action. It implies a hermeneutic work in which we are involved not only as researchers but also as subjects interested in overcoming the model of society that has evolved in the last decades. It is frequent nowadays to hear of a "militant researcher" or an "engaged researcher." By resorting to the new intellectual styles, we reinforce the rules of intellectual work and the researcher's political and academic responsibility, at the same time making clear that we are committed to various ways of studying and refuse to produce false "objectivity and neutrality." What is at stake is the need to distinguish "objectivity" from "neutrality," as Boaventura de Sousa Santos teaches us. Objectivity, because we resort to the methodologies proper to the social sciences in order to obtain a rigorous kind of knowledge to defend

> us against dogmatisms; while, at the same time, being aware that we live in extremely unfair societies in relation to which we cannot, nor would we wish to, be neutral. . . . We proceed from below, as it were, from the people down below offering resistance and thus changing the old scenarios of the 1990s. Such is the place of innovation and creativity in the ways of knowing. . . . To think collectively; foster a community of thought; bring together intellectuals from different regions and working in the same and in different registers. This is the experience narrated by the Oaxacans who actually lived it. They are activists, but of a different kind; they are intellectuals, but "deprofessionalized" intellectuals; in a word, they are the only ones that can give testimony to the phenomenon without prejudices, Europeanizing theorizations, or refinements of western politics. They are much closer to the Zapotec and Mixtec populations than to the new theoreticians of participative democracy. (Giarraca 2008: 6–9)

In her concluding remarks, Norma Giarraca contrasts the epistemological and methodological presuppositions underlying the study of Esteva, Valencia, and Venegas with the epistemologies of the North that dominated the social sciences in Latin America during the twentieth century:

> Young social scientists of the middle of the last century used to distance their research, based on surveys, estimates, curves, and standard deviations, from other activities that helped them grow intellectually and emotionally: political activism, artistic practices, spontaneous, non-planned interventions in interesting worlds. Very frequently, in the field diaries giving account of data collecting, there appeared instances of situations of a personal involvement not allowed in professional work. . . . In the second half of the twentieth century we witnessed the professionalization of social thinking, that is to say, the emergence of university carriers in the social sciences. Right from the start, the intent was to define the limits of what was, and was not, considered "scientific." The scientific text had to be distinguished from the mere essay, or from any text relying on the hermeneutics of understanding. This was the time of the prevalence of North American sociology, which exerted as much influence in Latin America as in Europe. (Giarraca 2008: 122)

As regards the Oaxaca Commune, the influence of the Zapatista epistemologies of the South is quite evident. In fact, Gustavo Esteva is the powerful engine behind UNITIERRA (the Zapatista university) in Oaxaca (see chapter 12).

Epistemic Mingas

Postabyssal science aims to build scientific knowledge in cooperation with other kinds of knowledge so that both scientific and artisanal knowledge end up benefiting from the cooperation. Resorting to a peasant term—minga—used by indigenous Andean peoples to refer to collaborative farming for the collective good of the whole community, we might designate such cooperation as an epistemic minga. Such cooperation is based on three guiding ideas: (1) the incompleteness of all the knowledges involved; (2) a common interest in promoting the convergence of different interests; and (3) that such interest, rather than being a free-floating intellectual interest, is an interest in empowering and strengthening the struggles against capitalist, colonialist, and patriarchal domination, and, in this sense, it is a metacognitive interest. The use of the peasant term may suggest that an epistemic minga is formed with all of its participants face to face in the same location. Indeed, it is in many situations, but not necessarily. The processes of cognitive cooperation may occur without physical contact, across great distances, whether in space or time, and not just because we live in a time of cyberculture. The sociology of absences, for example, is an epistemic minga engaging the postabyssal historian (or sociologist or anthropologist), on the one hand, and, on the other, peoples and struggles in distinct times and spaces together with the artisanal knowledges they use to lead their lives within and outside the relations of domination (more on this below).

The major contribution of postabyssal scientific knowledge to the epistemic minga consists in clarifying the different modes of domination: what they are and how they function, both in general and in the concrete case of a given social struggle; their causes and historical trajectories; their many manifestations and disguises; their strengths and weaknesses; how they articulate themselves to reproduce social, economic, political, and cultural domination; how oppressed social groups have organized their resistance and struggles in different spaces and times; their successes and failures; and so on and so forth. Artisanal knowledge, in its turn, contributes with its experience of having lived within and without relations of domination; the memory of unjust suffering inscribed in bodies, lands, and cultures; specific characteristics and vicissitudes of struggle and resistance; consequences of mistakes and corrections, failures and successes; the prolonged oscillations between feeling-thinking with fear and feeling-thinking with hope; and so on and so forth. Each contribution has its own cognitive logic, and their incompleteness manifests itself in how each one of them may surprise the other.

Surprise is the attitude before what one doesn't know or perhaps even what one doesn't understand. With regard to an epistemic minga, surprise doesn't

arouse distance or strangeness; it rather arouses the curiosity and humility capable of constructing a new proximity and familiarity. This reciprocal availability and openness are the result of the metacognitive complicity that brings together the bearers of scientific knowledge and the bearers of artisanal knowledge: their common interest in strengthening the resistance and struggle of the oppressed. Said complicity turns the zone of surprise into a zone of partial approaches, often involving intercultural translation and giving rise to mestiza narratives and hybrid knowledges. Scientific knowledge opens itself to contextualizations that compel it to unthink itself and rethink itself again, whereas artisanal knowledge willingly rethinks its lived experience without having to unthink it. Mestiza narratives and hybrid knowledges are not epistemologically more complete than the knowledges that were their base; they simply are more adequate for accomplishing their task, the metacognitive task of strengthening the struggles against oppression.

Postabyssal scientific knowledge is always coknowledge emerging from processes of knowing-with rather than knowing-about. Its autonomy is relative. It requires constant self-reflexivity in order to fulfill the double criterion of trust mentioned in chapter 2. Its methodological orientations are not mechanical recipes if for no other reason than because the contexts of the production of knowledge are widely diversified. Postabyssal science exercises in many different ways its commitment to strengthening the social struggles against domination. Knowing-with may take place in archives, in libraries, or in spaces and times inhabited by subaltern social groups; it may claim to be present and share a certain action or ongoing experience, or to study it years or even centuries after it happened; it may consist of opening up the past to understand the present or closing down the past to open up the future; it may entail dialogues that can be *viva voce* or virtual, real, or imaginary, with human or nonhuman beings; it may claim documental or conversational competencies; it may or may not call for a change of habits and language; it may or may not require a strong emotional and bodily investment; it may demand special training for each of the five senses (see chapter 8). The diversity of specific conditions, contexts, and objectives is virtually infinite. Great flexibility is recommended as regards the application of the methodological orientations in their various articulations.

The Postabyssal Social Scientist as Craftsperson

The postabyssal scientist resorts to methodologies just as a craftsperson resorts to tools and techniques: creatively rather than mechanically. A good knowledge of the techniques and a respect for the tools are crucial to avoid repeating

what has already been done and to produce instead new pieces, unique to a certain extent, which reflect the personality and emotional investment of the craftsperson. In chapter 6, while speaking of epistemological imagination, I alluded to C. Wright Mills's concept of sociological imagination. His reflections in this regard are extremely relevant to what I mean by the creative use of methodologies. I quote from Mills's "On Intellectual Craftsmanship" what he considers to be the first "precept": "Be a good craftsman: Avoid any rigid set of procedures. Above all, seek to develop and to use the sociological imagination. Avoid the fetishism of method and technique. Urge the rehabilitation of the unpretentious intellectual craftsman, and try to become such a craftsman yourself. Let every man be his own methodologist; let every man be his own theorist; let theory and method again become part of the practice of a craft" (2000: 224). In what follows, I state a few methodological orientations (or precepts) to which the postabyssal researcher must pay attention. Others are included in the next chapters.

1. Just like the craftsperson, the postabyssal researcher is humble; she is not obsessed with originality or authorship; as someone knowing-with (rather than knowing-about) she does not aspire to be a superauthor. She will never preach all by herself from the top of the mountain; she will rather work on the world's plains and hills while actively participating in relevant conversations and practices (she is a rearguard researcher). As also happens with the craftsperson, however, her respect for her tools and techniques is her point of departure for exerting her curiosity and creativity. Writes Todd Gitlin in his afterword to *The Sociological Imagination*: "Craft, not methodology—the distinction was crucial. Methodology was rigor mortis, dead rigor, rigor fossilized into arcanery of statistical practice so fetishized as to have eclipsed the real stakes of research. . . . Craft partook of rigor but rigor could not guarantee craft. A mastery of craft required not only technical knowledge and logic but a general curiosity, a Renaissance range of skills, a grasp of history and culture" (2000: 232).
2. The personal and creative appropriation of techniques and methods does not mean methodological anarchy (see Feyerabend 1975). Nor does it mean fickle spontaneity, as witness the sound sociological research carried out by Mills (1948, 1951, 1956). It simply means that the researcher is personally committed to his work and to society in general, a commitment that cannot be replaced by the accomplish-

ment of some mechanically applied recipe. As regards the postabyssal researcher, her commitment is even stronger, since it is the result of the double criterion of trust that her research work must respect (the procedures that guarantee the autonomy of the knowledge produced and its contribution to strengthening given social struggles against domination).

3 The relevance and meaning of issues are not determined by their place in the disciplines or the other specializations of academic knowledge. They are determined, rather, by the artisanship of the practices of which they are, or will be, a part. Different research topics arouse different methodological requirements; such requirements, however, cannot be the ones resulting from a given academic specialization; they must be defined bearing in mind the context of the artisanship of the practices into which the research in question may be integrated. Research topics refer to important or significant issues according to social context, historical period, and the artisanship of practices that constitute social struggles. "They are *your* studies; they are part of what you are part of; do not let them be taken from you by those who would close them off by weird jargon and pretentions of *expertise*" (Mills 2000: 225).

4 The postabyssal researcher often faces the problem that existing methodologies, even if used creatively, cannot adequately meet the challenges that the research presents. The epistemologies of the South encourage, therefore, the adoption of new methodological orientations. These are particularly necessary when the emergent practices that result from replacing the monocultures of abyssal thinking with the ecologies of postabyssal thinking need to be analyzed and symbolically enlarged, in other words, when the sociology of emergences is engaged. Transscale sociology recommends the use of several scales of analysis. For example, the struggle against land grabbing waged by Mozambican peasants, Indian Dalits, or indigenous Andean peoples needs to be analyzed according to their local scale, the national scale of their respective countries, and the global scale of capitalism. The ecology of temporalities recommends that the phenomenon that manifests itself here and now as Walter Benjamin's (1968: 253–64) *Jetztzeit* be submitted to historical revisionism (history read against itself, as Benjamin also recommends). The study of the postabyssal struggles I have just mentioned demands that the peasant, on the one hand, and, on the

other, the economist of the World Bank be considered representatives of two rival contemporaneities. It further demands that the temporality of modern colonialism be made part of the analysis. Even though I take off from epistemological premises that are different from those of Mills, I converge with him when he advises, "take as your time-span the course of human history, and locate within it the weeks, years, epochs you examine" (2000: 225). The ecology of productivities, in turn, demands that the struggles for land not be analyzed according to what is more or less productive, but rather in the light of the different conceptions of productivity clashing inside them. Finally, the ecology of differences requires the denaturalization of differences and their corresponding hierarchies. In the case of their struggles for land, the peasants, indigenous peoples, and Dalits involved are men and women, but gender discrimination in access to land is often omitted in official narratives and even in the peoples' own narratives.

5. All of these orientations may be condensed into one alone. Bearing in mind that the social practices in which (or for which) postabyssal knowledge is produced are conceived of by the epistemologies of the South as artisanal practices (see the concept of artisanship of practices in chapter 1), only an artisanal production of knowledge allows knowledge to accomplish efficiently the objectives for which it is produced.

Outsiders / Insiders

The modern trajectory of the idea of belongingness or identity is marked by the abyssal line. Metropolitan societies and sociabilities have always thought of themselves as belonging, at the existential level, to humanity and, at the theoretical level, to universality. These were two crucial ways of belonging (being human and being universal), but they evoked a difference that paradoxically was indifferent. Whatever was different from them was by necessity a monstrosity. The question of belongingness, as expressing difference and disqualified or disqualifying identities, was left to subaltern social groups.[2] As I have been arguing, such a disqualification did not occur just at the social and political levels; it occurred as well at the ontological, epistemological, and methodological levels. At the methodological level I am tackling here, while studying subaltern social groups—in particular those that are victims of abyssal exclusions—modern science has always been a science produced by outsiders studying insiders, the latter conceived of as research objects, probable provid-

ers of information but never of knowledge. In the rare case of an insider—a member of a subaltern community—ascending to the condition of scientist, the scientific protocol always required that she act as an outsider.

Belonging or not belonging to the community of the excluded is a different issue for postabyssal science. The decisive community of belongingness or identity has to do with sharing the struggle against domination. Knowing which side you are on is far more decisive than knowing who you are. On this basis alone is it possible to build the political alliances and the ecologies of knowledges claimed by the epistemologies of the South. This is not to say that existentially belonging to a given community is not important. Of course it is, and for two main reasons that actually exemplify the greater self-reflexivity demanded of the insider-researcher. On the one hand, the insider has an experience of the community that goes far beyond her presence there as a scientist. The artisanal knowledges circulating throughout the community are as familiar to her as scientific knowledge, if not more so. The construction of ecologies of knowledges capable of strengthening the resistance to and the struggle against domination is not, however, necessarily easier. In fact, it can be even harder if the relative autonomy of scientific knowledge (for example, its critical dimension) is less valorized because the scientist is an insider. Furthermore, the insider scientist has, in general, access to privileged knowledge, which, depending on the situation in question, may be valorized because of what it says about the community or because of what can be said about it without mentioning it (for instance, for being taboo).

Belonging to the community is even more important for a third reason: while engaging in her research, the insider scientist knows that the multiplex relations[3] linking her to the community (besides being a scientist, she is also a relative; a neighbor; a member of clubs, clans, or churches; a godmother; a schoolteacher; etc.) will be affected both by her research methods and by her results, as well as by the uses to which the latter will be put inside or outside the community. In her seminal book on insider research among the Maori people of New Zealand, Linda Smith describes the situation eloquently:

> the major difference [between insider scientist and outsider scientist] is that insiders have to live with the consequences of their processes on a day-to-day basis for ever more, and so do their families and communities. For this reason, insider researchers need to build particular sorts of research-based support systems and relationships with their communities. They have to be skilled at defining clear research goals and “lines of relating” which are specific to the project and somewhat

> different from their own family networks. Insider researchers also need to define closure and have the skills to say "no" and skills to say "continue." (2012: 137)

Smith's work is extremely relevant in that it describes with extraordinary lucidity the transition of the Maori people from a researched to a researching people.[4] At the methodological level, such a transition implies the emergence of hybrid methodologies that combine methodologies that are proper to the communities with methodologies that were developed by extractivist science and that are now used in a counterhegemonic way. As Smith says, "Indigenous methodologies are often a mix of existing methodological approaches and indigenous practices. The mix reflects the training of indigenous researchers which continues to be within the academy, and the parameters and common sense understandings of research which govern how indigenous communities and researchers define their activities" (2012: 143).

In the field of archaeology, the work of Sonya Atalay, which supports an indigenous archaeology carried out by indigenous archaeologists, must also be mentioned:

> There are a growing number of Indigenous people who have careers, in one form or another, in archaeology, and the influence of these Native leaders, who often view themselves as Indigenous activists working to change the discipline of archaeology from within, is now capable of having a profound effect on the direction of archaeological methods, theories, practice, and ethics. . . . As part of a decolonizing practice, Indigenous archaeologists aim to challenge the master narrative and attempt to decenter standard archaeological practice, to bring back to Indigenous people the power to set the agenda for their own heritage, to ask the questions, to determine what is excavated, and to remain involved in interpretations and dissemination of knowledge that reflect their own traditional methods of cultural resource management. . . . Such a research agenda might also include pointing out the power relations involved in mainstream archaeological practice and bringing the imbalance of power to the foreground. Indigenous archaeology exists and is growing today because Indigenous people, marginalized and victimized by the early development and ongoing daily practice of anthropology, archaeology, and other social sciences, are finding ways to create counter-discourse that speaks back to the power of colonialist and imperialist interpretations of the past." (2006: 294; see also Atalay 2012)

The Place of Resistance and Struggle in the Life Experience of People

Present (or past) subaltern social groups live (or have lived) complex lives, far beyond what can be designated as resistance or struggle. In chapter 4 I call attention to the need to conceive of social struggle in a broader sense so that it encompasses the actions and omissions of subaltern groups that, superficially viewed, involve no resistance to or struggle against domination. To be sure, the postabyssal researcher, guided by the epistemologies of the South, is particularly interested in producing and valorizing knowledges capable of strengthening resistance against domination. But she must contemplate two other situations. First, she must realize that social life is not made of resistance and struggle alone, but rather of fruition and contemplation as well, that there are moments and contexts of sociability that are experienced as if there were no domination and, thus, as if no resistance or struggle were necessary. Second, she may encounter situations in which, although domination is acknowledged as such, there is a consensus that it is impossible to resist or to struggle and, therefore, desistance and defeat are to be accepted. Both situations call for a stance of humility proper to the rearguard intellectual.

In the first case, humbleness implies recognizing that the paths leading to resistance and struggle are potentially infinite and that the scientist's research project grasps only a small part of the picture. Subaltern groups' festivities, carnivals, rituals, lavish meals, and sexual pleasure are relatively autonomous forms of appropriation of the world. They are representations of the world as one's own and thus of a world susceptible to being changed in order to eliminate the relations of domination and the deprivations and unjust suffering they cause. To enjoy a time-space as if there were no domination may sound like escapism and alienation, but it can also be witness to the fact that whoever is dominated is never totally dominated; herein may well lie the seed of insurgency and rebellion. The postabyssal researcher cannot but endure the disquietude caused by the limits of her research. Above all, she must not think that all that is not resistance is desistance.

In the second case (impossible resistance, desistance, and defeat are or seem to be accepted), desistance seems to be unavoidable since, even though domination is acknowledged, the capacity or will to fight against it is not. To experience this situation with the stance proper to the rearguard intellectual is not an easy task. The critical distance exercised by the postabyssal researcher must not consist of denouncing this as false consciousness or alienation. Above all, the rearguard intellectual must not imitate that sophisticated vanguard intellectual

of Western modernity, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, who maintains in *Du contrat social* that whoever goes against the general will that grants freedom for all must be forced to be free. Critical distance cannot be exercised by providing answers to questions that the social group does not recognize as such. It may involve asking questions, but never rhetorical questions, the right answers to which are assumed beforehand. The postabyssal researcher must valorize familiar realities and issues as if they were the only possible ones under the current circumstances. Without respect for desistance (those who give up fighting), efficient complicity with resistance (those who keep fighting) is not possible. Postabyssal research gains in this case an important pedagogical dimension (including self-learning); Paulo Freire's liberation pedagogy provides precious guidance on how to proceed in this domain.

Unlearning / Unthinking

The personal trajectory of the postabyssal researcher, whose profile I am trying to trace here, conditions the research process and the exercises in self-reflexivity that the researcher must undergo. Given the hegemony of the epistemologies of the North and the abyssal sciences they ground, it is very likely that the postabyssal researcher received her training in the methodologies developed by them and acquired the set of attitudes expected of her in the field and in society (Bourdieu's habitus). That being the case, the above-mentioned exercise in self-reflexivity must begin with the researcher's personal trajectory so that much of what she has learned, and, above all, much of what she learned of how to learn, may be questioned.

Unlearning does not mean forgetting. It means remembering in a different way. It means taking previously learned methodologies and attitudes out of the place where they come readily to hand and provide comfort to those using them and putting them in a mental space where they can be subjected to the following exercises in discomfort. The first consists of examining to what extent their efficacy depends on three assumptions, all of them problematic: (1) society is an object of knowledge, not a subject of knowledge; (2) for this reason, the scientist qua scientist can be questioned or challenged only by other scientists; and (3) the methodologies and attitudes provide the answers to scientific questions—the fact that society is not scientific and may be interested in finding answers to questions other than those posed by science need not be a concern.

The second exercise in discomfort consists in assessing to what extent the methodologies/attitudes, once out of place, lose their monumentality and gain

the kind of humbleness that allows the scientist to see intuitively what the methodologies/attitudes do not allow her to see analytically. The scientist will then be surprised by other methodologies or attitudes that might open other kinds of knowledge and fields of analysis. That is, she will learn to be analytical otherwise. Once the mental space for other possible approaches and attitudes is created, the third exercise in discomfort consists in exploring such new possibilities. This exercise is already influenced by the postabyssal viewpoint on society and science and, as such, it must be geared to the production of knowing-with. It cannot, therefore, be the scientist's solipsistic exercise; the exercise itself must be an exercise with, involving the social groups with whom the scientist is researching. Finally, the fourth exercise of discomfort consists in reassessing the place that is out of place in the methodologies and attitudes proper to abyssal science and in valorizing the analytical contributions they can offer, once articulated with and subjected to postabyssal methodological orientations.

The intensity with which these exercises should be carried out depends on the researcher's previous socialization with the methodologies/attitudes of abyssal social sciences. We must bear in mind that postabyssal science is a countercurrent science; it is as yet an aspiration to an emergent paradigm. Gradually, out of a previously existing identity as an abyssal researcher, the identity of a postabyssal researcher will emerge out of different exercises in self-reflexivity. One initial exercise consists of taking into account the ever-precarious identity of a postabyssal researcher: she must always bear in mind that the relative autonomy of science depends on the double trust criterion mentioned in chapter 2. A second exercise aims to neutralize the temptation of intellectual triumphalism. This temptation consists in too easily concluding that the personal and professional risks taken to carry out the postabyssal research were worthwhile as proven by the results of the research and that the control of the methodological orientations is now irreversible. This reassuring conviction must be subjected to a third exercise, the exercise of doubt and disquietude. It aims to neutralize the temptation of political heroism. This temptation consists of believing that, once the methodological orientations are fully carried out, the contribution toward the resistance and strengthening of the struggles against domination is guaranteed. Nothing is more fallacious. Solidarity and complicity with struggle are acts of will for the postabyssal researcher, but their effective contribution to strengthening the struggle can only be assessed by those actually fighting it. To assess with may be arduous and full of surprises. This is one of the crucial contexts in which what is meant by a rearguard intellectual gets defined.

Being Observed and Studied

Postabyssal knowledge is constructed by means of epistemic mingas, that is to say, through collective work (the cocreation of knowledge) for a good considered to be common (the strengthening of resistance to and struggles against domination). It is never an easy task to take seriously the idea of reciprocity, cooperation, mutuality, and complementarity, whenever what is at stake is not knowledge born of struggle but rather knowledge produced to be used in the struggle. It is a particularly difficult task when the researchers are outsiders, especially when they are unaware of the learning/unlearning processes proposed by the epistemologies of the South. The assumption is that the research is always authorized by the group it concerns, even (or perhaps above all) when the group has its misgivings about this odd person wanting to know with the group instead of the conventional wanting to know about the group.

One of the greatest difficulties lies in reciprocal observation. The postabyssal researcher must always bear in mind that science advances according to the trust it inspires with respect to the aims of the struggle against domination. Trust in knowledge is never assessed without regard for the trust placed in the person of the researcher. The researcher's personal physical, phenotypical, and psychological features, as well as lifestyle, are the visible face of research. The researcher trained to think that such features are irrelevant for the kind of work she wants to accomplish will soon realize that such features, and not her work, are the target of keen observation by the members of the social group, no matter how genuine her intention to study with them and share the struggle. In sum, postabyssal participant observation is not possible without observed participant observation.

I return to this topic in chapter 8 while analyzing the deep experience of the senses. Let me just insist on the need to establish (formally or informally, according to contexts and cultures) conviviality agreements suggesting that observation is reciprocal and benefits are mutual, and that contributions toward a strengthening of the group's struggle are to be realistically expected. Above all, devolution must be now far more intense than that theorized in the 1960s by critical sociology and must consist of returning to the communities to discuss with the group the results of the research conducted therein.[5] In a sense, only knowledge about (subject-object knowledge) calls for devolution; knowledge with (subject-subject knowledge) calls for an evaluation of the extent to which the research has fulfilled the second trust criterion, the criterion that pertains to the goals of the concrete struggles. Difficult as it is to imagine, in the end, the validity of postabyssal science can only be determined a posteriori.

Taking Risks, Curing Wounds, Healing

I have been arguing that, in certain contexts, knowing-with may involve personal, professional, or patrimonial risks to the researcher. I do not mean relatively predictable risks for which insurance can be procured. I mean unpredictable, existential risks involving the researcher, her family, her institution, and so on. Abyssal science has rarely taken into account how research often ends up putting at risk the objects of research. Whenever it does so, it tends to consider that the specific contribution to scientific progress must prevail as the overriding interest or value, thus justifying the risk. From the point of view of the epistemologies of the South, the double criterion of trust, to which postabyssal science must be subjected, takes care, at least in part, of the risks endangering the oppressed social groups and their struggles against oppression. I have in mind risks threatening the researcher intent on knowing-with.

Sharing the construction of knowledge may involve situations that existentialist philosophy designated as limit situations, that is, situations in which the subject finds himself or herself in conditions of almost dilemmatic risk; that is to say, following one or the other course of action may very well involve the same kind of risk. Or else, to bring in Ilya Prigogine's (1980, 1997) theory of systems, in situations of bifurcation, that is, in systems far from a state of equilibrium, the least oscillation may cause a major systemic change. Such actions or situations may vary in kind, and the risk level depends on the contexts in which they occur: for example, bearing witness to something just because you happened to be present; participating in a specific action of resistance and struggle; denying information to someone entitled to it who demands it in order to punish the group; saving wounded bodies; facing repressive forces; and so on and so forth. Some actions or omissions may even be illegal; they may, for instance, break the deontological codes of abyssal science (the issue of neutrality). The postabyssal researcher does not abide by reckless adventurism or voluntarism. Adventurism consists in taking unnecessary and probably counterproductive risks. Voluntarism consists in taking risks without consulting or touching base with the social groups directly involved in the struggle, who will thus suffer the consequences of any errors committed, even if committed with the most angelic of intentions.

In the case of the insider-researcher, such issues have little existential relevance—but not in the case of the outsider-researcher. We must not forget that trust in the objectives of the struggle against domination cannot be distinguished from trust in the knower, that is, in the subject or cosubject of such knowledge. Knowledge is never what is at stake; rather, the status of the person

who possesses that knowledge and who uses (or refuses to use) it in moments or conditions of danger is what is in question. Moreover, in many situations, particularly at the onset of the research, the outsider-researcher is viewed not as an individual person but rather as a collective being, an icon, a ghost, a monster, an involuntary representative of a history of capitalist, colonialist, and patriarchal domination; thus, whether reluctantly or not, the outsider-researcher is viewed as being complicit with much unjust suffering and painful remembrance. We face, in this case, unsaids that rarely reach the surface of relations and rather emerge as a kind of uneasiness, as heavy silences, as mistrust disguised as curiosity, as distance disguised as reverence.

The postabyssal research of our time has something of transitional justice, including all its characteristic and well-known contradictions.[6] By transitional justice is meant the set of institutions created in postconflict periods to guarantee the peaceful transition from violent governments characterized by loathsome atrocities and mass violations of human rights to legitimate governments allowing for a decent civic and political life. Transitional justice has had many forms, but it is generally guided by the idea of reconciliation, which, in the great majority of cases, requires forgetfulness (or selective memory) and pardon. The contradictions of transitional justice lie in calling for breaks with the past that may end up being continuities; in highlighting some abuses of power while hiding other, perhaps even more serious, ones; in criticizing some exercises of power while at the same time legitimating the power exercising them; and in changing the debate about the past in such a way that the causes of the injustices committed are not mentioned and hence are not eliminated.

Of course, postabyssal research is not an exercise in transitional justice. But it does share with it the idea that between the past and the future there is an abyssal line that must be defined by whoever has the historical will to denounce and put an end to it. Thus, the postabyssal researcher's self-reflexivity must include reflection on whether the abyssal line is being properly identified so as to be effectively denounced, and, once denounced, if political and epistemological forces are available to put an end to it. To be sure, the postabyssal researcher cannot perform individually what is a collective task of historical dimensions. She must, however, act as if, in her range of knowing-with-action, everything depended on her. If she does not do so, she may end up falling into contradictions similar to those of transitional justice. As I have frequently suggested, the abyssal character is the natural state of social sciences research in our time; thus, fighting for the postabyssal is always fighting against the current.

If, on the contrary, self-reflexivity goes deep enough and acts out accordingly, postabyssal research may gain a healing dimension.[7] The healing I have in

mind is a collective healing with repercussions in individual trajectories. Healing is the process by means of which both individual and collective wounded bodies reconcile themselves with life and world without surrendering to reconciliation with injustice and unjust suffering. In its more general sense, healing is an action aimed at restoring or enhancing the hope of a given group facing the structural factors generating systemic injustice, inducing fear, revolt, rage, or resignation. Such structural factors, rather than abstract entities, are the most concrete inscriptions of the capitalist, colonial, and patriarchal powers upon commodified, racialized, and sexualized bodies. The concrete inscriptions depend upon the contextual articulations of the three modern modes of domination with those satellite powers operating in conjunction with them, be they religion, nationalism, generation, regionalism, and so on. Healing can therefore assume many different forms: reparation for wrongdoing, the acknowledgment of silenced oppression and of historical whitewashing, the restoration of rights and legality, the settling of historical accounts (between so-called heroes who were indeed villains and of so-called villains who were indeed heroes), the recognition of cultural difference or territorial integrity, and so on.

Postabyssal research contributes to lessen unjust suffering and to heal by carrying out both the sociology of absences and the sociology of emergences. Subaltern social groups, especially those that are the victims of abyssal exclusions, suffer humiliation and social isolation literally in their skin. Since the deeper causes of humiliation and isolation are rarely transparent, the practice of knowing-with may contribute to rescuing the dignity and decency of those living in undignified and indecent conditions by denaturalizing and denouncing domination, and restoring hope by identifying not-yets, that is, by performing the sociology of emergences.

The therapeutic dimension of research may raise two questions. The first concerns the relation between healing and truth. According to the epistemologies of the North, the search for truth is knowledge's ultimate goal, truth being understood as the representation of reality. According to the epistemologies of the South, truth is a question of trust, and trust is directly linked to the results obtained in the practice of subaltern lives, particularly in the practices of resistance and struggle against abyssal exclusion. Healing poses the problem of how the collective transformations to which knowing-with aspires inscribe themselves, here and now, in the collective and individual bodies that suffer and resist unjust suffering. Truth consists in a healing that is not a placebo.

The second question is that of the relation between healing and social change. Modern Eurocentric critical thought has always imagined change as

oriented toward the future, a future breaking totally or partially with the past, which often meant the sacrifice of the present generations on behalf of a better future for future generations. In recent times, probably the most convincing intergenerational pact was the welfare state created by European social democracy after World War II. The institutionalization of this pact made transparent the estimation of the sacrifice, on the one hand, and its benefits, on the other. Given the reciprocity and reversibility of the sacrifice (sacrifice today to reap a benefit tomorrow), suffering in the name of a better future was considered fair. Because of the abyssal line, the sacrifice was deemed just even though it applied only to this side of the abyssal line, that is, to metropolitan societies and sociabilities. Actually, it resided on the invisibility of the extremely violent sacrifice imposed on the populations on the other side of the line (colonial societies and sociabilities). The ideology of colonialism as the bearer of civilization barely disguised the fact that the sacrifices on the other side of the line were not being imposed in exchange for any future benefit to the sacrificed populations.

Therefore, the ideology of progress had two faces: the face of the relative symmetry between sacrifice and benefit, and the face of the incommensurability between sacrifice and benefit. The abyssal line prevented these two faces from seeing each other in the mirror. Furthermore, besides the sacrifice-benefit of social democracy and the sacrifice-without-compensation of colonialism, the ideology of progress had a third face, that of sacrifice with long-term compensation: the revolutionary face. In this case, the required sacrifice was often harsh and violent and reached a paroxysm under Stalin; any realistic chance of reciprocity or reversibility of sacrifice got lost. The greater the imagined discrepancy between present experiences (misery and oppression) and future expectations (abundance and liberation), the greater the sacrifice demanded and the slimmer the realistic relation with future benefits. Authoritarianism and vanguardism were the responses to the lack of transparency regarding the sacrifice.

The epistemologies of the South dismiss the abstract idea of progress and focus rather on listening deeply to the life experiences of social groups that are victims of the exclusions and unjust suffering caused by capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy; they privilege knowledges produced and used by such groups and their allies in their resistance and struggles against concrete exercises of domination and oppression. The changes they long for have nothing to do with any of the three faces of Eurocentric progress, even though they may still bear some traces of each of them. Such changes take place at a time of historical impatience, in which the wretched of the earth are sick of waiting

for glorious futures that never arrive and of believing in promises that turn out to be empty, if not in fact the opposite of what they had promised. Concrete changes must occur here and now in the existential experiences of the social groups that are the victims of unjust suffering. These changes will be the result of transformations in the unequal relations of power that minimize or eliminate unjust suffering and extend dignity to humiliated and excluded social groups by valorizing the knowledges that will allow them to represent the world as their own and change it as if it were their own house. Such changes do not occur through ethical imperatives or moral obligations; they rather occur because of changes in power relations that turn the said imperatives and obligations into practices of good living—or buen vivir (see chapter 10).

An Epistemic Minga

As I explain in chapter 6 and mention at the beginning of this chapter, the word "minga," of Quechua origin, refers to a voluntary, collective, and communitarian work project of social usefulness. An epistemic minga is communitarian or collective work that aims to create or preserve common knowledges or knowledges of common interest. I have been arguing that while all social practices produce knowledge, the question of methodology applies only to a small fraction of such practices, those whose specific goal is to create knowledge as a relatively autonomous social object (postabyssal science). The previous sections frequently refer to an individual researcher. To the extent that the goal is knowing-with rather than knowing-about, all the research work guided by the epistemologies of the South is collective at its core. There are, however, research methodologies that are collective in a stronger sense of the term, I mean situations in which the whole process of knowledge creation is collective from the start. Such research collectives may be made up of insiders alone, that is, members of the community being self-studied, or else through collaboration between insiders and outsiders. Such kinds of collaboration raise specific methodological and epistemological problems.

The processes in question (mingas) have a definitely decolonizing vocation insofar as they have been used mainly by the groups, peoples, and nations that Western modernity has placed on the other side of the abyssal line, that is, in colonial societies and sociabilities that subjected them to the most violent forms of exclusion. They constitute one of the most convincing manifestations of the cognitive justice grounding the epistemologies of the South. They are most eloquent exercises in the sociology of absences and the sociology of emergences. Epistemic mingas vary widely and have great epistemological complexity. They

create both individual and collective authorship at one and the same time; they combine different kinds of artisanal, scientific, and hybrid knowledges, thus being as well a good example of the ecologies of knowledges; they resort to multimedia support to bring together written texts, audio and video recordings, art, music, and theater; some of them are revivalist (the past ratifying the present), while others are insurgent (the past denouncing the present and heralding the possibility of a different and better future). Such diversity allows the sociology of emergences to assume both the form of archive and the form of interventions in, if not interruptions of, the literary and artistic canons.

As an illustration, I refer here to an insurgent epistemic minga with which I have been involved in Chiapas, in southern Mexico, which brings together indigenous and mestiza authorships and is coordinated by Xochitl Leyva Solano, Camila Pascal, and Axel Köhler.[8] In the words of Solano:

> Latin America and Indo-Afro-Mestiza America have been a seedbed of knowledge practices sprouting from struggles, resistances, and autonomies and, at the same time, giving rise to multiple academic critical theories, which take off from situated knowledges, conceived and created in the South. This series aims to help map other, insurgent knowledge practices that contest the dominant forms of the current knowledge/power pattern in these times of crisis and wars, in these times of civilizational crisis, in these times as well of defense of the pluriverse. Thus, the volumes in this series will focus on answering some basic questions, such as: production/creation of knowledges from where? by whom? for what? for whom? with whom? how? (Solano et al. 2014: 23–24)

The goals of the project are quite revealing of the way in which the epistemologies of the South combine knowing-with and political intervention and change. They are formulated so eloquently that it pays to quote them in full:

1. To identify and render visible the epistemological, ethical, political, theoretical, and ontological contributions of women, young people, and professionals among the originary communities and afro-descendants that, from their fields of enunciation, have come up with published material that is the result of their practices with decolonizing, anti-patriarchal, anti-racist, and anti-systemic horizons. Above all, such books have, first of all, educational, social, and political value for the very organizations, collectives, and movements originating them.
2. To identify and render visible the epistemic, ethical, political, theoretical and ontological contributions of activist-researchers—especially

young activist-researchers—committed to the said struggles, resistances, and autonomies.

3 To encourage, with these publications, new generations of students, activists, and professionals to resort to their practices of situated knowledge in order to go on building the epistemic sovereignty and cognitive justice that are the fundamental ingredients of social justice. (Solano et al. 2014: 23–34)

This page intentionally left blank

8

THE DEEP EXPERIENCE OF THE SENSES

Knowledge is not possible without experience, and experience is inconceivable without the senses and the feelings they arouse in us. It is through experience that we open ourselves to the world, an opening that is vouchsafed by our senses alone. If the senses are essential for knowing, it is hard to understand why the epistemologies of the North have paid so little attention to them.

To take seriously the idea that knowledge is embodied implies recognizing that knowing is a corporeal activity involving the five senses, if not also the sixth sense that results from the many possible combinations between them. In the epistemologies of the North, valorizing the senses as sources of knowledge is out of the question.[1] Only the mind knows; only reason is transparent regarding what is known; hence, only reason is trustworthy. As Merleau-Ponty put it, "Cartesianism denies philosophical dignity to the senses: it is not the eye that sees, but the mind" (1978: 115; see also Merleau-Ponty 1962). The truth is, however, that without the senses there are no sensations, without sensations there are no emotions, without emotions there are no perceptions, and without perceptions there would be no world as it presents itself to us and as we present ourselves to it. Without the senses, it would be impossible to warm up reason as the epistemologies of the South recommend (see chapter 5), which yields the feeling-thinking, the corazonar that renders possible the transformation of the world into a world conceived of as a personal responsibility.

Modern science has conceived of the senses as necessary evils, indispensable but treacherous vehicles to be sorted out or unmasked by reason.[2] The world is thought of and possessed by the intellect, for only the intellect provides convincing proof of the world's existence. Modern science has never treated the senses on an equal basis; it has always privileged sight and hearing, having trained them for cognitive extractivism, thus turning them into abyssal sight and abyssal hearing, respectively. Because extractivism is always guided by what it aims to extract, the abyssal eye was trained to see only what it wants to see and the abyssal ear was likewise trained to hear only what it wants to hear. What cannot be heard or seen is not deemed relevant. The experience of the abyssal senses is thus partial and superficial, and such partiality and superficiality have been instrumental in producing (and making invisible) the abyssal line at the root of modern science. In this sense we can suggest that abyssal thinking also includes seeing and hearing with capitalist, colonialist, and patriarchal eyes and ears.

In the Western philosophical tradition, bodies open themselves to the world via the senses. But this abstract statement, however relevant in the philosophical arena, remains empty at the sociological level to the extent that the social processes and the power relations that condition a body's opening to the world are not taken into account. Opening to the world may be a more or less ample and diverse experience. Here are some parameters for variations in the experience: such an opening may be willed or imposed; it may allow for the control of the outside world or the other way around; the world to which the bodies open themselves may be a given or a projection; it may be familiar and welcoming or strange and hostile; some bodies are open to the world only because other bodies are closed to the world; the globalized opening to the world of some bodies may be the condition for imposing the localized opening to the world on other bodies. Indeed, the globalized opening to the world of the bodies of European Renaissance humanism entailed the localized opening (or even closing) to the world of bodies considered nonhuman or subhuman and inhabiting the other side of the line. And thus the abyssal line created two worlds to which different bodies opened themselves in radically different ways: the sensorial world of metropolitan societies and sociabilities and the sensorial world of colonial societies and sociabilities. The abyssal line created such asymmetrical experiences of the senses that they became incommensurate. Throughout Western modernity a political economy of the senses and sensoriality developed in terms of which hierarchies were established among the senses and among people according to the orientation or acuity of their different senses. The nineteenth century elevated sight and hearing to the top of the hierarchy because they

were associated with cognition, while taste, smell, and touch were considered lower senses, particularly developed among the lower races.[3]

The postabyssal experience of the senses is, above all, an experience of reciprocity: to see and be seen, to hear and be heard, and so on and so forth.[4] It is frequently an asymmetrical reciprocity. The postabyssal researcher must begin by being aware both of the reciprocity and of its asymmetry, and then proceed with a view to maximizing the symmetry or minimizing the asymmetry. How to go about this varies according to the different senses. In general, however, the difficulty in distinguishing feeling from being felt is the first lived experience of the problematic nature of the subject/object duality. The world is not a mirror; it is a producer of sensorial meanings that project themselves onto the researcher, sensing her in ways that she may hardly suspect. There is no uniform system of equivalence for the intercrossing senses. For instance, what the researcher sees in a particular group does not necessarily coincide with what that group sees in the researcher seeing them. Indeed, reciprocity may occur between different senses without those involved noticing it. A given sense of the researcher may be reciprocated by another sense on the part of the members of the group with whom she is interacting. The researcher may be intent on hearing the group while the group is intent on seeing her. She may be savoring the food she has been offered while whoever offered it is focused on seeing her eat. Reciprocity involves here two different senses: between hearing and sight or between taste and sight. The intensity of the two intercrossing senses may be equally high. The two senses may flow smoothly or clash and affect each other. The interactions between the senses are often riddled with obstacles, and such obstacles are always other senses, or different understandings of the contexts in which the senses express themselves.

The crisscrossed multiplicity of the senses is one of the most complex topics in social interactions. The same object or practice may be socially constructed to be seen and yet, at a deeper level, it may offer itself to be heard, touched, smelled, or tasted as well. In such cases, a deeper understanding of the object or practice requires the confluence of the various senses. This kind of sensorial depth based on intersensoriality is not compatible with the instrumental rationality of Western modernity, since it puts at stake the linearity, unidirectionality, and unidimensionality of extractivist perception. As I have suggested above, reflection on the role of intersensoriality in deep understanding was left to the philosophy of art. Writes Chrétien, “To say that painting is silent is to say that we not only see it, but that we listen to it as well” (2003: 19). With their guitars and mandolins, Braque’s and Picasso’s paintings are silent music; as van Gogh’s or Gauguin’s still lives are there to be seen, touched, and tasted; as the

colors and landscapes of Beethoven are there to be seen and smelled. The epistemologies of the South valorize the intersensorial, aesthetic experience to the extent that the latter has elective affinities with the nonextractivist processes of cognitive interaction that underlie knowing-with, the ecologies of knowledges, and intercultural translation.

The difficulties in defining reciprocities and equivalences result from the capitalist, colonialist, and patriarchal political economy of the senses and its specific inscription upon bodies. Such an inscription produced both different and unequal bodies. Bodies are different because of the cultural differences constituting them and because of the different contexts in which they are put into action; bodies are unequal because of differences of power in their opening to the world. Bodies are unequal because they feel and are felt in ways that reproduce the social inequalities that fix time-spaces in which the opportunities to feel and be felt are unequally distributed. Opening to the world is a mere abstract philosophical concept if it is not taken into account that bodies do not all open to the world with the same capacity to represent it as their own and change it according to their own interests and aspirations. The great majority of the world's bodies cannot open themselves save to a much reduced world of neighbors; they are nonetheless forced into being open, that is, exposed to an infinitely vaster world and to ends they do not control, such as war. In such cases, being open to the world means being exposed before a panopticon world, a world that observes all without itself being observed.

Subaltern bodies have and are subaltern senses. Feeling in a subaltern way means being compelled to transcribe what one feels in the language and terms of the oppressor. It amounts to transcribing what is active in a passive mode. To be a victim means to assume such a transcription as the true and only possible one. To be resistant means to question such a transcription by confronting it with one's own transcription in an active mode.

As regards the senses, being a postabyssal researcher entails assuming two commitments. First, the researcher must consider that she may be facing unequal bodies and that the inequality of the senses may damage her research and her part in the struggle, if inequality is not kept under control. Second, research must be converted into a pedagogy for the liberation of the senses; the transcriptions that produce passivity must be questioned so as to open space for alternative transcriptions. This twofold commitment allows the postabyssal researcher to contribute to turning subaltern victim bodies into resistant bodies, without becoming in the process the researcher's victim bodies.

Different bodies result from the cultural difference inscribed in the senses. Such cultural difference is almost always highlighted by the different social

contexts in which the senses are mainly put into action; they are contexts to see, hear, taste, smell, and touch; they are contexts that always combine other senses besides the privileged sense in each case. The idea that bodies and senses are intercultural is the most challenging of all because diversity is not limited to human bodies and senses; rather, it concerns nonhuman living bodies as well. It concerns the relations, likewise intercultural, that humans have with nonhumans. If the system of equivalence between sensations and perceptions is complex in relations between humans, it is even more so concerning the relations of humans with nonhumans, namely, with nature.

The intercultural diversity of the senses has long been acknowledged by the modern social sciences, but such recognition has been presided over by the extractivist model. As a consequence, the cultural distance between researcher and researched has reinforced the separation between subject and object, as well as the abyssal line between metropolitan societies/sociabilities and colonial societies/sociabilities. The seemingly noble acknowledgment of difference contributed to underscore the distance between us and the others and thus justify the impossibility of solidarity and cooperation with the others in their struggles against domination.

The postabyssal researcher is always running the risk of being out of context herself and, therefore, giving the wrong interpretation of certain ways of feeling just because she missed the context in which they were mobilized. A common mistake is to forget that being-with (sharing life and struggle) is far more complex than knowing-with. Research, even postabyssal research, creates its own, limited context that may actually interfere negatively with other contexts—life, sociability, struggle—in which it takes place. Contexts are not storehouses of senses and sensations ready to be sensed. They change the identity of both sensors and the sensed. Bodies sense and are sensed in contexts. Some contexts are more challenging than others. Two of them are particularly complex: the sacred context and the context of relations between humans and nonhumans. The context of the sacred or transcendent is the most difficult for the researcher to accede to if she is not an insider. However, if the wary, self-conscious researcher avoids dealing with this context, she may well run the risk of seeing all the other contexts wrongly. The context of relations between humans and nonhumans also raises complex issues. The easy path of anthropomorphizing the nonhuman is one of the most treacherous; it is a trap into which the postabyssal researcher with a Western cultural background frequently falls.[5]

The deep experience of the senses, her own and those of the people with whom the postabyssal researcher interacts, is very complex, constantly showing ruptures in the system of equivalences. To imagine abstract transparencies is a

modern disease. To live with error, the incommensurate, and the unintelligible is not to live as a limited being; it is rather to live as a human being.[6] To identify and interact across ruptures in the system of equivalences and the misunderstandings they cause is one of the main objectives behind the ecologies of knowledges and intercultural translation, the only way to foster alliances between subaltern social groups struggling against domination and, in the end, between the postabyssal researcher and the group with whom she studies. Sharing struggles and risks does not dispense with the intervention of corazonar. Being there at the moment of danger and assuming risks permits a testimonial gathering of senses, that is, an equivalence creating a mandate that imposes itself as necessary.

The diversity and inequality of bodies and their senses are responsible for most of the difficulties in organizing efficacious struggles against domination. At the level of the senses, the strangeness that may cause in one of us a totally distinct way of experiencing sight, hearing, smell, taste, or touch by some other is the same whether the other is an oppressor or an oppressed group. The diversity of sensorial experience may thus obliterate the power inequality of the senses. The differential experience of the senses may easily lead a dominated group to see in another dominated group a dominating group, and vice versa. The possible convergence of interests is neutralized by the difference in sensorial experience. The dominant social groups are aware of this, and so they foster diversity whenever it contributes to hide inequality and hinder alliances between social groups fighting against domination. The oppressors know very well that their days would be over, were such alliances to take place. This explains why the epistemologies of the South either are fulfilled in bodies and senses or will never be fulfilled in society and social transformation.

In the following, I deal with some of the characteristics of the deep experience of the senses in relation to each sense. It goes without saying that, like any other experience, the research experience is a totalizing social action, thus involving all the senses. What follows must be understood as a reflection on the different dimensions of this totalizing action. What is valid for one of the senses is often valid, with adjustments, for all the others. Thus, in what follows I do not repeat regarding other senses what can be directly deduced from the first sense analyzed: sight.

Deep Seeing

It should be clear by now that sight is one of the senses most in need of being decolonized. The modern paradigm of sight—seeing everything without being seen—was first formulated by Descartes and then turned into

political philosophy by Jeremy Bentham: the panopticon made famous by Foucault.[7]

Merleau-Ponty's anti-Cartesian conception of the senses is the most coherent one so far proposed by a Western intellectual, a conception that rests on the reciprocity of sight, on seeing and being seen, on the continuity between those seeing and what they see. Says Merleau-Ponty, "The visible world and the world of my motor projects are each total parts of the same Being. . . . Immersed in the visible by his body, itself visible, the see-er does not appropriate what he sees; he merely approaches it by looking, he opens himself to the world. . . . The enigma is that my body simultaneously sees and is seen" (1964a: 162).

This conception is apparently close to the deep seeing proposed by the epistemologies of the South. However, the problem with Merleau-Ponty's stance is that, quite in tune with Western mores, the theory is formulated as expressing a universal human characteristic that operates in a monotonic way irrespective of contexts, bodily cultures, and power relations among bodies. On the contrary, the postabyssal researcher must learn to see deeply but always bearing in mind that she is dealing with unequal and unequally differentiated bodies, and that such inequalities and differences define the ways in which bodies are seen and also how they see the researcher, as well as the ways in which they see themselves among themselves.

Deep seeing is not just about seeing; we might call it a meeting of seeing and being seen. I use "deep" here by analogy with the concept of depth in the optical sciences, while giving it a distinct meaning. In optics, depth points to the possibility of creating three-dimensional visual perception by means of mechanisms such as perspective, size, scale, texture gradients, and the partial overlapping of objects (occlusion). As I use the concept here, deep seeing has more affinities with the visual perception created by artists, especially painters, a perspective of deepness built creatively to maximize either proximity or distance, ambiguity or accuracy, movement or stasis, according to what the painter wants the painted object to communicate to us and the kind of emotion it is supposed to arouse in us.[8] While contemplating painting, sight engages in a journey that has only a point of departure. The emotions and imaginings it arouses only partially depend on the seer. Moreover, such emotions and imaginings double themselves with an interior gaze that contemplates and questions the seer. In art, as in religion, the possibility of seeing without being seen is absent. The ego has to unfold into two lest it fail to appreciate art as art (for instance, by not seeing in the painting anything but its frame, canvas, or type of paint or shade).

This reference to sight in art is pertinent because the postabyssal researcher sees deeply when she sees that what is within her reach is a social entity that

wants to be seen on its own terms, lest only a trivial and superficial sight be permitted. Seeing on the terms of the other, where the other is conceived of as an entity that does not depend on the seer, implies requiring that the seer become familiarized with unexpected, often uncomfortable angles and perspectives, and open herself to unpredictable emotions that may put routines and certainties at risk. The other that is seen by the postabyssal researcher is like a painter depicting a society that lies outside of his practice, his ideas and aspirations, his oral and written texts, his knowledge and ignorance, his pleasures and sufferings, his resistance and desistance. All observation is always completed by whatever or whoever is observed.

Deep seeing is performed in different modes. The first concerns the visible and the invisible.[9] In situations of exclusion, resistance, and struggle, the visible is often far less important than the invisible.[10] What is invisible may have been hidden from the researcher, or it may be invisible to all, or to the great majority of people. The modern researcher has been trained to be particularly interested in the invisible. Modern science relies on the assumption that the invisible is more important than the visible and that, therefore, science's mission is to disclose and unveil, in the sense of uncovering. Paradoxically, this assumption is grounded on a meta-assumption that contradicts it—I mean the abyssal line separating the metropolitan from the colonial sociability that modern science simultaneously produces and makes invisible. Modern abyssal science is interested in the invisible that can be made visible by scientific work, not in the invisible that science itself generates.

The postabyssal researcher must discriminate between several situations. When the group knows how to distinguish between what is concealed and what is by nature invisible, the postabyssal researcher must fully respect their decisions. In this case, seeing deeply means developing the capacity to see either the presence or the absence of the invisible in the visible. The postabyssal researcher must realize that the people or interactions she is seeing are telling her that she can't see at all, which means that they are looking at her as if she were an idiot or an ignorant person who takes the part for the whole. The eyes engaged in the struggle are mistrustful eyes on account of the many treacherous experiences piled up throughout history. In this case in particular, sharing the struggle must be an act of humility; it should never assume an instrumental objective, nor should the researcher expect to be able to see the invisible or the occult, until she has gradually obtained the group's trust.

There is, however, a situation in which the postabyssal researcher must exercise critical distance in order to render visible the invisible. Herein lies another mode of exercising deep seeing: seeing the unimaginable. I am talking

about something that is not even considered socially invisible simply because it can't be imagined as existing. I mean the abyssal line dividing metropolitan societies/sociabilities and colonial societies/sociabilities. Being a postabyssal researcher entails in most cases exercising a pedagogy of the postabyssal, a pedagogy premised upon the acknowledgment of the abyssal line. This line works somewhat like Carl Jung's (1969) collective unconscious—not Jung's universal and immemorial collective unconscious but rather the collective unconscious of capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy. I am referring to the fathomless wound inflicted on modern bodies and societies/sociabilities, a wound that is the cause of nameless suffering, "grotesque," "devilish," and "primitive" pain, to use Jung's terms: the wound of appropriation/violence without which modern regulation/emancipation did not work in the past and without which it still does not work today. Without wishing to force the analogy, I would add that the postabyssal researcher, just like the Jungian psychiatrist, must facilitate the emergence of the collective unconscious. That is to say, she must render visible the abyssal line in order to turn it into a target of denunciation and political struggle. Herein lies the pedagogy of the postabyssal, perhaps the most difficult task of deep seeing. Whether she researches abyssal or non-abyssal exclusions, the postabyssal researcher must always bear in mind the abyssal line; failing that, neither kind of exclusion can be fought efficiently.

The pedagogy of the postabyssal must begin by being a self-pedagogy. The abyssal line, although unimaginable as such, is seen by the social group that is a victim of abyssal exclusion under a phantasmagoric form, a form that is wholly astonishing and even shocking to the postabyssal researcher, in that it is the very form of the postabyssal researcher herself. In the case that the postabyssal researcher is an outsider, and although she is an individual and has solidarity, she is seen by the group as one more version of domination, even if the group does not think of capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy. When the group looks at her, particularly at first, they do not see a mere person; they see a history and an immense and hostile collective. The group may be willing to suspend what the memory says, but they do not forget. Any miscalculated gesture on the part of the researcher may lead to canceling the suspension.

Deep seeing implies that the postabyssal researcher is willing to see what she does not actually see, but what she knows or suspects is seen by the group concerning herself personally. She is fully aware that the way she handles these asymmetries of seeing will decide the fate of knowing-with and sharing the struggle. The researcher herself is, as it were, a map crossed over by the abyssal line; her knowing-with project must include healing the wound caused by the abyssal line, lest it fail to be what it claims to be (a postabyssal research

project). The postabyssal researcher's dilemma is to have to acknowledge that she herself is the abyssal line, and that constructing the postabyssal is, above all, an act of self-destruction. The required work of self-reflexivity and self-transformation is an almost inhuman effort to bring about humanity. It will take several generations of postabyssal researchers to accomplish the work and eventually overcome the current paradigm of extractivist knowledge. For a long time, being a postabyssal researcher will be in part a sacrificial experience.

Deep seeing can still be performed in another mode that actually is also present in the other two modes mentioned above (visible and invisible and seeing the unimaginable). I mean unequal eyes and different eyes. Subaltern eyes are different and unequal. Raised in abyssal exclusion, subaltern eyes see things that the researcher does not see; even when the subaltern eyes and the researcher see the same things, they hardly ever coincide in how they evaluate or ascribe meaning to what they see. The power inequality of the visions in attendance goes usually hand in hand with the vision's cultural difference; however, power inequality and cultural difference must be considered separately for analytical purposes. Subaltern eyes have been localized by modern global domination. As a result, they tend to have a more reduced field of vision, although they do see with a very fine texture gradient. Structurally, they are like large-scale maps showing a small territory in great detail. Exclusion, abyssal exclusion in particular, trains the eyes for the here and now, for what is near and is immediately necessary. Such is the existential logic of survival. Enlarging the field of vision may imply the risk of neglecting the details that grant survival.[11] The postabyssal researcher must respect this scale and then try to help strengthen resistance within that scale. Her field of vision is broader, covering a much larger territory or a far vaster time-space of exclusions and struggles against exclusion. She knows that postabyssal science constructs critical distance by enlarging the field and thus changing the scale to make the field visible. But she also knows that enlarging the field (a struggle, a territory, etc.) goes hand in hand with loss of detail, since a gradient of coarser texture is then required. The postabyssal researcher knows that, in order to fight efficiently against a kind of exclusion that casts the excluded groups on the lowest levels of life's resources and opportunities—the survival level—the struggle needs to be engaged at a higher level than that of mere survival. Indeed, at the level of survival it is only possible to reproduce survival, not to overcome it. But none of this is easily communicated to or shared with those who would be more interested in and would benefit more from having access to such knowledge.

The postabyssal researcher must be aware of another lack of coincidence (asymmetrical seeing) regarding the apparent reciprocity and complicity of

the gazes. Even when they seem to be looking at the same reality, the postabyssal researcher and the social group engaged in the struggle see it on different scales; actually, they do not see the same reality, since it is true that we do not see phenomena but rather scales of phenomena.[12] As such, deep seeing implies that scales come gradually closer together, in which case the postabyssal researcher needs to resort to a transscale pedagogy: the pedagogy of seeing the large in the small, the historical in the here and now without losing sight of the small and of the here and now. For excluded social groups, a change of scale only makes sense if it creates a credible expectation that things will get better as a result of the struggle against domination. For those who are on the verge of not surviving, any change must be undertaken carefully as it may have serious consequences. If everything in your life is already at risk, risking any further may be fatal.[13] Transscale pedagogy is at the antipodes of the abyssal scientific diktat, which simply imposes the scale of sight that allows it to dominate the excluded group scientifically (knowing-about), turning all the other scales into discardable localisms. Such is the nature of the imperial gaze.

Subaltern eyes are bound to be different eyes because they are trained in another culture. In this case, visibility is even more enigmatic, the possibility of lack of coincidence (asymmetrical seeing) even greater. A culturally different vision occurs according to perspectives, scales, textures, colors, and movements that may be unintelligible to the postabyssal researcher. Such disagreements are conceived of as analytical curiosities by the abyssal researcher who studies-about and knows-about. However, to the postabyssal researcher who studies-with and knows-with, such disagreements imperil her existential project. Just an example: the postabyssal researcher may be seeing and being seen by eyes that see the collective in the individual, nature in society, the transcendent in the immanent, the past in the present, the future in the past, or, vice versa, the past in the future. Or eyes that see ancestors being present and participating in meetings; or see sounds; or see abundance where the researcher sees only scarcity or rubbish; or see the colors that only birds can see; and so on and so forth. Knowing-with requires that, in such circumstances, differences be turned into opportunities for intercultural intelligibility. The point is not to eliminate visual cultural differences. The point is to create some degree of reciprocal intelligibility allowing for the creation of ecologies of visual knowledges, thus rendering possible articulations and alliances capable of strengthening the struggles against domination. The point is to engage in intercultural visual translation and the pedagogy of intercultural translation it requires.

Generally speaking, Western culture privileges writing and speech to the detriment of listening. In spite of the fact that a large majority of the population spends as much time in life hearing as it does speaking, schools teach how to speak but not how to listen. At most they may teach how to hear, but not how to listen. This distinction is more important than it seems. In Alfred Tomatis's words, "Hearing is a superficial use of one's ear, while listening implies an act of will to connect with the sonic environment and learn what must be known. It is through the listening posture that we make the shift from a passive awareness that there is some sort of sound, to listening: paying attention to the sound and becoming actively involved with it" (2005: 86; see also Tomatis 1991: 16).

The abyssal scientist's ear is an ear trained to hear himself, while reducing to the minimum the outside sounds he has to face. It is an ear trained for extractivism; it only hears the outside whenever it is not hearing itself alone, and even then it only hears according to an austere economy of audition geared to extract the maximum amount of relevant information in the shortest period of time. Such an aural economy does not allow the abyssal researcher to engage in any act of self-reflexivity.[14] That is to say, when he listens he does not listen to himself listening. Unlike the reciprocity between seeing and being seen, the reciprocity between hearing and being heard works by sequences. Abyssal hearing is the type of hearing that tries to control the sequences as much as possible: the researcher decides when he wants to hear (what he wants to hear) and when he wants to be heard; he also decides not to have to tolerate overlaps (for instance, to have to hear while he speaks or to have to speak while he hears). Controlling the sequence is crucial for maintaining a monopoly over the criterion regarding what is, or is not, relevant.

Deep listening is a very complex experience occurring at the antipodes of the abyssal auditory experience.[15] In education, there has been a very important reflection on the centrality of listening in the act of teaching. Paulo Freire's influence is obvious. Katherine Schultz conceives of the act of teaching as an act of listening: "Locating listening at the center of teaching works against the notion that teachers talk and students listen, suggesting instead that teachers listen to teach and students talk to learn" (2003: 7). Although formulated in the pedagogical context, this notion of teaching as listening has many affinities with the notion of deep listening I propose here. A long citation is in order:

> As used here [listening] suggests how a teacher attends to individuals, the classroom as a group, the broader social context, and, cutting across all of these, to silence and acts of silencing. Teachers listen for the individual

> voices and gestures in their classrooms; they also listen for the heartbeat or tenor of the group. Whereas educational literature often foregrounds the importance of observation, I purposefully choose to focus on listening, to highlight the centrality of relationships in teaching. Observation can be done from a distance; listening requires proximity and intimacy. The phrase "listening to teach" implies that the knowledge of who the learner is and the understanding that both the teacher and learner bring to a situation constitute the starting place for teaching. Listening encompasses written words as well as those that are spoken, words that are whispered, those enacted in gesture, and those left unsaid. (2003: 8)

There are several dimensions or kinds of practices of deep listening. The first one concerns the sound of the inaudible. This is not the place to analyze in detail the role of silence in society and the various kinds of silence.[16] For the postabyssal researcher, silence is perhaps the most complex form of social interaction. Sound and silence belong together; where sound is not possible, silence is not possible either. In processes of struggle, the relation between sound and silence carries great strategic value; the postabyssal researcher must be aware that respecting this relation (not interfering with it, avoiding endangering it) is one of the basic requirements of knowing-with. What is not heard may very well be a sound not audible or intelligible to extractivist ears. Or perhaps it is being communicated by other senses, which in turn may provide significant reinterpretations. Silence seen is not the same as silence heard or smelled or touched. Subaltern ears are trained to detect invasive senses.

The postabyssal researcher knows that she will not be able to listen to the voice of silence if she does not undergo a deep self-silencing herself. Deep self-silencing is the condition for listening to the voice of the inaudible. The aim is to make voices and sounds emerge out of the convergence of two antiphonal movements: the deep silence of the researcher, on the one hand, and the silence of the action or omission she confronts, on the other. Antiphonal convergence requires time, training, and availability; above all, it requires corazonar. Only such a convergence makes deep listening possible. The postabyssal researcher lives intensely the multiplicity of voices that may actually be inaudible. The most recondite and elusive voice is the inaudible voice produced by the abyssal line and the abyssal exclusions it generates. Appropriation/violence translates itself into inaudible voices because such voices refer to realities that became unpronounceable due to reiterated silencing. Such realities are an abyssal lack, to be retrieved only by the sociology of absences as something that never existed, but that should have existed.[17]

Another dimension of deep listening concerns the sound of the unintelligible. Unintelligibility is more challenging than inaudibility because only the latter disguises itself as absence; what is unintelligible, on the contrary, is always positioned before the hearer as an uncontrollable presence, hence, as potentially dangerous. Intelligibility has always to do with the language or code through which the sound is conveyed. Claiming that an extractivist learning of the language or code permits one to unveil the unintelligible is one of the fallacies of abyssal social science. Subaltern ears are different to the extent that their culture allows them to recognize different sounds and silences, to which they ascribe sources and origins that will be intelligible only by means of intercultural translation. A nonhuman sound may be heard as a human sound, and vice versa; a sound from the past may be heard as a sound from the present, or even from the future, and vice versa.

Sequences and Rhythms

Subaltern ears are so because they do not control the sequences and rhythms of sounds and silences. They hear themselves listening not by their own decision nor at times chosen by them. The postabyssal researcher faces here one of her major challenges. Deep listening entails losing control of the sequences and rhythms as a way of reducing the inequality of the subaltern ear. It is the opposite of active listening, one of the most efficacious modes of extractivist listening.[18] This is why silence is one of the subaltern bodies' weapons of resistance, often the only one available. The sequences and rhythms condition the contents or meanings of sound and soundlessness, of what is heard or not heard. Some contents or meanings are traceable only in shared sequences and rhythms.

Silencing and Vocalizing

This is a particularly relevant domain of deep listening. To have control of both sequences and rhythms implies having the capacity both to silence and to give voice. When it has not been the surrogate voice of dominant social groups, modern social science has excelled in giving voice to the dominated social groups. As Gayatri Spivak (1988) has eloquently shown, the tragedy of modern critical sciences has been to yield to the temptation of giving voice to the silences of subaltern bodies. The abyssal researcher's naive assumption is that his voice is transparent, not to be confused with the dominant voices, and can therefore be given to the dominated as if it were their own.

This temptation resides in a double fallacy. On the one hand, it cannot be assumed that the silence of the oppressed is always the result of imposed silencing. It may actually be a silence of revolt or protest against imposed silencing. There is a right to voice only when there is a right to silence as well. On the other hand, the voice being given is always a voice overlapping another voice that exists in reality but is not heard. Giving voice is less transparent than it claims; it can be (and often has been) either a dominant voice translated into a dominated dialect or a dominated voice selectively translated into a dominant dialect. In either case, what we have is a false, ventriloquist voice. No wonder it continues to be the only voice of the oppressed understood by dominant groups. Unsurprisingly, dominant groups do not feel threatened by it.

The pedagogy of postabyssal listening has two main aspects. On the one hand, domination often works silently by means of what I called the dominant inaudible above. In this case, the researcher must learn how to detect the silence and denounce it to the social group with which she is sharing knowledges and risks. It is no easy pedagogy, for it has to overcome the barrier of credibility raised by dominant groups around all the sounds they use to justify their domination. As Gramsci (1971: 337) so cogently argued, the hegemony of the dominant groups is gauged by their capacity to convince the dominated that there are no other sounds in the city. In such a case, the critical distance characterizing postabyssal research needs to be carefully pondered, lest the researcher run the risk of becoming a noncredible partner when denouncing the credibility of the dominant voice. Her voice may ring false.

The second aspect of postabyssal pedagogy concerns the silencing/vocalizing mentioned above. This is an area in which, given the hegemony of the epistemologies of the North, the postabyssal researcher must undergo an exercise in profound self-reflexivity in order to avoid both the risk of silencing and the opposite risk of vocalizing. She must train her voice for it to be in chorus, or at least to serve as a sound amplifier. In some situations, it may be more appropriate to imagine her voice as an echo. As in the case of all the other senses, the system of sense equivalence is always open and precarious. Sounds of hope may be heard as sounds of fear; sounds of resistance may be heard as sounds of desistance; and vice versa. The postabyssal researcher may also realize that she is being heard in what she thinks is a surprising way, either because what she says is highly valued or because what she says is received with mocking smiles. In such cases the mismatches will always be of little consequence, since sharing the struggle, being there at dangerous moments, and corazonar will gradually make sure on which side the postabyssal researcher is.

Deep Smelling, Tasting, and Touching

Sight and hearing are generally considered the most important senses to connect us to the world. The truth is, however, that in social relations it is through the senses of smell, taste, and touch that opening to the world becomes a physical, material contact with the world.[19] Furthermore, while the sense organs of four of the senses (sight, hearing, taste, and smell) reside in only a part of our body (the brain, though this is disputable today), the sense organ of touch resides in the skin; hence, it is spread all over our body, exposing the body to more contact. Life without touch or self-touch is literally impossible. Touch is considered the most basic sense because touch, as Montagu says, "is what gives us our knowledge of depth or thickness and form; we feel, we love and hate, are touchy and are touched, through the touch corpuscles of our skin" (1971: 1). Montagu goes so far as to say that after the brain the skin is the most important of all our organ systems. According to him, touch is the only sense without which it is impossible to live: "consider: as a sensory system the skin is much the most important organ system of the body" (1971: 7).[20]

As I have already said, the cultural history of the senses reveals the existence of infinite cultural diversity. As regards touch, cultural differences play a particularly important role insofar as different cultures have different codes of touching. This means that the full understanding of the meaning of the experience of the senses, in both experiences of knowing and experiences of struggle, may involve intercultural translation. The debate between Guru and Sarukkai (2012) on untouchability in India (the problem of the untouchables, the Dalits) deals with the issue of intercultural translation at some length. Sarukkai (2012b: 157–99) contrasts the Western conceptions of touch, which can be traced back to Aristotle, and Indian conceptions. For instance, the key distinction in Indian culture is between touch and contact (2012b: 164). According to Sarukkai, "Given that Indian philosophical views were reflected in social order in various ways, it will be useful to first of all interpret untouchability through categories specific to Indian cultural and philosophical traditions" (2012b: 167). The Guru/Sarukkai debate on untouchability is exemplary in many respects. It brings into the debate not only different existential experiences (differentiated by caste) but also different cultural and philosophical systems (Western and Indian). They also illustrate the superior cosmopolitanism of their positions when compared with those of the Western philosophers they discuss, mainly Derrida and Merleau-Ponty. While the latter confine themselves to the Western tradition as if it were universal, Guru and Sarukkai rightly provincialize the Western philosophers and widen our

views and deepen our understanding. They illustrate one of the basic claims of the epistemologies of the South: that understanding of the world far exceeds the Western understanding of the world.

The dominant, Christianized culture of the West has been more open to cultural differences regarding the other senses than to those surrounding touch.[21] In the course of the West's modern history, touch gradually lost relevance as a source of contact with the world and was protected, as it were, in the name of hygiene and comfort.[22] Very significantly, and powerfully reflecting tactile culture in the West, Thayer affirms, "Touch represents a continuation of our boundaries and separateness while permitting a union or connection with others that transcends physical limits. For this reason, of all the communication channels, touch is the most carefully guarded and monitored, the most infrequently used, yet the most powerful and immediate" (1982: 298).[23]

Smell and taste, as well as touch, are senses for which sense equivalences are more problematical, and the respect for intimacy and the integrity of bodies is more demanding.[24] Perhaps for this reason, the epistemologies of the North have been particularly reluctant to ascribe epistemic value to these three senses, considering them rather as merely physical or chemical devices to support different forms of sociability. Such neglect serves the extractivist interests of modern science well. The sensorial experiences of the dominated social groups are socially constructed and pronounced nonrelevant so as to degrade subaltern bodies, thus justifying subalternization. In this case, capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy use sensorial ideologies that ascribe inferior senses to the classes, races, and genders considered inferior. Bodies defined as unequal and different are bodies having strange smells and tastes; less equivocally, they are bodies that smell badly or stink and whose tastes (whether for food or otherwise) are deemed savage, inconvenient, or unhealthy. They are presented as degraded, distant bodies that, as objects of sociability, may be appropriated and violated; as subjects of sociability, they must be kept at a distance and, whenever possible, remain untouched.[25]

The challenges of deep smelling, tasting, and touching are enormous since, for the epistemologies of the South, knowing-with entails feeling-with. The distinction made above between outsider and insider is decisive in this domain. The insider researcher has no difficulty in feeling-with, which does not mean that the sensorial equivalences automatically render knowing-with easier. What seems easy may be extremely treacherous. As I have been arguing, sharing a group's struggles does not dispense with corazonar. Sharing feelings is not possible without somehow sharing sense experiences: smelling, eating, and touching what the group smells, eats, or touches. But this does not at all mean having the

same sense experiences and responding to stimuli in the same way. Feeling-with merely requires that differences not be stigmatized or converted into ethnographic curiosities. The mismatches of equivalences (for me, it smells or tastes nice; for you, it smells or tastes badly) are less important than the complicity with the struggle against domination. On the other hand, however, this complicity may be enhanced by the discovery of surprising equivalences, similarities of tastes, shared pleasure in tasting food and drink. Corazonar is strengthened by sensorial communion, whether it concerns dancing and singing or sharing meals. The investment of the body is particularly deep in this regard and subverts any idea of distinguishing between what is or is not relevant to the research.[26]

To be sure, difficulties cannot be minimized. An almost dilemmatic issue must be faced: how can it be expected that subaltern bodies—whose sensitivity is subjected to a naturalization process that limits them—liberate their senses, granted that no knowledge is liberating without the liberation of the senses? Subaltern bodies are bodies whose sensorial experiences are heavily conditioned by factors they do not control. In order to be effective, postabyssal research must invert the relation between the logic of discovery and the logic of sharing: it must begin by rendering credible the existence of limitations of sensitivity before credibly revealing the factors causing such limitations. In the absence of the uneasiness resulting from sensorial experiences whose lack is deemed serious and unfairly caused, no kind of domination can be challenged.

The intercultural, sensorial pedagogy that the postabyssal researcher must undergo has several aspects. The first consists of keeping always in mind that the basic premises of the epistemologies of the South are ingrained in concrete bodies. One such premise—the infinite variety of the experiences of the world—is particularly relevant in this context. Such infinite diversity, however, is contradictorily located in finite bodies. The ways in which bodies live their sensorial experiences are always one possible version alone, even though, for the bodies themselves, that particular version seems to present itself as the only possible one. This is so because the continued reproduction of power inequalities and cultural differences naturalizes sensitivity (as well as insensitivity). The more unequal the relations of power and the more rigid the cultural differences, the more limited the sensorial experience of subaltern bodies is. This limitation is one of the most effective weapons of the dominant powers. The truth is that without feeling in a different way, it is not possible to know and act in a different way. The postabyssal researcher must learn how to imagine the sensorial potentialities repressed by the naturalization of the sensitivity in force, both her own and that of the group with which she is shar-

ing her research. Imagining the sensorial potentialities constitutes, in itself, an act of rebellion against unequal powers and unequally different cultures. Such rebellion, once shared by the group, is the first step toward denaturalizing confined or thwarted sensitivities.

Intercultural, sensorial pedagogy requires that the postabyssal researcher defamiliarize herself with what is familiar and be willing to familiarize herself with what is strange to her. She needs to build an internal ecology of sensorial experiences capable of providing enough flexibility to tend to the different encounters generated by the research (and sometimes the struggle as well). Copresence and corazonar may require that, in moments of danger, wounded or offended bodies be taken care of and that, in moments of feast, joyful bodies indulge in eating, drinking, singing, and dancing.

This page intentionally left blank

9

DEMONUMENTALIZING WRITTEN AND ARCHIVAL KNOWLEDGE

In chapter 3, I mentioned that the epistemologies of the North favor written knowledge, be it in science, the humanities, or literature. Besides conferring fixity or stability and permanence to knowledge, writing easily distinguishes knowledge from other social practices; without this distinction, it would not be possible to stabilize the conditions and criteria of accuracy, excellence, innovation, and creativity in modern thinking. The autonomy of written knowledge is the result rather than the cause of the conditions and criteria it creates. In the following, I refer to science alone, but much of what I say about science could be said, with some adjustments, about other erudite or learned knowledges, that is to say, knowledges socially acknowledged as being distinct from other social practices, as well as autonomous due to conditions and criteria that they have produced by themselves.

As to science, autonomy—combined with exclusivity of rigor or accuracy and instrumental, rational effectiveness—grants science a monumental character, a grandiosity establishing distance, a perenniality permitting remembrance, a narrative architecture evoking heroism. Science is a sui generis monument. Like any other monument, it has an inside and an outside. The outside is the social being of science, the way science presents itself in the public sphere; the inside refers to the actual work involved in doing science. The messy inside of science totally gainsays its monumental outside, but that does

not affect in the least the credibility of the monument. Doing science and being science are two incommensurate realities united by a belief, a faith in science regardless of what it does and how it is done.[1]

From the point of view of the epistemologies of the South, abyssal science is a monumental science. Its eventual inclusion in the ecologies of knowledges requires a demonumentalizing intervention. This intervention has several components. One of them was already analyzed in chapter 1: it consists in submitting science to a twofold criterion of trust through which the relative autonomy of science is confronted with the pragmatic task of strengthening the struggles against domination. The remaining components are oralization, personalization, and argumentative logic.

The oralization of written knowledge. Scientific knowledge abhors oralization; it accepts it only in a very limited way and in highly controlled contexts. The classroom, the lab, and conferences are some such contexts, the written text being always there to control the inexactness of oral interactions. On the contrary, the contexts in which the ecologies of knowledges occur tend to be barely controlled; to the extent that they are controlled at all, the priorities in question are very different from those underlying scientific contexts. By the same token, they are contexts in which orality prevails, if for no other reason than because all the intervening knowledges other than science are oral knowledges. Furthermore, they are contexts in which debates about knowledges do not target the knowledges themselves but rather seek to understand how knowledges can contribute to enhancing resistance and strengthening struggles. This is why oralization does not affect knowledge alone; it also affects the person of the scientist, both as a scientist and as a citizen. There is no oralization of knowledge without a certain personalization of knowledge. The notion of an activist-intellectual, which I have been defining as a rearguard intellectual, is crucial in this context, because it alone assures the coherence and conviction needed for the transposition or translation of scientific knowledge into cognitive contexts not controlled by the scientist. Without the personal involvement of the scientist as a scientist, scientific knowledge may well fall short of its potential contribution to the ecologies of knowledges.

Away from the written text or in a context not dominated by writing, scientific knowledge remains fragile and not convincing at all. If the rearguard intellectual does not take into account the nature of the argumentative community that accomplishes the ecologies of knowledges, she may end up self-boycotting her voluntarism and the possible utility of scientific knowledge. The inutility or inadequacy of scientific knowledge often results from the scientist's arrogance

and hermeticism. In other words, once confined to its comfort zone—the scientific community—scientific knowledge resorts to its own argumentative rhetoric, a rhetoric that is totally ineffective when knowledge is invoked outside its comfort zone, for instance, in contexts of social struggle.[2] The contexts in which the ecologies of knowledges occur create epistemic-political communities demanding other kinds of rhetorical argumentation: instead of technical language, vernacular language; instead of monological narrative, dialogical narrative; instead of explanation, translation; instead of methodological accuracy, intelligible results; instead of contributing to science, contributing to society; a balance between new replies and new questions; neither certainties nor immoderate doubts.

Demonumentalizing monumental knowledges is a precondition for opening argumentative spaces where other ways of knowing may be able to show their possible contribution to a more diverse and profound understanding of the world and a more efficient and widely shared progressive social transformation.[3] In recent years, I have been engaged in some research projects guided by the epistemological and methodological orientations proposed in this book. Drawing on my research experience, I present in what follows two processes for demonumentalizing knowledge: Conversations of the World and Voices of the World. A third process, the workshops of the Popular University of Social Movements, is presented in chapter 12.

Conversations of the World

The project called Alice—Strange Mirrors, Unsuspected Lessons has been experimenting with some methodological innovations aimed at fostering dialogue and exploring further articulations between different kinds of knowledge.[4] These innovative methodologies aim at trying out the possibilities for the cocreation of knowledge in demonumentalized cognitive contexts. Two of them imply demonumentalizing knowledges authored by superauthors, of which I have chosen two types: noted intellectuals and noted activists. In the case of intellectuals, monumentality is also inherent to written knowledge. Both of these innovative methodologies emphasize orality. They are Conversations of the World, addressed in the following section, and the workshops of the Popular University of Social Movements, which, as I mentioned above, are dealt with in chapter 12.

Conversations of the World consists of in-depth dialogues between myself and either distinguished intellectuals in whose theoretical work I identify a strong presence of the epistemologies of the South or with activists renowned

for their struggles against capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy. Regarding the conversations with intellectuals, the most important upshot concerns the comparison between the theories and ideas they have proposed in their books and the way in which they formulate them orally, particularly when engaged in a dialogue.[5] Written ideas are transfigured in remarkable ways when exposed orally and in dialogue. In general, through oralization, knowledge becomes more uncertain, incomplete, and less differentiated from other knowledges. Here, I only deal with dialogues in which the author renders an oral version of his or her written knowledge. Of course, we can imagine other situations in which the written ideas of an author are put forth orally by a third party, as is typical in the classroom. There are many ways to engage in the oral transfiguration of a written text.

The inversion of the logic of discovery and the logic of justification. At the beginning, the conversation tends to focus on the context and logic of justification and only gradually moves from the logic/context of enunciation to the logic/context of discovery, that is to say, to the real processes and motives (often nonscientific, affective, intuitive motives) that gave rise to the first formulation of a given scientific or intellectual development.[6] When said movement occurs, written knowledge loses much of its linearity and impeccable rationality. It lets itself be described according to factors, incidents, or even anecdotes that would have discredited the text were they to be included in its written version: for example, the contexts in which the writing took place, motifs having nothing to do with dry scientific curiosity, influences that often were silenced in the written text, hesitations, gestures of desistance and retrieval, quite disparate formulations, and analytical intentions other than the ones that were later attributed to the project. All this gives the ideas a human quality and a liveliness that are totally absent from the written text.

From the arrow to the crab and the frog. By means of orality and dialogue, written knowledge loses linearity, that is, the trajectory and direction proper to the arrow, and adopts, at different moments of its creation, two animal-like movements. On the one hand is the crab movement, when the process of building knowledge advances slowly and awkwardly, zigzagging toward a final target. On the other is the frog movement, when knowledge advances by sudden leaps. In both cases, the movement is devoid of any aura of autonomy, since it occurs without reference to any methodological protocol. Through oralization it becomes evident that all knowledge created by humans, including scientific knowledge, is ultimately amethodical.

Lack of rigor. During the process of oralization, written knowledge changes by setting aside the rhetorical logic and technique proper to writing and by opening up, albeit with difficulty, to a natural rhetorical logic that must take common sense into account.[7] I am referring to the rhetoric of pragmatic relevance, that is, taking into consideration the benefits derived from the results and, therefore, implying an evaluation of the social, political, and economic context in which the scientist or philosopher has no other competence but that of an ordinary citizen. In this process of oralization, particularly if occurring in dialogue, the distinction between what is relevant and what is not, which is crucial in written knowledge, virtually disappears. The written knowledge turns into a story that could be told by a nonscientist.

In this process, theoretical or scientific knowledge gains a powerful ability to persuade, even as it loses rigor according to methodological protocols. To be sure, one may suspect that, as scientific knowledge gets demonumentalized via its loss of rigor, it may, in turn, be remonumentalized by the additional persuasiveness it gains. I venture to think that this is not very probable; persuasion occurs in a dialogical context, and you don't dialogue with monuments—as becomes clear in the following.

Familiarity and proximity. I stated above that the monumentality of science resides in the belief in what science is rather than in what it does and how it does what it does. Of course, the scientist can enhance monumentality by presenting himself or herself, in nonscientific contexts, as an icon or even an idol of the monumentality of science. However, the intellectuals whose work is guided by the epistemologies of the South and, above all, the scientists who agree to participate in ecologies of knowledge are sharp critics of the monumentality of science; thus, dialogues such as I am describing here become active scourges of icons and idols. By highlighting the ways in which science is made and critical knowledge is created, the scientist or philosopher proves to be a human being like any other, thus becoming a mediator or translator who brings science or philosophy closer to ordinary citizens like himself or herself. As a consequence, written knowledge becomes more familiar and closer to the life experiences of people and social groups.

Space-time and the corporeality of knowledge. As easily concluded by viewing Conversations, the contexts and environments in which the dialogues evolve clearly show that what circulates in the conversation is far more than what is said. The time-spaces surrounding us, of which there is no mention, affect the dialogue as well. Their silent presence is all the more powerful as it assumes

the form of a transcendent icon watching us, welcoming us, protecting us. Just a few examples: The conversation with D. L. Sheth takes place in Ahmedabad, by the river Sabarmati, not far from Gandhi's ashram. The conversation with Mogobe Ramose takes place in Pretoria, in Freedom Park, an imposing monument celebrating the struggle against apartheid and the new South Africa. The conversation with Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui takes place in Valle de las Animas, at 3,900 meters of altitude; behind us rises Illimani, the sacred mountain of the indigenous peoples of the Andes. The powerful symbolism of these places penetrates all that is said and not said, our bodies and gestures, the ideas and images that crop up for debate. It permeates the silences and rhythms of our dialogues, how we are willing to listen deeply. Even the interlocutors' mutual respect is underscored by their own respect for the places and memories surrounding them. Intellectual interactions mix with affectivities; there emerges a corazonar that urges the interlocutors to go deeper and build more mutual trust. The emerging knowledge is somehow quite local, however universal the topics discussed. It is a deeply situated knowledge that cannot be fully understood by someone just reading the transcript of the dialogue. It is, in a word, a sui generis ecology of knowledges because it starts out as an ecology involving erudite knowledges and ends up as an ecology of knowledges that have left erudition behind without knowing what they have concretely gained in the process. Nonetheless, existentially, such knowledges constitute a full experience, not a mere cognitive experience but a human experience as well, not only an individual but also a collective experience, an experience not simply surrounded but permeated by nature as well, and not just immanent but transcendent as well, not merely accomplished in the present present but also in the present as memory and the present as utopia.

It is doubtful that such knowledge could be transmitted outside the contexts in which it was generated without being more or less severely impoverished, a circumstance totally in accord with the epistemologies of the South. Knowledges having vitality enough to strengthen the social struggles must arise from intense and complex contexts, such contexts as permit corazonar to invent reasons unknown to cold reason to mobilize into sharing struggles and risks.

Coknowledge. If the dialogue is successful, the circulation of knowledges is intense; at some point, circulation becomes interpenetration or even cooperative construction of new knowledge. I should point out that, as regards the Conversations of the World, since I am one of the interlocutors, my own written knowledge undergoes oralization, and so the transformations sustained by

my interlocutor's knowledge parallel those undergone by my own knowledge. Thus, without losing their identity, the knowledges in dialogue gain new elements emerging from cocreation.

Interrupting racialized disciplines. As the abyssal line traverses and constitutes Eurocentric modern thought, all modern disciplines are racialized: they were established on this side of the abyssal line as if the existence of the other side of the line were of no account or had no influence on them. Actually, the historical processes of the development of the various disciplines were quite distinct, with the result that the disturbing presence of the abyssal line was felt more profoundly in some of the disciplines. Among them, philosophy is probably the discipline that has been more successful in exorcising the ghostly presence of the abyssal line and, therefore, it is the most abyssal of disciplines.[8] In fact, its abyssal character has various dimensions. On the one hand, universal philosophy is considered to be Western philosophy with its origin in ancient Greece; Greece, in turn, from the nineteenth century onward has been conceived of as being only European, rather than Egyptian and Persian as well. On the other hand, the fact that the abyssal line is drawn by race and gender together may have something to do with the fact that philosophy tends to be a branch of knowledge practiced by white males. This is not the place to analyze how this conception of philosophy has been severely contested in recent times.[9] In the context of the Conversations of the World, I only wish to stress that acknowledging the increasing numbers of women philosophers or of Black or African or indigenous philosophers is not the same thing as acknowledging feminist, Black, African, or indigenous philosophies. Furthermore, even when such philosophies are acknowledged, they are usually lumped together as a homogeneous group with specific characteristics distinguishing them from the large discipline to which they belong. Thus, while the plurality of philosophical currents within the canonical, philosophical tradition is discussed ad nauseam, other philosophies are racialized or gendered, among other factors, because of the opacity created around their internal diversity.

In the Conversations of the World, I tried to interrupt the abyssal line of philosophy at two levels: the racial divide and the negation or invisibility of internal diversity. I greatly admire the work of the philosophers with whom I conversed; they are both Black and African and hold very divergent positions about what it means to philosophize and about the status of African philosophy: professors Valentin Mudimbe and Mogobe Ramose.[10]

Promoting Cognitive Authorships Otherwise

The Case of Odera Oruka's Philosophical Sages

Demonumentalizing erudite knowledge may result from a process through which an author of erudite knowledge actively promotes the emergence of authors of other types of knowledge with alternative representations of the world. Explicitly or implicitly, the erudite author in question may do this with the purpose of demonumentalizing his or her own knowledge. Perhaps the best-known case is that of Oruka, the already-mentioned Kenyan philosopher who, unhappy with the Eurocentric notion that philosophy is a quintessentially erudite and written knowledge, engaged in a project he termed sagacity or sage philosophy to make known the philosophy of the wise men or sages of his country, some of them illiterate. Later, Oruka's project had followers in other contexts and regions of the world.[11] Oruka's initiative has many innovative facets. For my purposes here, the most important one concerns stressing the dialectics of monumentalization and demonumentalization. By putting the sage peasants of his country at the same epistemological level as himself, a philosopher credentialed by the Western, hegemonic, philosophical tradition, Oruka demonumentalizes this tradition, as well as his own learned knowledge. It may, however, be argued that, by so doing, the Western-trained philosopher ends up monumentalizing sagacity. This argument gains force given the distinction he makes between the philosophical sage and the folk sage, that is to say, between the sage that reflects critically and creatively upon ancestral African knowledge and the sage that does not. Only the philosophical sage holds before the tradition the attitude expected of a philosopher, be he a professional philosopher or not.

On further reflection, one might say that Oruka demonumentalizes philosophy as a whole by showing not only the diversity of philosophical theories but also the diversity of philosophical authorships and processes of creativity and authorial legitimation. Oruka's initiative also helps us to refine the concept of methodological extractivism I have put forward as a crucial feature of modern abyssal science. The sages are authors, even superauthors, in the sense I ascribe to the term in chapter 3, but they are authors in their communities in which the authority of their knowledge is recognized by all. They are not, nor do they claim to be, authors beyond such a context. In order to become so, which is after all Oruka's ultimate objective, Oruka has to extract from them a second and different kind of authorship. He has to interview them and coax them into formulating their ideas in the best possible way by confronting them with issues and situations bearing witness to the reflective, critical, and creative na-

ture of their thinking. With this goal in mind, Oruka assumes a methodological stance very similar to that of the extractivist, abyssal researcher.[12] He has to be selective, unidirectional, and guided by an objective that is his own, and not that of his interviewee. Such a similarity is, however, quite misleading.

Whereas the abyssal researcher wants to extract information to build his own knowledge upon it, Oruka wants to extract knowledge (not at all information) in order to create authorship otherwise; he wants to question himself as a credentialed author of erudite knowledge by convening a group of peers as far as knowledge goes, except that their credentials have a totally different type and origin. Oruka accomplishes a first-rate cognitive revolution, as important as that of Paulo Freire (1970) in the field of education with his *Pedagogia do oprimido* and *Pedagogia da libertação* (Shor and Freire 1987). Both Oruka and Freire aim to expand the Conversation of the World by multiplying the empowering representations of the world authored by excluded, dominated, or subaltern social groups. Oruka is, therefore, at the antipodes of abyssal extractivism. The second authorship he searches for in the philosopher sages ends up being a coauthorship involving the sages and Oruka himself.

Voices of the World

There are many other ways of promoting cognitive authorship. One such instance took place in the course of another project I conducted from 1999 to 2001, funded by the MacArthur Foundation and Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian. The project, Reinventing Social Emancipation, involved sixty-nine social scientists from six countries—South Africa, Brazil, Colombia, India, Mozambique, and Portugal.[13] Since many of the topics under analysis concerned social struggles and the social movements engaged in them, I proposed that some of the leaders of the social movements with whom the researchers had strong trust relationships be interviewed by them, an unconventional interview, in violation of the methodological recipes of abyssal social sciences. The interviews could last a whole day or longer; they were to focus on the topics that had been the object of analysis in the case studies, but also any other topic considered relevant by the interviewee or interviewer. The aim was not to gather additional information, but rather different knowledges, evaluations, and perspectives. The interviews were later published in a book titled *Voices of the World*, a brief biographical note written by the interviewer opening each interview (see Santos 2010c).

It was thus possible to hear the voices of social and political activists from two countries in Africa (Mozambique and South Africa), two countries in Asia

(China and India), two countries in Latin America (Brazil and Colombia), and one country in Europe (Portugal).[14] The voices were representative only by their exemplarity, by the uniqueness of the struggles, life stories, and narratives they laid before us with unsurpassable transparency. Millions of other voices might have been chosen, all of them equally representative according to the criterion of exemplarity. These unheard voices constitute the ungraspable planetary silence through which the voices of the activists spoke and whose heavy presence they acknowledged.

Who is an activist? The choice of interviewees was, in principle, limited to the struggles and movements analyzed in the project. But, of course, this limitation allowed enormous leeway. In a first approach, one might say that the potential interviewees were the unknown Gandhi, Martin Luther King Jr., Nelson Mandela, Rosa Parks, Emiliano Zapata, Rigoberta Menchú, Subcomandante Marcos, Chico Mendes, and so on. But how were we to identify them if our objective was to analyze ongoing struggles and movements, in other words, before the activists had achieved public recognition? Let us bear in mind that very often activists are amply acknowledged only after death.

Alternatively, we could define the profile of the activists using the Gramscian concept of the organic intellectual or simply refer to thinker activists. This approach would not be correct either. Gramsci's organic intellectual implies a technical knowledge emerging within the working class that is geared to organize it and prepare it to organize and run society as a whole.[15] The designation would be correct regarding some (but not all) of the activists involved in workers' struggles, but certainly not those in the many other contexts of social struggle.

Broadly speaking, the criterion was to choose for our interviews either activists or the leaders of struggles, movements, initiatives, and progressive organizations that were engaged in resistance against oppression and fighting for a more just society and a better collective life; leaders or activists that had been successful in their struggles and had earned from them a practical experience and knowledge that they were willing to share with us. The levels of their formal education might vary; some might even be illiterate. It would only matter that they held a practical knowledge that, having emerged from very concrete experiences and struggles, included knowing how to draw from those struggles useful lessons for other activists engaged in struggles elsewhere.[16] As in the case of Oruka's philosophical sages, the criteria for promoting authors of knowledge otherwise were proposed from the outside. We were not before the kind of epistemic mingas analyzed in chapter 7.

The activists' knowledges. Reading *Voices of the World* and confronting the statements of the activists with the interviews that they had previously given to the researchers involved in the above-mentioned project, one is struck by the extractivist selectivity of the conventional social scientific methodologies guiding that research project. In the course of the research, citizens, men and women, authors of their own lives and ideas, with a wide range of knowledge, found themselves limited to answering questions and dealing with topics of interest only to the interviewers. From the texts of the activists, an analysis emerges often very similar to that of the sage-philosophers of Oruka—I mean a kind of analysis that is denser and has a finer and more diverse texture than the conventionally scientific ones. In *Voices*, the semantic-, linguistic-, and narrative-constraining conventions are absent. The Voices allow us to see what those conventions conceal.

Scientific knowledge is still present through the choice of concrete manifestations of nonscientific, artisanal knowledge, through the selection of questions that give structure to the individual's life story, and, above all, through the conversion or translation of an oral knowledge into a written narrative. Still, the epistemological status of social scientific knowledge is different here: rather than producing knowledge, scientific knowledge's role here is to facilitate the emergence and self-presentation of knowledges otherwise. We could conceive of *Voices of the World* as a set of illustrations of emancipatory common sense. In terms of the voices themselves, they were stories of chains of events caused or suffered by the storytellers and interpretations of the larger world that emerged from the storytellers' experiences in trying to transform the world into a better one. They were activists' knowledges as self-expressions of past, present, and future activism. They were both collective and extremely personal accounts. Because of their diversity, they were knowledges, in the plural, rather than diverse manifestations of a single form of knowledge.

Was Voices of the World *a postabyssal research project?* In retrospect, it can be said that it was a quasi-postabyssal research project. On the one hand, it fully recognizes the epistemological value of the activists' knowledge. On the other, that knowledge appears totally separate from the scientific knowledge produced about the struggles in which those activists took part. As I said, there was no epistemic minga. *Voices of the World* was published as a separate book, which means that the scientific analyses made in the ambit of the research project, by being published in other books, were protected or at least insulated from the voices of the world. Were the scientific texts protected in order to preserve their monumentality? Did monumentality end up being an impoverishment?

Moreover, by being published separately, did *Voices of the World* create its own monumentality?

How could the project have gone further toward postabyssal research? The strict separation between scientific knowledge and the knowledge of the activists prevented imagining the ecologies of knowledges; it was not possible then to assume clearly the task of passing from knowing-about to knowing-with; whenever researchers got involved in the struggles, it looked like a political option with no consequences at the epistemic level. At any rate, the characterization of the knowledges of the activists clearly reveals the emerging thrust of the epistemologies of the South:

1. These knowledges are knowledges that do not distinguish between theory and practice because they do not exist outside the social practices in which they occur. As a matter of fact, when we speak of these knowledges we necessarily speak of the agents, individuals, and social groups that hold and produce them.
2. They are not written or recorded but expressed through what they make happen in the world and their interpretations of it.
3. They do not distinguish between the true, the good, or the just because they are obtained in the truthful processes of the struggle for a more just society and a better life. But, on the other hand, they are not interested in abstract ideas of justice or a good life, which in fact they do not even consider intelligible. Nor, for that matter, is the idea of social emancipation necessarily intelligible to them. They are concrete knowledges born of concrete struggles for survival, for a decent life, for dignity, for equality, for the right to difference, in a word, for the aspiration to a better life. What they have in common is conceiving of reality as a social task. They do not reduce reality to what exists because what does not exist and ought to exist is truly their reason for being as knowledges.
4. They refuse to be defined by logical propositions. They prefer formulas, proverbs, stories, myths, gestures, silences. They become more precise by means of examples, illustrations, cases. They are capable of reasoning about the world, life, the future, god; however, they do it always as if they were narrating concrete cases of worlds, lives, futures, gods.
5. They consider themselves neither traditional nor modern, neither secular nor religious, neither specialized nor nonspecialized. They are pragmatic. They resort to everything, including modern science, to

the extent that it is useful for the objectives of the practices in which they occur. They are nonetheless most unequivocal and clairvoyant in their definitions of the enemies, forces, evils, and powers against which they fight.

6. They do not own the truth, but they do feel that they are at the service of practical truths in concrete contexts and situations. These truths are truths about knowing and doing; they are political in the sense that they exist only because they are adequate to the objectives to be reached; and they are ethical because they distinguish unambiguously between concrete goodness and concrete evil.
7. They are not methodical knowledges, in the sense of establishing in the abstract a single path that leads from ignorance to knowledge. Their criteria of relevance and pertinence are vague, and for that reason they are willing to make connections between realities or conditions that science keeps separate. Their gestation and emergence are always enigmatic to those facing them from the outside. They are collective but are voiced by individual spokespersons who are recognizable by the way in which they formulate these knowledges, above all before strangers.
8. They are probable and antitotalitarian knowledges, which do not assert themselves by way of demonstration but rather by practical confirmation and persuasive argumentation. They are rhetorical knowledges that express themselves in common language and whose arguments are validated inside the community, organization, or movement involved in specific social struggles.

The Archive of the Future as *Nunca Más*

The dominant archive is the modern abyssal way of producing knowledge under the guise of storing it. It is an active epistemic intervention that presents itself as a passive and neutral restatement. The disguise implies a twofold power: the power to produce or select the kind of knowledge that is worthy of being stored, and the power of pretending that there is no selection at all, and that, therefore, the act of selecting and the mode of storing, in themselves do not amount to new knowledge. Rather than appear as an exercise of power, storing is justified as compliance with a cultural duty. In a remarkable study on how the British Museum created ancient Egypt, Stephanie Moser affirms, "The question of how meaning is produced in exhibitions has centered on demonstrating how certain arrangements or styles of presenting objects have

constructed a particular view of a subject. This not only requires an investigation of what kinds of objects are present or absent in a display but demands a more comprehensive investigation of the representational system that has been created for the depiction of a subject. . . . The arrangement of material culture creates a 'mental picture' that functions as an interpretive framework for understanding a particular theme, cultural group, or historical episode" (2006: 2; see also Hooper-Greenhill 1992, 2000; Macdonald 1998; Macdonald and Fyfe 1996).

The modern archive is the official cartographer of the abyssal line. The other side of the line—colonial societies and sociabilities—is registered in the archive through a double negation: first, by negating the colonial criterion that erased as absences, irrelevancies, and invisibilities everything that might denounce the abyssal character of the metropolitan society and sociability; second, by negating the colonial domination that made possible the extraction of what is registered. Whatever the mode of selection, what is not selected by the archive is nonetheless constitutive of what is selected. What is not selected is not just knowledges but also times, rhythms, chronologies, sequences, narratives, spaces, foundational myths, stresses, memories, identities, and representations. The other face of the archive is modern epistemicide and all its historical repercussions. Commenting on the magnificent Gold Museum of Bogotá, Michael Taussig notes, "But one story is missing. The museum is silent as to the fact that for more than three centuries of Spanish occupation what the colony stood for and depended upon was the labor of slaves from Africa in the gold mines. Indeed this gold, along with silver from Mexico and Peru, was what primed the pump of capitalist takeoff in Europe, its *primitive accumulation*" (2004: x).

For the epistemologies of the South, the abyssal archive is an epistemic artifact. Accordingly, it must be subjected to an epistemological and methodological interruption. Such an interruption includes several moments or dimensions corresponding to the specificities of the archive. I select four such specificities: settled accounts, monumentality, docility, and ambiguity. Viewed historically, these features do not exist without their opposite. It is the archive's mission to conceal such a contradiction here and now.

Settled accounts. The archive bespeaks the present under the guise of a concluded past. What is past is past, nothing to be done about it; it may be questioned but there is no going back. The archive can be visited and utilized, but it is untouchable. It is unchangeable, though it may be added on to. What goes

into the archive can never leave it, even if it is never presented to the public. There is no live archive without a dead archive. The archive ratifies the present, however problematical, and dramatizes the irreversibility of time. As the apex of history, the archive is in itself antihistorical. A finished story is a historical fact, but it is not history.

As I have intimated, however, from a historical perspective accounts are never definitively settled. They may be so at the present moment, and that is the moment that the archive turns into the final moment. Ann Stoler shows very eloquently the "epistemic anxieties" of the Dutch colonial archive as time went by: "As such, the documents in these colonial archives were not dead matter once the moment of their making had passed. What was 'left' was not 'left behind' or obsolete. In the Netherlands Indies, these colonial archives were an arsenal of sorts that were reactivated to suit new governing strategies. Documents honed in the pursuit of prior issues could be requisitioned to write new histories, could be reclassified for new initiatives, could be renewed to fortify security measures against what were perceived as new assaults on imperial sovereignty and its moralizing claims" (2009: 3).

Monumentality. The archive has a twofold monumentality: the objects or documents it stores and the space in which it stores them. They reinforce each other. The architecture of the archive underscores the weight and historical value of what is being stored and preserved. Like written, erudite knowledge, the archived material has its own rigor meticulously preserved by the archival and museological rules. In this case as well, the vicissitudes undergone by the archive in the course of history show the fragility of monumentality, the chaos behind the orderly façades, the controversy generated in moments of political change, which may even, in certain situations, bring about the destruction of the archive.

Docility. Paradoxically, however, the archive, whose monumentality arouses distance and aggressivity, is also close, harmless, affable, and available. Monumentality often unfolds in miniature, the transcendent at a stone's throw, as it were, when the eye captures the piece in the museum or the hand touches the document. Just like the botanical gardens, the other great invention of imperial Western modernity, the archive exposes itself by exposing, shows itself by showing. The archive keeps its secrets so well that it doesn't seem to have any. From a historical viewpoint, the archive's docility is treacherous since, at any moment, the archive's selectivity denies itself insofar as it just reflects what

is available. Whether for reasons of political or moral reservation, what is unavailable permits no contestation, or, simply, it is not contested because it is not known or is declared nonexistent.

Ambiguity. The archive is paradoxical in still another way; it cannot shed light without casting shadows or duplicating images. It cannot glorify the winner without displaying the defeated; it cannot present artifacts that do not self-present themselves. The archive discloses the complexity of classifications and the perplexity of recordings before new situations. In sum, the archive cannot make negated history and memory totally invisible. What is left of meaning is a loose, underdetermined meaning, carrying with it the seeds of contestation and contradiction. As time goes by, the archive resorts to different techniques to eliminate ambiguity. Recently, one of the favorite techniques consists in providing authorized versions of the negated memories and histories as if they were the only ones available in the archive after supposedly exhaustive excavation.

Bearing in mind these features, we may conclude that the abyssal archive, as the official cartographer of the abyssal line, is a very vulnerable cartographer indeed. But such vulnerability is only evident when the archive is confronted with a hostile epistemic intervention, an intervention that pits a counterarchive against the archive. The epistemologies of the South propose two interruptions of the abyssal archive: the palimpsest archive, geared toward the sociology of absences, and the insurgent archive, geared toward the sociology of emergences. They both aim to create plural criteria of authority so that a nonauthorized archive is not an archive without authority.

The palimpsest archive. This archive is the result of an intervention in the currently existing abyssal archive, which consists of scraping the surface of what the archive shows in order to identify the marks, traces, shadows, and silences of what was destroyed or produced as absent, invisible, and irrelevant in the process of building the archiveable world. By means of this intervention, the archive becomes a sui generis parchment that was reutilized before being utilized at all. That is to say, it suffered many rival inscriptions before one of them overpowered the others by defining itself as the only one worthy of being archived. Thus, the archive had many lives before becoming the archive we know today. By interpellating the abyssal archive, the epistemologies of the South force it to return to the history it once left triumphantly, and to watch the film of its own genesis, a film it did not authorize. The archive of history becomes the history of the archive.

The palimpsest archive is a postabyssal archive that proceeds through the counterhegemonic appropriation of a hegemonic form. It resorts frequently to the ambiguity of the archive, that is to say, to how the abyssal archive cannot help revealing what it aims to hide so efficiently. Iain Chambers has written some of the most luminous pages on the process I here designate as palimpsest archive; he specifically focuses on how migrations and immigrants destabilize the archive. According to Chambers (2012: 15), migrations are not a history of Western modernity; they are the history of modernity.[17] Taking off from Foucault, Chambers conceives of the postcolonial archive, as yet unfulfilled, as a heterotopy, an other-place, here and now, an archive facing the very processes of exclusion, erasure, silencing, and forgetfulness that were needed to make the archive what it is. The archive must be subjected to nonauthorized questions so that the historicity of objects without history may emerge. "The coordinates of time, place and belonging once removed from seemingly taken-for-granted and common-sensical understandings inevitably introduce us to their social production and historical fabrication. . . . Interrupting the artificial continuity that guarantees a historical narrative implies cutting up and re-assembling the past according to another rhythm and another series of accents. . . . The still to be realized postcolonial museum that evokes another, untapped economy of sense, promotes a sharp reassessment of the subject-object divide that maintains the complex and seemingly neutral power relationship over a non-European and apparently non-modern world" (Chambers 2012: 20–23; see also Chambers, Grechi, and Nash 2014; Chambers et al. 2014). Lidia Curti, too, focusing on the language of archival practices, conceives of the museum "as space-theatre or event-encounter, and its interaction with pasts, presents and futures, genres and genders, black and white, in a movement between becoming and immobility. The changes produced by the 'irruption' of the other, producing an interruption of the archive, and the movement from colonized object to postcolonial subject in museological and exhibitionary systems—where prestige resides precisely in representations of alterity—becomes the basis for a discourse still to be realized" (2012: 187).

The palimpsest archive is the counterarchive to be built on the basis of the existing abyssal archive, submitting it to a nonauthorized questioning and intentionality, a curious perspective that destabilizes it. The curious perspective, very fashionable in the seventeenth century, consists of the use of devices that manipulate the linear perspective with a view to obtaining astonishing visual effects.[18] In the case of the palimpsest archive, the curious perspective has nothing to do with ludic effects; the goal is rather to demonumentalize the archive by forcing it to acknowledge its abyssal nature.

The insurgent archive. While the palimpsest archive keeps the archive form or the museum form while giving it a counterhegemonic meaning, the insurgent archive breaks with the archive form by scattering it through a multiplicity of sites and kinds of practices that aim to archive, even if in an ephemeral form, a nonofficial and nonauthorized present, a dense present whose strength comes from claiming a suppressed past. I am talking about an archive scattered through streets and walls, performances, videos, books, and exhibits. It involves many artistic manifestations, all of them nonauthorized aesthetic interventions that, for this reason, assume the form of counteraesthetics—murals, graffiti, break dancing, DJing, hip-hop, and rap, as well as all the epistemic mingas I mentioned above.[19] So, from the point of view of the epistemologies of the South, art has a doubly counterhegemonic existence, as an aesthetic manifestation and as an archival exercise. Art interrupts both the aesthetic and the archival conventions at one and the same time. This is why the insurgent archive has more potential to carry out the sociology of emergences, that is to say, to allow the denied representations, memories, and experiences to assume their own forms of expression. The not-yet of what is latent takes on a prefigurative character as it inscribes itself in the present as a promise of a different future, the future here and now. In a metaphorical sense, Taussig's book *My Cocaine Museum* may be viewed as an insurgent archive: "I find them [museums] dead and even hostile places, created for a bored bourgeoisie bereft of life and experience. What I am interested in is the life of gold and the life of cocaine where one is dying and the other taking off . . . to combine a history of things with a history of people forced by slavery to find their way through these things . . . so that along with the ghosts of slavery haunting the museums, nature itself is released along with the rush of the time-compacted magic of gold and cocaine" (2004: xix).

Both the palimpsest archive and the insurgent archive are postabyssal archives, two ways of destabilizing the abyssal archive or museum. The emphasis on one or the other depends on the context. It behooves the social groups resisting domination to assess, in each context, the best counterhegemonic archival strategy to be adopted. Different groups may prefer different strategies. But it should always be borne in mind that the refusal of a given regimen of representation may at times involve the refusal of any representation at all. The sociology of absences aims to denounce the absences, invisibilities, and silencings that were imposed as exercises of domination. There is no place for the sociology of absences when oppressed groups assume absence itself as a form of struggle, as their right to invisibility and silence. In such cases, absence is, in itself, postabyssal. An autonomous absence is an under-protest presence.

One of the most consistent movements toward articulating the palimpsest archive and the insurgent archive is social museology or sociomuseology, which is an international movement with a strong presence in Brazil.[20] The movement has assumed many names, such as popular museology, active museology, ecomuseology, communitarian museology, critical museology, dialogic museology, liberation museology. As the designations indicate, it is a very diversified movement and many of its strands end up reproducing, in one way or another, the abyssal line and the epistemologies of the North. Here, though, I am referring to a clearly counterhegemonic current that has been very strong in Brazil and is eloquently formulated by Mário Chagas and Inês Gouveia in the following terms:

> When we speak of the social museum and social museology we are alluding to ethical commitments, particularly as regards their scientific, political, and poetical dimensions; we are radically asserting the difference between a museology having conservative, bourgeois, neoliberal and liberal anchors, and a museology of libertarian perspectives; we are acknowledging that, for a very long time, at least since the first half of the nineteenth century until the first half of the twentieth, what prevailed in the western world was a practice of memory, heritage, and the museum totally committed to defending the values of aristocracies, oligarchies, and the dominant and dominating classes and religions. . . . Social museology, in the perspective here presented, is rather committed to reducing social injustice and inequality; fighting prejudice; improving the quality of collective life; strengthening social cohesion and dignity; using the power of memory, heritage, and the museum on behalf of the popular communities, the indigenous peoples and the quilombolas, and on behalf as well of the social movements, including the LGBT, the MST (Landless), and other movements. (2014: 17)

Thus considered, social museology is an exercise of the sociology of absences and the sociology of emergences aiming to build the postabyssal archive and museum in consonance with the epistemologies of the South. It is concerned with the memory of those who cannot forget the unjust suffering caused by capitalist, colonialist, and patriarchal domination and who invoke such remembrance as part of their struggle against those who refuse to remember. It is, therefore, a memory geared to the future. Actually, both the palimpsest archive and the insurgent archive are ultimately archives of the future.

By rejecting the idea of settled accounts, both the palimpsest archive and the insurgent archive state the possibility of a future asserting itself as a

radical interruption of a past of unjust exclusion, oppression, and suffering. Their rhetorical topos is "Nunca Más." "Nunca Más" [Never again] is the title of the report, published in 1984 by the Argentinian National Commission on the Disappearance of Persons, about the crimes committed by the military dictatorship (CONADEP 1984). According to some, the phrase was inspired by Jewish slogans in the Warsaw Ghetto during their famous revolt of 1943. Since 1984, "Nunca Más" has been used in multiple manifestations of social protest against capitalist, colonialist, and patriarchal domination.

The Maré Museum: An Instance of Insurgent Museology

I used to live in the stilts. Now I live in Pinheiro. I am 31. I have been shot at. I have suffered physical and mental aggressions. This visit makes you realize the development of a people that had no chance. A people that fights. A people that suffers and no doubt goes on winning every day. I say this as a winner who has to go on working hard to continue the fight!—MARCOS ANTÔNIO A. SANTOS, testimony in the guestbook of the Maré Museum, June 5, 2006

The *favela* (squatter settlement) of Maré was built in the Guanabara Bay area of Rio de Janeiro in the 1940s. It constitutes today the Maré Complex, the name given to the set of sixteen communities that developed around the main core.[21] More than 130,000 people live there in an area of 800,000 square meters. The Maré Museum was opened to the public in 2006. It was inaugurated by the then minister of culture of president Lula da Silva's government, the great popular composer and singer Gilberto Gil, who became famous for his energetic drive to recognize and promote the cultural initiatives of local communities.

The origins of the museum date back to 1997, when the Maré's Center of Studies and Solidary Actions (CEASM) was established. This organization was put together by residents and former residents who managed to gain access to college and follow an academic career. This made it possible for Rede Memória da Maré (Memory Network of Maré), which was subsequently created, to establish a partnership with the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro. Under this partnership, workshops on social museology as well as temporary exhibits were put together, not to mention the creation of the Dona Orosina Archive in 2001 and the Maré Museum itself in 2006.[22]

The successful founding of the museum relied on several convergent factors: local mobilization, duly recognized memory work already in place, training workshops for skills deemed important by the community, the creation of a managing group, the establishment of partnerships, recourse to in-

ternal and external support, and development of the project on the basis of established criteria. According to the founders of the museum, everything had been thought over and critically studied and examined. It was clear from the start that there would be no room for improvisation, even if poetics and creativity would be more than welcome.

The museum is structured according to a narrative based on twelve time periods, like the twelve hours on a clock or the twelve months in a year, including the Time of Water, Time of Home, Time of Immigration, Time of Work, Time of Resistance, Time of Festival, Time of Fair, Time of Everyday Life, Time of Faith, Time of Children, Time of Fear, and Time of Future. This structure, the organizers explain, was inspired by a leaflet published by CEASM in which the photograph of a favela family, accompanied by a written testimony, was published each month. The choice of twelve times (or topics) was also the result of debate and reflection. At present, the museum includes an archive, a library, and a technical materials space. There are also short- and long-term exhibition spaces. Various courses and workshops are offered. There are also artisan studios (Marias of Maré) and several theater, dance, music, capoeira, and storytelling projects.

Since its establishment, the museum has been awarded several prizes. It has been a great source of inspiration for similar initiatives. The Maré Museum is, indeed, a concrete example of how it is possible to put memory and patrimony at the service of social cohesion, dignity, and empowerment. Unfortunately, given the liabilities of property titles, the museum faces today a problem that is all too well known to favela inhabitants: the threat of eviction and displacement. The museum's management, however, supported by its community (residents, former residents, artists, intellectuals, teachers, students) is determined to resist and confront a powerful capitalist group that claims the property where the museum was built. Resistance is based on three kinds of interpellations to the civil society and political power. What good were the prizes and praises if not to guarantee the survival of the Maré Museum? What kind of commitment can be expected of public power (federal, state, and municipal) to support a popular museum that continues to inspire public cultural policies? How can we support an insurgent and counterhegemonic museum that makes all the difference in the museological scene of today's Brazil?

Maré Museum displays an impressive set of objects. Nonetheless, its major collections are the people and their knowings and doings. Maré Museum is actually a meeting place, a place of relationships, a place of struggle, resistance, and the celebration of life.

This page intentionally left blank

Part III

POSTABYSSAL PEDAGOGIES

This page intentionally left blank

10

GANDHI, AN ARCHIVIST OF THE FUTURE

On the Need for Intercultural and Interpolitical Translation

Intercultural translation has a central role to play in the epistemologies of the South, as I discuss in chapter 1. It is a crucial tool for reciprocal learning among the different oppressed social groups that, in different regions and at different times, resist and fight against the different forms of domination of which they are victims. Intercultural translation is always interpolitical translation. As such, it is nothing new. Throughout the ages, social groups fighting oppression and domination have always tried to find out as best they could about the fighting experiences of other social groups, either to avoid making the same mistakes or to find ideas about which paths are best to take. Eurocentric critical thinking has never valorized this work of mutual and permanent learning. Such learning processes occurred in contexts that were not considered contexts of intellectual production, where oral knowledges considered unintelligible and relating to unknown life experiences abounded and were shared by individuals and collectivities not certified to produce true knowledge. Moreover, and as I have been arguing, Eurocentric critical thinking has always assumed that it has the monopoly on objective and rigorous knowledge concerning social emancipation. Intercultural translation could not, therefore, but be viewed as a dangerous lack of rigor.

In the last decades, intercultural translation has gained a new visibility in light of globalization. What is usually called globalization is a very complex phenomenon, not only because it hides localization processes but also, and mainly, because it includes contradictory forms of globalization. In Santos (1995) I identify two kinds of globalization: hegemonic neoliberal globalization and counterhegemonic globalization—the globalization of the social movements fighting against neoliberalism, colonialism, and patriarchy. Concerning counterhegemonic globalization, the first meetings of the World Social Forum (WSF) that took place in Porto Alegre, Brazil, in 2001 turned out to be a potent and surprising demonstration of the new emerging articulations among different struggles and social movements; such new articulations were the result of the new opportunities for interknowledge and intercommunication. As such, they called for intercultural translation.[1]

Bearing in mind this chapter's analytical objectives, three observations are in order. The first one is that interknowledge among the different movements and organizations from different regions of the world has expanded considerably since 2001. Such interknowledge led to an intercontinental articulation of struggles among movements fighting against the common forms of domination. This is the case, for instance, with Via Campesina, which articulates peasant movements from seventy-three countries; with the World March of Women, which brings together feminist movements from the global North and South; and with several intercontinental coalitions of indigenous peoples that have gathered together movements from different continents. All these articulations have allowed the movements and organizations to define common agendas for political action, whether at the level of the countries in question or at the international level. These aggregates and articulations implied, in practice, much intercultural translation among the involved peoples, movements, and organizations, meaning that the ecology of knowledges served in large part to strengthen the struggles by means of more advanced cooperation and internationalization.

The less satisfactory side of this globalization process is that even today the articulations between movements and organizations involved in struggles against different kinds of domination have not been very successful. I mean, for example, articulations between workers', women's, and ecology movements; or between indigenous and peasant movements; or between urban, rural, and peace movements. From the point of view of the epistemologies of the South, such articulations are essential in order to successfully face the complexity of modern domination.

The second observation is that, particularly during the past decades, obstacles to the international interaction of movements and organizations have mul-

tiplied. On the one hand, the more benevolent forms of so-called development aid, particularly on the part of European countries that in the past contributed to the sustainability of some organizations and movements, have been replaced by so-called economic diplomacy, a concept that actually means channeling the funds to economic agents, to the detriment of social and cultural agents. On the other hand, the so-called war on terror and the security paranoia it has produced and upon which it feeds has resulted in imposing ever more restrictions on the movements across borders of leaders of organizations of the global South.[2] Thus, neoliberal globalization aims to localize, in many different ways, all its antagonists. This is why social movements have been privileging national or regional struggles and articulations.

Finally, the third observation is that, aside from the security and economic objectives more directly at play, the technologies of information and communication have become massified due to depoliticized interactions, self-exposed intimacy, and superficialized privacy, as well as an increase in narcissistic individualism that only acknowledges solidarity when it does not imply risks or simply amounts to shared trivialities.

What this amounts to is that we live at a time when intercultural translation is more and more necessary, when certain technical conditions exist that might render it easier, but also when obstacles to it are increasingly difficult to overcome. As I have said above, intercultural translation is an ancient phenomenon, even in the restricted sense that the epistemologies of the South ascribe to it (i.e., intercultural and interpolitical translation as a tool for articulating struggles against domination). It is, therefore, important to invoke the processes of intercultural translation as it existed in the past in order to strengthen the possibilities of intercultural translation in the present. The more recent globalization processes, because they are so spectacular, may lead us to forget that in the past there were other kinds of globalization that were just as strong, even if at times they were geographically more limited.

It is possible to identify many instances of intercultural and interpolitical translation among movements engaged in anticapitalist and anticolonial struggles in different countries over the past 150 years: for example, the workers' and leaders' organizations that convened in the First International Workingmen's Association (1864–76); the strongly anarchist-inspired revolutionary movements at the end of the nineteenth century and their alliances in some European capitals, especially Paris; the ideological debates and experience sharing among different liberation movements fighting against European colonialism at the Asian-African Bandung Conference in 1955; the debates among the different African liberation movements in Ghana and Algeria after their independence;

and, last but not least, the amazing case of intercultural translation embodied by Gandhi.

In chapter 4, while analyzing the different kinds of knowledge emerging from or mobilized by social struggles, I made reference to twentieth-century African liberation movements. The case of anticapitalist revolutionaries at the end of the nineteenth century is little known but extremely interesting. Right at the peak of European colonialism, the vicissitudes of European politics, particularly repression of political opposition in both the metropoles and the colonies, led to some little-known interactions and articulations between anticapitalist and anticolonial struggles. European revolutionaries, often intent on propaganda by the deed, which included the assassination of political leaders, found themselves together in the same cities, if not the same prisons, with revolutionaries from the colonies (almost all of them of European origin), who were living in Europe, whether willingly or in forced exile, and intent on the liberation of their countries.[3] Well-known European anarchists (Félix Fénéon, Errico Malatesta, Louis Blanqui, Louise Michel, Emile Verhaeren, Elisée Reclus, etc.) and revolutionaries from Cuba, Puerto Rico, Santo Domingo, and the Philippines (José Rizal, Ramón Betances, Fernando Tarrida del Mármol, Mariano Ponce, etc.) came to know one another, read one another's works, discuss one another's writings, and collaborate in the same anarchist journals (e.g., *La Revue Blanche*). The city of Paris and the Barcelona prison of Montjuïc were some of the nodal points of this communality, which Benedict Anderson (2005) describes with unsurpassed liveliness in one of his lesser-known books.

In this chapter, I focus on Gandhi's intercultural work, both his own and what can be imagined by following his anthropophagic method, which consisted of selectively and creatively appropriating any kind of knowledge that could be used to strengthen his struggle to liberate India from British colonialism.[4] My purpose here is to analyze Gandhi's method and, on its basis, trace a program for intercultural translation concerned with the demands of future liberation struggles, and present it to social movements of our time, particularly to rearguard intellectuals. Last century, Mahatma Gandhi was no doubt one of the main protagonists of intercultural translation. Bearing in mind the kinds of intercultural translation I proposed in chapter 1, Gandhi excelled in didactic intercultural translation bringing together knowledges and cultures of the global South and the global North. But Gandhi's reflection and practice are so rich that he can also inspire South-South intercultural translation.

Gandhi's intercultural translation work is more relevant today than in the first decades after his death. At that time, the promises of independence for the countries that were to be known as the Third World seemed to be coming

true. As I analyze in chapter 4, the liberating drive of the struggles for independence owed much to the emancipatory ideals of Eurocentric modernity. Thus, the liberation movements largely shared promises of development, whether capitalist or socialist, a belief in modern science and law together with the progress they would engender, and an acceptance of the Westphalian, monocultural, centralized, and bureaucratically organized state as the obvious model for new states. In such a context, Gandhi's conceptions and proposals could not but be considered eccentric, utopian, the product of a brilliant mind that had nonetheless lost touch with the world of his time and that arrogantly refused to acknowledge the imperatives of development, which alone, it was believed, would eventually guarantee survival and prosperity to the large minorities oppressed by colonialism.

However, in the following decades filled with disappointments, that faith in development lost its strength and luster. Gradually it became clear that independence was not synonymous with self-determination, that the promise of development was being successively postponed, that historical colonialism was being replaced by neocolonialism, and that the newly independent state had more continuities than discontinuities vis-à-vis the colonial state.[5] The first and perhaps most brilliant warning came from Kwame Nkrumah in his 1965 book on neocolonialism.[6] It became increasingly clear that the abyssal line had moved with the independences but had not disappeared. The different paths followed by the different countries out of colonialism eventually led in the end to the same historical frustration. But, until recently, there was no profound questioning of the development model that had been adopted in vain, let alone any questioning of Western modernity as a philosophical and ideological horizon for social change. The very idea of unfulfilled promises and historical frustration was stealthily erased by neoliberalism to the extent that neoliberal globalization went on consolidating itself while asserting that there was no credible alternative to capitalist development. The ecological crisis that was meanwhile emerging in the global political agenda managed, at most, to legitimate the idea of an alternative development and to stimulate debates about it. But it never went so far as to legitimate the far more radical alternatives to development.

This situation only started to change when, in the past thirty years, there was a considerable increase in political power and public visibility of social movements that radically called into question the very idea of development, and did so based on non-Western cultural, philosophical, and existential premises. Among such movements, indigenous and peasant movements were particularly prominent. At present, such movements and the struggles they

organize are active in many countries, from the Dalits in India and peasants in Mozambique, Brazil, Colombia, and Mexico, to indigenous peoples in the Philippines, Chile, Argentina, Peru, Bolivia, Ecuador, Colombia, Venezuela, Nicaragua, Guatemala, Mexico, Canada, and even the United States.[7] The violence to which they are subjected, from illegal expropriation to the assassination of leaders, from their expulsion from ancestral lands to the contamination of their water, is the new version of what Karl Marx called primitive accumulation and which Rosa Luxemburg viewed as a structural and permanent feature of capitalism. In Latin America, this new version is generally designated neo-extractivism.[8] At the origin of this phenomenon is the ever-renewed coveting of natural resources by global capitalism: open-pit mining at an unprecedented scale, oil drilling in highly biodiverse national parks, megaprojects (dams, canals, continental turnpikes), land grabbing, particularly in Asia and Africa but in Latin America as well, and the consequent displacement of hundreds of thousands of poor and indigenous peoples and peasants. The social and ecological consequences of such changes, together with the resistances and struggles they provoke, are encouraging growing numbers of both activists and academics to call into question the very idea of development as a whole. They point to the social inequalities, irresponsible consumption patterns, individualistic ways of living, and the destructive relationship with nature that development entails at its very core. In a word, what is being called into question are the cultural, philosophical, and ideological premises grounding Western modernity.

It is in this context that Gandhi gains a new relevance for our time as an outstanding dissident to the model of development as it stood at the very moment when Western modernity was at its global zenith. His relevance, as I understand it in this chapter, does not have to do with the concrete solutions for which he advocated and fought with such perseverance. Instead, it has to do with his method, with the way he acted so as not to squander any social and cultural experience in the world that might contribute to the cause for the peoples' self-determination and humanity's individual and collective freedom.

Reflecting on Gandhi's work of intercultural translation may help to encourage the formation of a thousand Gandhis who will be prepared for the difficult tasks of intercultural and interpolitical translation. These will be necessary in order to strengthen the struggles against domination on an increasingly global scale and at a time increasingly dominated by sectarianism, the war of civilizations, aggressive nationalism, rightist populism, identitarian essentialism, terrorism, state terrorism, permanent security vigilance, and so on and so forth.

In the context of the epistemologies of the South, reflecting on Gandhi as an intellectual translator only makes sense to the extent that such a reflection is conceived of as an exercise in intercultural translation between Gandhi and the requirements of the resistance movements and struggles of our own time and place. I insist that of interest to us is not so much the concrete results that Gandhi achieved but rather the processes and methods he used to reach them. My purpose is not to monumentalize Gandhi, which would actually be in contradiction with the epistemologies of the South.[9] I aim rather to identify the profound logic of Gandhi's disquietude in his search for new responses to new problems. This led him to reconsider a subverted cultural tradition that he envisaged as being in constant dialogue with other cultural traditions and that he interrogated in light of the needs of the present. Such disquietude and the profound logic at its origin inspired Gandhi to become an accomplished builder of ecologies of knowledges and quite skilled in the artisanship of practices, two basic procedures characteristic of the epistemologies of the South. Such an approach is less exegetical than archaeological, but of a kind of archaeology that engenders proximity rather than distance. That is to say, going back to Gandhi it is possible to perform not only North-South or South-North intercultural translations, but also South-South intercultural translation.

In what follows, the point is not to present Gandhi as an exemplary practitioner of the epistemologies of the South. The point is to analyze Gandhi in the light of the epistemologies of the South so as to valorize both the strangeness they provoke in us (defamiliarization) and the proximity that never stops surprising us (refamiliarization). Resorting to the concepts I have been putting forward, I conceive of Gandhi in terms of two forms of the sociology of emergences: as a ruin seed and as a counterhegemonic appropriation (see chapter 1).

Gandhi was an assiduous and competent intercultural translator in the contact zone between Eurocentric and non-Eurocentric conceptions. According to him, learning from the South, his main objective, could be facilitated by learning from the North.[10] Learning from the North was a kind of negative learning, the unlearning of what claimed to be universal only because it was more powerful. Such learning and unlearning also involved the dissenting voices, the countercultures that in the global North fought against capitalism, patriarchy, and colonialism or, still, against modern, Eurocentric civilization. Such learning was instrumental for Gandhi to achieve his main goal: to interrogate his ancestral tradition and to reinvent it in a way that would enable it to provide both the foundation and the guidance for the political tasks ahead. The ultimate objective was thus to let the anti-imperial South emerge and flourish as a contribution to the world—both North and South, West and East.

I begin by highlighting some aspects of Gandhi's upbringing that may have contributed to developing his extraordinary capacity for intercultural translation. Next, based on Gandhi, I propose two exercises in South-North-South intercultural translation, one imaginary and the other real. The first one, imaginary, takes place between Gandhi, on the one side, and two well-known Eurocentric intellectuals on the other: Habermas and Chomsky; the second one, really conducted by Gandhi, takes place between himself and a Eurocentric dissident and countercultural intellectual: Tolstoy. I then propose two exercises in South-South intercultural translation; again, one of them is real and the other imaginary. The real one took place between Gandhi's political practice and the African American civil rights movements. The other, imaginary, I stage between Gandhi and the philosophy of the indigenous peoples of the Andean region.

The Making of an Intercultural Translator

There are several factors that may have contributed to establishing the foundation for intercultural translation in Gandhi's thought and practice. Gandhi, unlike most other children brought up in Hindu households at that time, spent his childhood in a multicultural environment. "The household in which Mohandas Gandhi grew up was one in which a young mind could experience religious pluralism in action. His parents belonged to different sects [within Hinduism]. Moreover, the Gandhi home was frequently visited by Jain monks, who provided religious counselling, and by Muslim friends. It was open to people of all faiths, and religious issues were often discussed in these gatherings. Religious pluralism was a living reality in Mohandas' life: it was simply taken for granted" (Jordens 1998: 148). Thus, the environment that was afforded to Gandhi in his early childhood may have planted the seeds for intercultural and interreligious translation. Later, from a mystic Jain named Ravjibhai Mehta, Gandhi learned the Jain philosophy and teachings on matters of the soul, God, liberation, Gita, Vedas, *anekantavada* (the many-sidedness of truth), and dharma (Parel 1997: xlviii). From this philosophy, Gandhi borrowed the key concepts of plurality and the many-sidedness of the world.[11] The anekantavada is one of the fundamental doctrines of Jainism. It refers to the principles of radical or ontological pluralism (a multiverse or pluriverse rather than the universe) and of a multiplicity of viewpoints, the notion that truth and reality are perceived differently from diverse points of view, and that no single point of view is the complete truth.

The willingness to reach out to other cultures is anchored both in Gandhi's adoption of the Jainian conception of the manyness of reality and, more generally, in his conception of religion. Says Gandhi, cited by Jordens, "It has been

my experience that I am always right from my point of view and often wrong from the point of view of my honest critics. I know that we are both right from our respective points of view. And this knowledge prevents me from attributing motives to my opponents or critics. . . . I very much like this doctrine of manyness of reality. It is this doctrine that has taught me to judge a Mussulman from his own standpoint and a Christian from his" (1998: 151–52).

For a time, Gandhi believed that Hinduism was superior to other religions for its capacity to include all other religions. Probably because a claim based on such grounds was a *contradictio in adjecto*, Gandhi's later philosophy accepted all religions as equal with each other: "In essential reality there is no difference whatsoever; the difference is only in the eye of the beholder. Believe that, grasp the essence, and you will make progress in religion. Whatever religion you profess, I do not take sides for or against. Only this is worth saying: by whatever method, devotion or dharma the contamination of the soul by this world is destroyed, that is the dharma, that is the discipline you should follow. . . . This world has been unable to discover the truth because it is shackled by the chain of doctrinal disputes" (Jordens 1998: 150).[12]

The idea of the equality of religions is clearly indicated by the use of a new metaphor: "Even as a tree has a single trunk, but many branches and leaves, so is there one true and perfect religion, but it becomes many as it passes through the human medium." Previously, Gandhi's metaphor was that "religions are all rivers that meet in the same ocean." That image stressed the similarity of the final goal to which by their individual meandering ways all religions eventually lead. However, it did not suggest the equality of religions: although they all ended up in the ocean, some might be majestic, fast-flowing rivers, while others might be brackish, stagnating creeks. The new metaphor concentrated on the sameness of essence: religions are equal because at the root, at the trunk, they are really one: there is one true and perfect Religion, and the various branches share equally its wood and its sap (Jordens 1998: 154–55). This idea of the multiplicity of viewpoints but of their sameness in essence brought about another change in Gandhi's outlook. For a long time Gandhi asserted that " 'God is Truth,' implying both that Truth was one of God's many properties and that the concept of God was logically prior to that of Truth. In 1926 he reversed the proposition and said, 'Truth is God.' He regarded this as one of his most important discoveries and thought that it crystallized his years of reflection" (Parekh 1997: 26). This latter conception brings Gandhi very close to Spinoza's (1888: 3–56) conception of God.

Another important factor that fostered Gandhi's ability with intercultural translation is the outsider's perspective that he developed over the course of

his life. This is significant because, in my view, without the existential experience of seeing things from an outsider's perspective, such notions as the many-sidedness of reality will have trouble becoming embedded in one's actions. Gandhi's life positioned him to have an outsider's perspective on all the schools of thought to which he adhered: during his time in South Africa he experienced racism and gained an outside perspective on Indian nationalism (Gandhi 2001). With his ideas bordering on atheism, he gained an outsider's perspective on religion in general and on Hinduism in particular. For a while he became an outcast from his sect and community for pursuing a Eurocentric education; he acquired that Eurocentric education and spent enough time in England to be able to decide what he would accept and reject from Eurocentric modernity. Gandhi did not consider himself as belonging to either extremist elements or to moderate political parties, both of whom he said were tainted by conceptions of Eurocentric modernity; he borrowed from Jain, Christian, Buddhist, and Islamic philosophies, though he did not adhere to any one of these completely. Because he borrowed concepts from other religions to enrich his conception of Hinduism, he was not considered a pure Hindu by extremist Hindu elements.

This outsider's perspective on different schools of thought enabled Gandhi to see the deficiencies and problems with each. Understanding that each viewpoint carries with it its own deficiencies is an integral part of moving toward the manyness of reality, because it leads one to understand that there isn't a viewpoint that is flawless and complete. This, of course, does not amount to relativism or eclecticism. Bearing in mind feminist standpoint theories, we might even speak of standpoint intercultural translation. It is intercultural translation at work; it creates a distance vis-à-vis one's own standpoint in order to evaluate its competitive or cooperative relationship with other standpoints. Gandhi still rooted himself in some essential beliefs: Hinduism, Indian civilization, Indian history, truth, nonviolence, and so on. However, he continually tested these beliefs in the light of morality, humanity, and reason, and argued against corrupting practices such as untouchability, patriarchy, undue traditionalism, and so on.[13] Gandhi's journey showed that there is a middle ground between taking undue pride in one's beliefs and throwing them away to be truthful to a many-sided worldview.

This middle ground is the terrain of intercultural translation. Gandhi moved toward intercultural translation when most of his contemporaries, in the same circumstances, adopted parochial nationalism, right-wing Hinduism, or an uncritical adherence to Eurocentric materialistic philosophies. The three years Gandhi spent in England studying law were for him a prolonged and decisive

contact zone for intercultural translation. He became well acquainted with the imperial culture and politics that dominated India and seduced a portion of Indian elites, and transformed his stay into a constant flow of intercultural interactions between Eurocentric and Indian texts and the central concepts of such fields as law, religion, politics, and philosophy (Nanda 2007: 54). Lloyd Rudolph pointedly sums up Gandhi's journey as a cosmopolitan translator:

> The encounter with the culture of modernity, British traditions, and the Christian epistemology challenged Gandhi's own roots, beliefs and knowledge systems. However, rather than jumping on board with modernity as several Indians had done, Gandhi reverted back to his own roots and his own traditions. Moreover, in turning to his own culture, he did not resort to parochial nationalism; rather, he turned to it with an open mind to see its advantages and its shortcomings, deciding that if the latter outweighed the former, he certainly would break his ties with it. These were vital conditions for intercultural translation. It was the international encounter that moved him to read and articulate his "native" understandings. (1996: 41)

Gandhi and South-North Translations: Habermas and Chomsky

The need to keep some distance from the Eurocentric critical tradition entails a deconstructive démarche to be complemented by a reconstructive one.[14] The fact that analytical spaces are opened up by means of such a distancing does not mean that new analytical tools for theoretical and epistemological reconstruction thereby become available. The epistemologies of the South are part and parcel of such reconstructive work. Gandhi represents very well the tension between the tasks of deconstruction and reconstruction. Without losing sight of his roots, Hinduism and Jainism, Gandhi subjects them to a constant critical evaluation, which becomes surprisingly credible in view of the equally demanding critique to which he subjects Eurocentric modernity. Gandhi excels in using double negation in order to define a new positivity—his path of struggle. This kind of double negation does not exist in Eurocentric critical thought. Hence the importance of comparing and contrasting Gandhi with two distinguished Western thinkers that have been very critical of Eurocentric modernity, Habermas and Chomsky.

The anti-imperial global South emerges through a double act of defamiliarization, vis-à-vis both the global North and the imperial global South, that is,

the South that actively reproduces the economic, political, and cultural mechanisms that sustain the global domination of capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy.[15] As defamiliarization from the imperial global North proceeds, conceptions and practices of the global North that have been suppressed, repressed, or marginalized by the hegemonic, imperial thinking begin to be seen in a different light and are thus rendered more visible and even more familiar. The same happens as regards conceptions and practices existing in the global South prior to colonial and imperial domination, or that were generated as part of the resistance against the latter. Defamiliarization thus entails refamiliarization.

The main contention of the epistemologies of the South is that such defamiliarization truly begins when the abyssal line is identified and denounced, when, in other words, the sociology of absences and the sociology of emergences are made possible. It does not suffice to recognize the imperial character of global North dominance in the modern world (what I would call learning that there is a South).[16] Nor does it suffice to condemn the unjust suffering caused by imperialism and to show solidarity with its victims (what I would call learning to go South). The abyssal line is only properly identified and denounced when modern domination is viewed as occulting the fact that such domination dehumanizes both oppressors and oppressed and that the oppressed have an existential and epistemic value that by far exceeds what is codified via the relation of domination. Since the key for genuine global liberation lies in the struggle against oppression, rather than showing solidarity with the oppressed it is imperative to join the struggle and learn from it and, through it, learn how to become fully human (what I call learning from the South). Defamiliarization of the imperial North is thus a more complex epistemological démarche than it may seem.

In the following I illustrate this complexity by briefly discussing Gandhi in an imagined translation with Habermas and Chomsky, two thinkers of the global North who have critiqued the dominant versions of Eurocentric modernity in different ways and may thus be considered oppositional thinkers, Chomsky to a much larger degree than Habermas.

How difficult it is for a Western thinker to be defamiliarized vis-à-vis the global North is well illustrated by the work of Jürgen Habermas. For Habermas (1981), Eurocentric modernity, rather than a failed project, is an incomplete project. His well-known theory of communicative action as a new universal model for discursive rationality is precisely aimed at maximizing the possibilities of completing the modern project. By this theory, Habermas means a telos of development for humankind as a whole, on the basis of which it is possible

to reject relativism and eclecticism. However, when he was asked if his critical theory of advanced capitalism could be of any use to the socialist forces in the Third World and if, on the other hand, such forces could, in turn, be of any use to democratic socialist struggles in advanced countries, Habermas replied, "I am tempted to say 'no' in both cases. I am aware of the fact that this is a Eurocentric limited view. I would rather pass the question" (1985: 104). What this reply means is that Habermas's communicative rationality, in spite of its pretense of universality, starts out by excluding about four-fifths of the world's population from participating in discourse. Such an exclusion is declared because of criteria whose legitimacy resides in the universality that is ascribed to them. Hence, the statement of exclusion can be made both with extreme honesty ("I am aware of the fact that this is a Eurocentric limited view") and with blindness concerning its unsustainability (or perhaps the blindness is not extreme after all, considering the exit strategy adopted: "I would rather pass the question"). Thus, Habermas's universalism turns out to be an imperial universalism, in full control of the decision about its own limitations, thereby imposing itself upon both what it includes and what it excludes.

There is a debate regarding the intellectual affinities or divergences between Habermas and Gandhi. On the one hand, Thomas Pantham (1988) stresses the differences between the Eurocentric confines of Habermasian universalism and Gandhi's reliance on Hinduism to provide a creative alternative; on the other, Dipankar Gupta (2009) considers Gandhi a precursor to the liberal, secular, and democratic ideas later developed by Habermas, thereby stressing the affinities between the two thinkers. In this debate I coincide with Pantham. While Habermas is an example of the failure to understand the need for epistemological defamiliarization vis-à-vis the imperial North, Noam Chomsky shows very eloquently that defamiliarization is much easier on political than on epistemological grounds. With Chomsky we learn that there is a South and that we must go South in solidarity with it. But he is equally unhelpful in leading us to learn from the South. For that we will have to resort to Gandhi. Being unquestionably one of the most brilliant radical critics of the imperial North, Chomsky comes closest in the global North to representing defamiliarization vis-à-vis the imperial North. Ever since he became, in the 1960s, one of the most articulate spokespersons against the Vietnam War, Chomsky has never stopped being a consistent anti-imperialist activist.[17] In order to dismantle imperialism, Chomsky engages in a radical critique of the role played by the social sciences in the naturalization of the imperial relation. Chomsky's political writings assume a distinctly nontheoretical character, which is all the more surprising in view of the fact that as a linguist he is a world-renowned theoretician. In

fact, Chomsky's theory of transformational generative grammar is considered by some as important a revolution in linguistics as Einstein's was in physics. The nontheoretical nature of his political writings is in part to blame for the silence or discredit with which they have been met in professional circles. At best, Chomsky's political writings have been harshly criticized. "Chomsky's political writings," Wolin remarks, "are curiously untheoretical. . . . His apparent assumption is that politics is not a theoretical subject. . . . One gets the impression from reading Chomsky that if it were not urgently necessary to expose lies, immorality and the abuse of power, politics would have no serious claim upon the theoretical mind" (1990: 103). Of the professional field of the social sciences, Chomsky had this to say:

> The professional guild structure of the social sciences, I think, has often served as a marvelous device for protecting them from insight and understanding, for filtering out people who raise unacceptable questions, for limiting research—not by force, but by all sorts of more subtle means—to questions that are not threatening. Take a look at any society, there will be certain topics that they will be very reluctant to investigate. In particular, one of the things that they are very unlikely to study is the way power is actually exercised in their own society, or their own relationship to that power. These are topics that won't be understood, won't be studied. (1987: 30)

The conclusion is that the modern social sciences are of very little use for the defamiliarization of the imperial North. Chomsky proposes, therefore, the creation of a new common sense. Significantly, he calls it "Cartesian common sense." Chomsky's insight is that ordinary people know a tremendous amount in many different areas. His particular example is conversations and debates on sports in our society. Observing that ordinary people apply their intelligence and analytical skills accumulating quite a lot of knowledge and understanding in this particular area, Chomsky goes on to argue that the same intellectual skill and capacity for understanding could be used in areas that are really important for human life in society. He actually insists that, under different systems of governance involving popular participation in important decision-making areas, the knowing ability of ordinary people would no doubt be used in relevant ways. Going back to his metaexample—the Vietnam War—Chomsky writes, "When I talk about, say, Cartesian common sense, what I mean is that it does not require very far-reaching, specialized knowledge to perceive that the United States was invading South Vietnam. And, in fact, to take apart the system of illusions and deception which functions to prevent understanding of

contemporary reality, that is not a task that requires extraordinary skill or understanding. It requires the kind of normal skepticism and willingness to apply one's analytical skills that almost all people have and that they can exercise" (1987: 35).

From the point of view of the epistemologies of the South, the detheorizing proposal advanced by Chomsky is an important contribution, but it has fatal limitations. By admitting the total separation between his scholarly and his political activity, Chomsky acritically accepts one of the basic dichotomies of the paradigm of modern science, the dichotomy between science and politics, which is, indeed, one of the most entrenched components of the old Eurocentric common sense. Chomsky's radical critique of the modern social sciences fails to acknowledge the fact that they are part of a vaster epistemological paradigm that includes modern science as a whole, and hence linguistics as well. He thus fails to see that the dichotomy between science and politics is political, rather than scholarly, and therefore prey to the politics of the imperial global North.[18] With the exception of anarchism, Chomsky pays little attention to the eccentric, peripheral traditions suppressed by Eurocentric modernity, and no attention at all to knowledge produced in the South from an anti-imperial standpoint. In other words, with Chomsky we do not learn how to learn from the South.

In order to learn from the South as the anti-imperial South, we must first of all hear it speak, listen to it deeply and understand what it has to say, for what best identifies the South is the fact that it has been silenced. Gandhi is one of the most eloquent voices of the anti-imperial global South, a distinguished master of the process of learning with (and from) the South.[19] Gandhi and Frantz Fanon symbolize two of the most radical rejections of the imperial North: one in the first half of the twentieth century and the other in the second half.[20] When, in 1909, he was asked what he would tell the English about their colonial domination over India, Gandhi replied that, among other things, he would say the following: "We hold the civilization that you support to be the reverse of civilization. . . . We consider your schools and law courts useless. We want our own ancient schools and courts to be restored. The common language of India is not English but Hindi. You should, therefore, learn it. We can hold communication with you only in our national language" (1956: 118).

As Nandy correctly emphasizes, "The Gandhian vision defies the temptation to equal the oppressor in violence and to regain one's self-esteem as a competitor within the same system" (1987: 35).

The concept and practice of nonviolence and noncooperation, to which Gandhi devoted all his life, are the most striking features of political and cultural

defamiliarization vis-à-vis the imperial North. The aim is not to conquer power in a corrupt world, but to create an alternative world where it might be possible to recuperate the humanity of the human: "In our present state," says Gandhi, "we are partly men and partly beasts and in our ignorance and even arrogance say that we truly fulfill the purpose of our species when we deliver blow for blow and develop the measure of anger required for the purpose" (1951: 78). As we see, then, in Gandhi, defamiliarization vis-à-vis the imperial North is likewise defamiliarization vis-à-vis the imperial South.

Speaking in 1938 about the practice of *satyagraha*, Gandhi remarks, "Non-cooperation being a movement of purification is bringing to the surface all our weaknesses as also excesses of even our strong points" (1951: 80). For Gandhi, then, European Marxism and communism, though unquestionably representing a profound critique of the imperial North, are still too compromised with it to function as models for the construction of a nonimperial South:

> The class war is foreign to the essential genius of India which is capable of evolving communism broad-based on the fundamental rights of all and equal justice to all. . . . The Ramarajya of my dream ensures the right alike of prince and pauper. . . . Let us not be obsessed with catchwords and seductive slogans imported from the West. Have we not our distinct Eastern traditions? Are we not capable of finding our own solution to the question of labour and capital? . . . I have been a sympathetic student of the Western social order and I have discovered that underlying the fever that fills the soul of the West there is a restless search for truth. I value the spirit. Let us study our Eastern institutions in that spirit of scientific inquiry and we shall evolve a truer socialism and a truer communism than the world has yet dreamed of. It is surely wrong to presume that Western socialism or communism is the last word on the question of mass poverty. (2009: 39–40)

Defamiliarization vis-à-vis the imperial North and South is not, for Gandhi, an end in itself. It is rather a means of creating an alternative world, a new form of universality capable of liberating both victim and oppressor. In this regard, and as the preceding analysis clearly demonstrates, the striking contrast between Gandhi and Habermas is highly favorable to Gandhi. To begin with, Gandhi's concept of rationality is much more comprehensive than Habermas's as he stresses the warm current of reason, argued for in chapter 5. Gandhi refuses to distinguish truth from love and joy: "The force of love is the same as the force of the soul or truth" (1956: 110). Pantham is, therefore, right when he says that

"Gandhi's *satyagraha* is an integral mode of political praxis which is restricted to critical reasoning." And he adds, somewhat excessively, "Gandhi's *satyagraha* starts from where rational argumentation or critical reasoning stops" (1988: 206).[21] Second, Gandhi's scientific inquiry claims no epistemological privilege. The knowledge was always already there, so to speak, and all he had to do was "experiments": "I have nothing to teach the world. Truth and non-violence are as old as the hills. All I have done is to try experiments in both on as vast a scale as I could. In doing so I have sometimes erred and learnt by my errors. Life and its problems have thus become to me so many experiments in the practice of truth and non-violence" (Gandhi 1951: 240).

Gandhi pleads for the ecologies of knowledges that strengthen the liberation struggle and, by the same token, prefigure the types of sociability in the liberated society. His proposal consists of a vast project of intercultural translation that encompasses both the exacting interrogation of the imperial North in order to extract its anti-imperial potential and the exacting interrogation of his own culture because the latter's anti-imperial potential, far from being evident, must be equally extracted. Gandhi interrogates his own Hindu culture in order to learn how to engage in dialogue with other cultures with the greatest discursive tolerance, and to recognize that other cultures also have similar emancipatory aspirations: "Non-violence is therefore, in its active form, good will towards all life. It is pure love. I read it in the Hindu scriptures, in the Bible, in the Koran" (1951: 77).

The contrast between Gandhi and Habermas is more evident than the one between Gandhi and Chomsky. There are, however, obvious differences between Gandhi and Chomsky concerning knowledge, disciplinary boundaries, and politics. Chomsky makes a distinction between science and politics that would be unacceptable to Gandhi. Gandhi has much more concrete ideas about the means and ends (never to be separated) of social struggles than Chomsky, and they would definitely differ on the evaluation of different modes of resistance by oppressed groups.[22] On the other hand, both try to ground a new emancipatory common sense on a demanding and highly risky practice. Each in his own way engages in a radical critique of hegemonic professional knowledge that entails the detheorization of reality as the only way of reinventing it. Furthermore, each of them sets out from a radical interpellation of his own culture in order to understand what might bring it closer to other cultures, and is willing to engage in cross-cultural dialogues. Chomsky unearths the deepest roots of European liberalism and discovers a new communitarianism and a new solidarity in the political form of anarchism. To his way of thinking,

anarchist society, based on the free association of all the productive forces and on cooperative labor, would satisfy the necessary requirements of all its members adequately and justly:

> In such a society, there is no reason why rewards should be contingent on some collection of personal attributes, however selected. Inequality of endowment is simply the human condition—a fact for which we may be thankful; one vision of hell is a society of interchangeable parts. It carries with it no implications concerning social rewards. . . . Without bonds of solidarity, sympathy, and concern for others, a socialist society is unthinkable. . . . Socialists are committed to the belief that we are not condemned to live in a society based on greed, envy, and hate. I know of no way to prove that they are right, but there are also no grounds for the common belief that they must be wrong. (1987: 192)

Chomsky's praise of community and solidarity can be translated into the concerns expressed by Gandhi from the point of view of his own culture. But, curiously enough, in his radical interpellation of Hindu communitarianism, Gandhi discovers the value of the autonomy and freedom of the individual. Shortly before he died, someone asked him what he meant by socialism, since he insisted on distinguishing his notion of socialism from the European variety. Gandhi gave the following answer: "I do not want to rise on the ashes of the blind, the deaf and the dumb. In their [European] socialism probably these have no place. Their one aim is material progress. . . . I want freedom for full expression of my personality. I must be free to build a staircase to Sirius if I want to. That does not mean that I want to do any such thing. Under the other socialism, there is no individual freedom. You own nothing, not even your body" (1956: 327).

Coming from places of departure that are so far apart, Chomsky and Gandhi converge on significant matters. By digging deeply into his own culture, each one reaches out to the other culture. But it is even more significant if we consider that the political model that best seems to capture the affinities between them is a certain type of anarchism, a nonviolent anarchism. As a matter of fact, what Gandhi has to say about anarchism is not so different from what we just heard from Chomsky: "If national life becomes so perfect as to become self-regulated, no representation becomes necessary. There is then a state of enlightened anarchy. In such a state everyone is his own ruler. He rules himself in such a manner that he is never a hindrance to his neighbor. In the ideal state therefore, there is no political power because there is no state. But the ideal is never fully realized in life. Hence the classical statement of Thoreau that that government is best

which governs the least" (Gandhi 1951: 244). It is probably no coincidence that the convergence between Chomsky and Gandhi finds in anarchism one of its formulations. Indeed, of all the transformative political traditions of Eurocentric modernity, anarchism is one of those most discredited and marginalized by hegemonic political discourse, whether conventional or critical. As a relatively unfinished representation, anarchism displays, therefore, more availability for intercultural translation.[23] Finally, as Chomsky rightly notes, anarchism is the only transformative political project that grants intellectuals and professional knowledge no particular privilege. The detheorization of reality as a precondition of its reinvention, desired by both Chomsky and Gandhi, finds in nonviolent anarchism a congenial field.

Gandhi and Nonoccidentalist Wests: Tolstoy (and Ruskin and Thoreau)

In my previous work I inquired into centrifugal modernities and subaltern Wests as a way of exploring new possibilities for liberation arising from those Eurocentric traditions that, for not fitting the hegemonic objectives of capitalist, colonialist, and patriarchal domination, were suppressed or silenced (Santos 2014: 99–115).[24] As a researcher and an activist, Gandhi paid careful attention to such possibilities. He was particularly interested in grasping the internal diversity of Western thought and politics in order to appropriate for his thinking and practice whatever in the West showed some distance from hegemonic colonialist and imperialist conceptions. Like his contemporaries, the Brazilian modernists, Gandhi deeply experienced the need for the colonized to devour anything of the colonizer that might favor autonomy and liberation.[25] Gandhi viewed centrifugal, subaltern, countercultural, Eurocentric conceptions as a meeting point between colonizer and colonized, a kind of priceless complicity and solidarity capable of strengthening the anticolonial cause. When in the global North movements appeared that radically criticized the present civilizational models, including the state and political organizations that had presided over colonialism and imperialism, the important thing, Gandhi thought, was not simply to identify allies. The important thing was to learn from them and selectively integrate their ideas into the struggles of the colonized. The aim was, therefore, to carry out the cosmopolitan intercultural translation underlying the epistemologies of the South—in other words, to look for transnational relations that were as horizontal as possible and submit the work of translation to the political needs of the oppressed struggling against capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy.

Herein lies the motive for Gandhi's translation of Tolstoy, Ruskin, and Thoreau into Gujarati; these authors, he often acknowledged, had influenced him most.[26] For the same reason he felt attracted to vegetarianism as a gesture of Eurocentric counterculture.[27] All these centrifugal Eurocentric traditions were shot through with beliefs and principles that were close to Gandhi's heart. Gandhi's selectivity and creativity while translating different centrifugal ideas and practices from the West, as well as the way he put them at the service of his own philosophy and struggle, turned him into an autonomous, countercultural voice offering an alternative critical thinking and guidance for practices of change, capable of attracting followers in cultural contexts very distinct from his own. He creatively borrowed and reconstructed what he considered suitable from the traditions encountered (e.g., human rights from the West, duties from the East; democracy from the West, village federation from the East, etc.). Lloyd Rudolph (1996: 37) emphasizes how Gandhi incorporated aspects of the counterculture in the West into his challenge from the periphery and how that challenge in turn rejoined the challenge in the West to become part of a global contestation of modern civilization.

As regards the relation between Gandhi and dissident, or countercultural, Eurocentric thought, what is striking is the method and the logic of intercultural translation adopted by Gandhi. My interpretation is based on an archaeological reading of Gandhi in light of the epistemologies of the South. Gandhi is fully aware of the existence of the abyssal line; colonized peoples, whether South African or Indian, are subjected to forms of abyssal exclusion that remain hidden or trivialized in dominant Eurocentric social thought, the result being that dominant Eurocentric social thought is unable to conceive of liberation. On the contrary, dissident Eurocentric thinkers who vehemently denounce the unjust suffering inflicted on European societies by capitalism and who show solidarity with the excluded social groups within the European societies themselves can be advantageously studied and strategically interpreted with a view toward formulating a way of thinking that may contribute to anticolonial liberation.

Such authors acknowledge, often implicitly, that the abyssal line separating metropolitan from colonial sociability traverses the European societies themselves, thus creating forms of abyssal exclusion inside them. For example, Tolstoy denounced the wretched conditions of starving peasants in Russia; Ruskin, in England, denounced the plight of workers, especially working children.[28] The radicalism of these authors pushes Eurocentric thought to its very limits, to such an extent that it becomes a true counterculture. Drawing on such thinkers, it becomes possible to imagine new and credible theoretical

and political horizons where unsuspected convergences with anti-Eurocentric and anticolonial and nationalist thought may be found. The dissenters admired by Gandhi are coherent with their theories and accordingly lead their lives as active citizens, committing themselves to the social struggles of the oppressed. Furthermore, in spite of their radical condemnation of the violence permeating the relations between ostentatiously wealthy, small minorities and wretched, large majorities, and in spite of their likewise radical condemnation of the oppressor's brutal repression of resistance, these authors did not end up proposing that the oppressed exert resistance by using the same weapons, that is, through direct, violent action. Quite the opposite, to their way of thinking: the ethical superiority of the oppressed consists in their being the carriers of the idea of a society without exploitation or violence; their kind of resistance must bear witness to such an idea. In what follows, I limit myself to the relations between Gandhi and Tolstoy.

Gandhi became acquainted with Tolstoy's work quite early on, but his engagement with the Russian author really began only when he heard of a letter Tolstoy wrote to an Indian nationalist in December 1908, in response to a request of support for the liberation of India from British colonialism. In "A Letter to a Hindu," Tolstoy (1987: 44–60) advocates, for the struggle against British colonialism, the principles of love and nonviolence (protests, strikes, and passive forms of resistance). Gandhi translated Tolstoy's letter into Gujarati and published it with an introduction quite revealing of his own method of intercultural translation. Here is what Gandhi wrote on November 19, 1909:

> To me, as a humble follower of that great teacher whom I have long looked upon as one of my guides, it is a matter of honour to be connected with the publication of his letter, such especially as the one which is now being given to the world. . . . It is a mere statement of fact to say that every Indian, whether he owns up to it or not, has national aspirations. But there are as many opinions as there are Indian nationalists as to the exact meaning of that aspiration, and more especially as to the methods to be used to attain the end. . . . One of the accepted and "time-honoured" methods to attain the end is that of violence. The assassination of Sir Curzon Wylie was an illustration of that method in its worst and most detestable form. Tolstoy's life has been devoted to replacing the method of violence for removing tyranny or securing reform by the method of nonresistance to evil. He would meet hatred expressed in violence by love expressed in self-suffering. He admits of no exception to whittle down this great and divine law of love. He applies it to all the problems

> that trouble mankind. . . . If we do not want the English in India we must pay the price. Tolstoy indicates it. . . .
>
> One need not accept all that Tolstoy says . . . to realize the central truth of his indictment of the present system, which is to understand and act upon the irresistible power of the soul over the body, of love, which is an attribute of the soul, over the brute or body force generated by the stirring in us of evil passions. (1987: 41–43)[29]

What most impressed Gandhi about Tolstoy was the latter's fervency and indignation in his description of the violence of the czarist government against famished peasants. Writes Tolstoy: "Fate, as though on purpose, after my two years' tension of thought in one and the same direction, for the first time in my life brought me in contact with this phenomenon, which showed me with absolute obviousness in practice what had become clear to me in theory, namely, that the whole structure of our life is not based, as men who enjoy an advantageous position in the existing order of things are fond of imagining, on any juridical principles, but on the simplest, coarsest violence, on the murder and torture of men" (2007: 293).

On Tolstoy's outburst, Rudolph comments, "In the moment of Gandhi's reading these lines, we may say, his movement for non-violence was born, the most striking single case, in an otherwise amorphous world movement for peace and social justice" (1996: 38). To my mind, what brings Gandhi and Tolstoy closer together is the complex relation between tradition and reason. The complexity of this relation is expressed remarkably in a little-known text by Tolstoy, titled "Reason and Religion," written in response to a question by one of his many correspondents: "But you must not do as people advise who prefer not to obey the law: you must not check his reason by tradition, but, contrariwise must check tradition by reason" (2007: 203).

South-South Intercultural Translations

Throughout the twentieth century, the resistance against colonialism was conducted by resorting, however selectively, to both European Enlightenment ideals and to modern conceptions of linear progress, and by turning these against the colonizers. As I argued in chapter 4 while analyzing the knowledges that circulated in the struggles of liberation against colonialism, quite often Marxism, communism, and socialism were deployed in combination with African ways of being and knowing. Although the Eurocentric cultural and philosophical foundations of these new political proposals were discussed,

they did not challenge the dominant Eurocentric perspectives. Accordingly, the first great political manifestation of South-South articulation, the Non-Aligned Movement (Prashad 2008), while it helped to spark debate about the cultural and epistemological cleavages that separated the global South from the global North, had little impact on the major political projects. But Gandhi's strategy of nonviolence remained present. In South Africa, for example, the African National Congress, strongly influenced by Gandhi's ideal of passive resistance, presented itself for many years as a movement in the pacifist tradition; without abandoning nonviolent resistance, the congress would combine it with armed struggle (Luthuli 1982: 41). Even if in several cases newly independent nations remained attached (by the elite's cultural affiliation) to the former colonizer, throughout the twentieth century many social movements considered Gandhi a very important reference. They questioned the cultural and philosophical foundations of the colonial metropolis and claimed forgotten legacies of non-Eurocentric cultural universes, recovering or reinventing their precolonial roots, traditional knowledges, traditional forms of government, and non-Eurocentric religions. All this invites revisiting Gandhi, once more, as an intercultural and interpolitical translator.

I present, in this section, two exercises in South-South intercultural translation involving Gandhi, one of them having actually happened, the other a hypothetical one that I suggest may be considered as an instance of the sociology of emergences.

Gandhi and African American Civil Rights Movements

The first exercise in intercultural translation I offer here takes place between the South of the south, the anti-imperial South situated in the geographical south (Gandhi), and the South of the North, the anticolonial South of the racialized minorities in the geographical north (United States). Between the 1920s and the 1960s there was a strong articulation between Gandhi's thought and practice and the various Black movements fighting against racial discrimination in the United States.[30] I would like to highlight here the processes of intercultural and interpolitical translation that occurred in the United States over the course of years. These were based on debates over Gandhi's political philosophy as well as on the kinds of struggles Gandhi engaged in and how he organized them. There were trips to India by American activists as well as trips to the United States by Indian activists, not to mention ongoing correspondence with Gandhi himself. Were we to analyze such interactions carefully, we could not but conclude that they are an extraordinary example of an exercise in intercultural

translation. Indeed, the participants, as true rearguard intellectuals, never lost sight of the concrete struggles in which they were involved and instead tried to make sure that reciprocal learning included the different political and cultural contexts in which the struggles took place. As always happens in intermovement relations, particularly when different cultural universes are in question, there was some tension between identitarian essentialism, on the one hand, and subaltern cosmopolitanism, on the other. The former highlighted differences and the impossibility or uselessness of mutual learning; the latter understood Gandhi's philosophy and practice as a precious contribution for strengthening the struggles against oppression in the context of the United States, provided some adjustments were made. Such tension was often manipulated in one way or another by forces alien, if not hostile, to the movements. In the case of Gandhi, identitarian essentialism was reinforced whenever the religious, Hindu foundations of his philosophy, as well as his sainthood, were underscored. As Richard Fox analyzes, in the *New York Times* coverage of Gandhi between 1920 and 1940: "The message itself appears almost entirely as a moral philosophy, which emerges from Gandhi's religious principles, self-sacrifice and love. It is not a political culture that could endure, never mind prevail, independently of Gandhi and outside of India" (Fox 1997: 71).

Fox's reading influenced the social movements and organizations themselves. For example, during the 1920s, Du Bois, even though he was a great admirer of Gandhi, thought that the latter's proposals were applicable only to an Eastern culture that highly valued asceticism, fasting, and nonviolence. His conclusion, then, was that they could not be applied in a modern, Western society such as the United States, and that if they were they would no doubt be considered "a joke or a bit of insanity" (Chabot and Duyvendak 2002: 718). Du Bois writes in 1943: "our culture patterns in East and West differ so vastly, that what is sense in one world may be nonsense in the other" (10).[31]

The truth is that, as time went by, subaltern cosmopolitanism ended up prevailing. The reason was that Gandhi came to be understood less on the basis of his moral philosophy than on the basis of his political philosophy and the resistance strategies derived therefrom. The change occurred because the different Black/African American movements in the United States felt the need to radicalize their struggle, with much discussion with prominent Gandhians and Gandhi himself contributing to it. Among the Gandhian activists who visited the United States at the time, let me single out Khrisnalal Shridharani. After having participated in the 1930 Salt March, he was then forced into exile and went to live in the United States, where he contributed decisively to spreading Gandhi's political practice among the Black movements. His book *War*

without Violence: The Sociology of Gandhi's Satyagraha, published in 1939 (originally a PhD dissertation defended at Columbia University), is a model of the kind of creative selectivity, adequacy, and reconfiguration that are the basis of all successful works of intercultural and interpolitical translation. His words in the introduction are eloquent in this regard: "From the point of view of the Western readers, the interest of this book lies in the fact that here at last comes a contribution from India whose appeal is not based on the traditional 'mysticism of the Orient' but on a very matter-of-fact pragmatism. The whole focus is upon securing effective action, short of the destructive practice of war, for achieving realistic and needed ends" (Shridharani 1939: xxviii). As Shridharani formulates his proposal addressed to a North American audience, he resorts to terms that maximize potential convergences and mutual learning. He explicitly assumes an antiphilosophical stance by setting aside Eastern philosophy. However, as a matter of fact, Shridharani subliminally replaces Hindu philosophy with Dewey's pragmatism, one of the most influential philosophical currents in the United States at the time. He refers to traditionalism ("mysticism of the Orient") with undisguised contempt in the name of modern efficacy and efficiency. Thus, the modifier in "matter-of-fact pragmatism" seems totally superfluous. Finally, he claims, convergence must not be based on abstract principles or unreachable utopias but rather on consequences, on concrete objectives to be achieved, that is to say, on a pacifist struggle for realistic and necessary objectives.

Many North American activists also visited India aiming to explore and strengthen the possibilities of accomplishing a Gandhism without Gandhi in a completely different social and political context. Gandhi fully supported the ongoing learning and intercultural and interpolitical translation. Interviewed by North American activists, he commented, "Well, if it comes true, it may be through the Negroes that the unadulterated message of nonviolence will be delivered to the world" (Rustin 1971: 103). When asked about the relevance of his political practice, he replied, "a minority can do much more in the way of non-violence than a majority. . . . I had less diffidence in handling my minority in South Africa than I had here in handling a majority" (Chabot and Duyvendak 2002: 719).

Gandhi's impact on African American civil rights movements became more obvious after the mid-1950s, particularly when Martin Luther King Jr. and the Montgomery Improvement Association organized the boycott of public transportation in Montgomery, Alabama, in 1955 and 1956. At the time, as noted by David Garrow (1986: 68), King did not know much about Gandhi, but the movement had two members, Bayard Rustin and Glenn Smiley, who accompanied

King and made sure that satyagraha principles were followed. "The Southern Christian Leadership Council (SCLC) served as the institutional vehicle for King and other ministers involved in satyagraha campaigns. The Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), founded after the student sit-ins of 1960 and 1961, referred explicitly to nonviolent direct action in its statement of purpose. And CORE [Congress of Racial Equality, created in the 1940s by, among others, Bayard Rustin] which staged a comeback with the Freedom Riders of 1961, remained committed to its original aims—at least until 1965" (Chabot and Duyvendak 2002: 715).[32] It has been said that Gandhi's influence was interrupted at the end of the 1960s, with the emergence of more radical Black movements. Nico Slate contests such an idea on the basis of an ample analysis of shared struggles for freedom in the United States and India: "Tracing the history of African-American engagement with Gandhi reveals the continuity between early Black nationalism and later notions of Black Power while demonstrating that Black Power did not always entail a rhetoric of violence" (2012: 246).

Gandhi and Andean Indigenous Peoples in the Mirror

During the past thirty years, the increasing strength and visibility of movements and social struggles claiming to be founded on non-Eurocentric knowledges and cultures has forced into the political agenda of many countries the denunciation of cultural suppression and has led in some cases to important constitutional transformations guided by ideas of plurinationality, interculturality, deep legal pluralism, non-Eurocentric conceptions of nature, alternatives to Western-centric development, and so on. This is the case of various indigenous movements in Latin America, particularly in Bolivia and Ecuador, where the constitutions of 2009 and 2008, respectively, established profound changes in the structure of the state and in the model of development by making use of concepts that derive from indigenous ancestral knowledge and cultural universes. Such concepts are inscribed in the text of the constitutions in native languages (Quechua and Aymara), which is a remarkable achievement in modern constitutional texts in Latin America.

The indigenous contributions to the new constitutions help to expand our political and theoretical imaginations beyond Western confines. Moreover, these contributions offer an unprecedented opportunity for new comparisons and intercultural translations with other struggles and movements based on non-Eurocentric ideas and conceptions. As I have been stressing, intercultural translation presupposes the existence of cultural difference but not the polarity

between pristine, uncontaminated entities. The fact that indigenous conceptions, cosmovisions, or philosophies are acknowledged by a hypermodern document (the country's political constitution) is in itself an act of intercultural translation between oral, ancestral knowledge and written, Eurocentric knowledge. As we will see further down, it is possible to identify forms of hybridity giving rise to new cultural phenomena that cannot be reduced to the different parts composing them. This nonessentialist, pragmatic perspective, aiming to strengthen the social struggles (for better or worse, the indigenous movements of Bolivia and Ecuador believed that constitutional acknowledgment of their ideas would assist them in their struggles), opens new possibilities for intercultural translation involving movements and struggles in different parts of the world. In this regard as well, Gandhi provides an excellent point of departure for intercultural translations, this time between distinct cultural universes of the anti-imperial South and between struggles likewise distinct, but having the same objective: anticolonial and anticapitalist resistance.[33]

Both indigenous struggles and Gandhi's affirm the radicality of their claims by formulating them as a civilizational debate. They invoke a civilizational alternative to the capitalist and colonialist version of the Eurocentric civilization that was imposed on them in order to create an external perspective enabling them to engage in a debate and confrontation whose terms are not vitiated at the outset by having been previously defined by the oppressors. Such an external perspective has a performative value to the extent that it aims to deny the age-old abyssal inequality between oppressors and oppressed. It points to a minimally acceptable platform of interactions that may involve selective appropriations, mutual learning, and nonassimilationist articulations and hybridities. In the next sections, I propose two brief exercises in intercultural translation between Gandhi and Andean indigenous movements, one of them focusing on the question of the state, the other on the model of development (aware as I am, nonetheless, of the Eurocentric trap that these concepts carry).

PLURINATIONALITY AND SWARAJ

One of the central demands of the indigenous movements of Latin America has been the recognition of plurinationality of the state.[34] Such a demand, if carried out consistently, would involve the refoundation of the state.[35] In fact, it poses a radical challenge to the concept of the modern state based on the idea of a civic nation—a civic nation conceived of as the set of inhabitants (not necessarily residents) of a certain geopolitical space that are recognized by the state as citizens, and hence on the idea that in every state there is only one nation, hence, the nation-state. Plurinationality is, rather, a demand for the

recognition of another concept of nation, the ethnic-cultural nation, conceived of as belonging to a given ancestry, ethnicity, culture, or religion. It does not preclude national unity from continuing to be celebrated and reinforced; it only prevents plurinationality from being ignored or devalued for the sake of unity.[36]

In the language of human rights, plurinationality implies the recognition of the collective rights of the peoples or social groups in situations in which the individual rights of their members are insufficient to guarantee the recognition and persistence of their cultural identity or the end of the social discrimination they suffer. As shown by the existence of several plurinational states (e.g., Canada, Belgium, Switzerland, Nigeria, New Zealand), the civic nation can coexist with various cultural nations within the same geopolitical space, within the same state. The recognition of plurinationality implies the notion of self-government and self-determination, though not necessarily the idea of independence. This has been the understanding of the indigenous peoples of the Latin American subcontinent, an understanding that also presides over international treaties concerning indigenous peoples, such as Convention 169 of the International Labour Organization and, more recently, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples of 2007.

The idea of self-government underlying plurinationality has many implications: a new kind of institutionalism, a new territorial organization, intercultural democracy, legal pluralism and public policies (intercultural health, education, and social security), new criteria for state planning and administration, citizen participation, and public services. Each one of them poses challenges to the premises underlying the modern capitalist, colonial, and patriarchal state. The recognition of plurinationality implies another project for the country, other objectives for state action, and other kinds of relationships between the state and society. The recognition of national or cultural differences does not imply an ad-hoc juxtaposition of worldviews or an unprincipled hybridism or eclecticism, since plurinationality is bounded by the constitution, that is, by the constitutional mechanisms and criteria that will preside over plurinational and intercultural conviviality.[37]

The demand for plurinationality in Latin America bears striking similarities to Gandhi's demand for swaraj.[38] At the core of the two demands is the idea that, given the cultural and institutional continuities between the colonial and the postcolonial state, political independence from the colonizer does not bring about true liberation.[39] Gandhi saw that long before independence when he wrote *Hind Swaraj or Indian Home Rule* in 1908. The indigenous peoples of Latin America have been experiencing the same for the past two

hundred years. Their most basic experience has been of the multiple expedients through which colonialism reinvented itself after independence, very often under progressive ideas such as equal citizenship rights, individual autonomy, progress, development, or modernization.[40] Moreover, the same appeal to an ancestral, precolonial culture or civilization conceived of as the primary resource for successfully defeating the Eurocentric imaginations and impositions is present both in Gandhi's swaraj and the indigenous peoples' demands.

There are also differences, the main one being that, while Gandhi was struggling for full political independence, the indigenous peoples do not question the existence of the geopolitical entities already in place; they simply fight for self-government within the current states. But, on the other hand, although in different ways, both Gandhi and the indigenous movements of Latin America have similarly hybrid political and institutional imaginations in which the non-Western/ancestral model is combined with the Western/modern model. At the same time that he contributed enormously to the foundation of the Western-based Indian democracy, Gandhi saw in swaraj a republic based on communitarian democracy. Similarly, the Bolivian constitution establishes three forms of democracy: representative, participatory, and communitarian, the last being the consensus-based, rotation-based, ruling-by-obeying-based forms of indigenous local government (article 11 of the new Constitution of Bolivia). Such an exercise in intercultural translation has another virtue: depending on context, converging ideas may be expressed by very distinct concepts. Both Gandhi and the Andean peoples support a political organization that better reflects their ways of life and their cultures and that answers better to their expectations and aspirations. At bottom, all they desire is a political organization of society that allows them to represent the world as their own world and as susceptible to being changed according to their interests. For the indigenous peoples, such an aspiration is formulated by the concept of plurinationality, a concept that, as we have seen, only makes sense under the presupposition that plurinationality will be put into practice in preconstituted geopolitical units called nation-states. In the case of Gandhi, the same desire for autonomy vis-à-vis the Eurocentric conception of the state is formulated as nationality (Indian home rule), which asserts itself against a foreign occupier and can only be concretized through total independence. This is not the time to discuss the ways in which Gandhian nationality combines civic nation and ethnocultural nation (Hinduism), or how Gandhian nationality contradictorily articulates the autonomic aspirations of the tribal people (Adivasi) or of the inferior castes, particularly the Dalits.

One of the novelties of the constitutions of Ecuador and Bolivia is that they resort to indigenous concepts formulated in indigenous languages to define the foundations of the social transformation envisaged by the new political project. In the Ecuadorian constitution, the key concept is sumak kawsay, a Quechua phrase that is usually translated into Spanish as *buen vivir* and into English as "good living" or "living well."[41] In the constitution of Bolivia, we find similar conceptions and concerns. For the first time in a modern constitution, the constitution of Ecuador grants rights to nature, nature understood, according to the Andean worldview, as pachamama (Mother Earth), as I address below. Taken together, these provisions establish that the project for the country must follow very different paths than those leading to the current capitalist, dependent, extractivist, and agro-exporting economies. On the contrary, a solidary and sovereign economic-social model is privileged (León 2009: 65; Acosta 2009: 20). Such a model is based on a harmonious relationship with nature. Nature thus stops being, in the formulation of Gudynas (2009: 39), natural capital in order to become natural heritage. This does not preclude a capitalist economy from being accepted in the constitution, but it does prevent global capitalist relations from determining the logic, direction, and rhythm of national development. The complexity of these constitutional innovations resides in that they signal not just different cultural identities but also new political economies, as illustrated by the demand for the control of natural resources. In Bolivia, such demand calls for the nationalization of natural resources, a struggle that is at least as old as the 1952 Revolution and that became central again in the so-called Water War (2000) and Gas War (2003), the sweeping social mobilizations that led to the election of Evo Morales.

But the programmatic ambition of these constitutional provisions is even more far reaching. Besides establishing a new economic and political model, they put the question of the civilizational project on the table. The ancestral indigenous civilization makes its entrance in a modern Western-centric document and proposes a modus vivendi with the Western models (both capitalist and socialist models) of society, economics, and politics. The civilizational debate is dramatized by the use of concepts expressed in a noncolonial language and that have no close equivalence in a colonial language. I interpret this as an indigenous contribution to overcoming the loss of critical nouns in Eurocentric critical theory as discussed in my previous work (Santos 2014: 33–34). As I said above, the words sound strange and what they express is foreign to the Euro-

centric critical tradition as well. This, in itself, does not eliminate miscegenation or hybridity, as shown below.

Based on shared, ancestral worldviews and forms of knowing and feeling, *sumak kawsay* is a way of living together in harmony, not only among humans but also with nature. This conception presides over the regulation of such diverse areas as water and land, biodiversity, management of natural resources, science and technology, health, education, and so on. The two following definitions of sumak kawsay, expressed shortly after the approval of the constitution, one by an indigenous leader and another by the state planning agency, show the complexity or ambiguity of the concept.[42] According to the former president of the Federation of Indigenous Organizations of Ecuador (CONAIE), "The logic of Sumak Kawsay is the logic of 'good living' (buen vivir), living in a wholesome environment, eating well, enjoying a living space, receiving an education in accord with our reality, health . . . a series of projects that every human being requires to subsist and give life to future generations. . . . The 'buen vivir' was more or less articulated with the economic model: sharing equitably and respecting Mother Nature . . . hence the inclusion of Mother Nature as a subject in its own right and a chapter on the Rights of Nature" (Santi 2008).

According to the Ecuadorian planning agency, sumak kawsay is a wager for change:

> Buen vivir seeks to achieve the satisfaction of needs, the attainment of the quality of life and a dignified death, to love and be loved, the healthy flourishing of all, in peace and harmony with nature and the indefinite flourishing of different human cultures. It recognizes the need for free time for contemplation and emancipation, and that real liberties, opportunities, capacities, and potentialities of individuals grow and flourish in the manner that they permit a simultaneous achievement of that which society, territories, diverse collective identities and each one—seen as both an individual and UNIVERSAL HUMAN BEING—value as the objective of a desirable life. It obliges us to reconstruct the public in order to recognize, understand, and value one another—as diverse but equals—with the goal of making possible reciprocity and mutual recognition, and with this, the self-realization and construction of a social and shared future. (SENPLADES 2009: 6)

These two formulations are different, and not just because they are formulated in two culturally different contexts: grassroots indigenous discourse on the one hand, and Eurocentric official technical discourse on the other. It is

possible to say that they anticipated the different interpretations to which the concept would be submitted in subsequent years, the ambiguities such interpretations would give rise to, and the political conflicts that would result therefrom.

Pachamama is another central concept in the new noncolonial constitutional language. Roughly translated, pachamama is Mother Earth, a living entity that encompasses both human and nonhuman beings. Respect for its life cycles is the precondition for the sustainability of everything else on earth. Regarding the rights of nature, the constitution of Ecuador goes much further than the constitution of Bolivia. After identifying "nature, *Pachamama*, of which we are part and that is vital for our existence," the preamble of the Ecuadorian constitution announces the objective of "a new form of citizen living together, in diversity and harmony with nature, to achieve the good living, the *sumak kawsay*." Throughout the constitution, the rights of nature are specified in different contexts. For instance, article 71 states the right of nature to have its existence fully respected; the right to have its vital cycles, structure, functions, and evolutionary processes sustained and regenerated; and the right of every person, community, people, or nation to demand from the public authorities that the rights of nature be respected and that the state encourage such initiatives. Article 71 also states the right to restoration and the obligation of juridical or natural persons to compensate individual or collective subjects that depend on the affected natural systems.

Gandhi's position on good society (the concepts of swaraj, swadeshi, *sarvodaya*) is strikingly similar to the ideas of sumak kawsay and pachamama of the indigenous peoples of the Andes. Gandhi's nonviolent cosmology challenges the anthropomorphism of modern science and speaks on behalf of nonhuman nature as well, the pachamama of the Andean peoples. Coming from such different cultural universes, these ideas share their non-Eurocentric origin and their being invoked to resist and present alternatives to Western colonialism and capitalism. Bhikhu Parekh emphasizes that Gandhi's good society should cherish epistemological pluralism: "It should appreciate that reason, intuition, faith, traditions, intergenerationally accumulated collective wisdom, and emotions were all valuable sources of knowledge, and made their own distinct contributions to understanding and coping with the complexities of human life. The good society should encourage a dialogue, a creative interplay, between them, and not allow one of them to acquire a hegemonic role or become the arbiter of all others" (1997: 75–76). The idea of autonomy and self-government is present in both conceptions, and in both cases it relies on non-European symbolic universes, normative codes, and conceptions of individual

and collective life. Swaraj as much as sumak kawsay appeals to communitarian democracy. Says Gandhi about village swaraj:

> The government of the village will be conducted by a Panchayat [village council] of five persons annually elected by the adult villagers, male and female, possessing minimum prescribed qualifications. These will have all the authority and jurisdiction required. Since there will be no system of punishments in the accepted sense, this Panchayat will be the legislature, judiciary and executive combined to operate for its year of office. Any village can become such a republic today without much interference even from the present Government whose sole effective connection with the villages is the exaction of the village revenue. . . . Here there is perfect democracy based upon individual freedom. The individual is the architect of his own government. (1942)

There is a difference, however, between the indigenous and the Gandhian conception of community. While the indigenous ontology is communitarian and the individual is conceived of as an individualized version of the community, in Gandhi (even if in some writings more than in others) the autonomy of the individual seems to play a bigger role. Just like sumak kawsay, swadeshi is an ideal of economic self-reliance based on usage rather than accumulation. And the idea of welfare for all is present in both sumak kawsay and sarvodaya. As Dallmayr comments, the "idea of *swadeshi* [is] a broad term designating national self-reliance, preference for homegrown products, and cultivation of indigenous (material and spiritual) resources of development" (2002: 223).

There are also similarities between the nondualistic conception of nature in Gandhi (the idea of the ontological continuity between nature and society) and the conception of pachamama, the Mother Earth that encompasses us all.[43] In Vedic texts the earth is Our Mother (Dharti Mata), or the Universal Mother. According to T. N. Khoshoo (1995: 8), for Gandhi we are a part of nature rather than being apart from nature. Need but not greed, comfort but not luxury must guide our relations with nature. According to Dalton,

> Gandhi's economics seems particularly relevant today to our concerns about the environment because of his insistence that we should not violate nature through self-indulgence. In a plea for self-restraint, he distinguished between essential needs and unnecessary accumulation of things, or between needs and wants. His argument for disciplined voluntary control of the latter is the magnetic center of all his thinking about economics. The concept of *sarvodaya* is most optimistic when it asserts

> that people can summon the common sense to exercise restraint in their own self-interest: not from an instinct of compassion but born of a reasoned judgment that our planet cannot endure forever the blight of endless acquisitiveness. (1996: 132)

On the eve of India's independence, when asked if India would attain British living standards, Gandhi replied, "It took Britain half the resources of the planet to achieve this prosperity. How many planets will India require?" (Bawa 1996: 3048). Resorting to different cultural roots and imagined pasts, Gandhian ideas formulated at the beginning of the twentieth century meet the ideas of indigenous movements in their struggle for genuine liberation and autonomy at the beginning of the twenty-first century. Beyond the more or less superficial comparison between formulations, we should focus on the parallel processes of cultural hybridity that emerge in struggles that resort to non-Eurocentric cultural roots to fight against colonialism and capitalism at different times and in different places. Gandhi was an inventive intercultural translator in search of new cultural and political constellations combining a certain understanding of ancestral Hinduism with Western ideas of emancipation and liberation, particularly those of Western countercultures. Many of his conceptions reveal such hybridity, as in the case of the above-mentioned appeal to individual autonomy, or in his conception of a universal religious truth built upon the contributions of different institutionalized religions, none of them holding a monopoly on truth.

The same construction of hybridity can be identified in the ways in which indigenous conceptions have been enshrined in the new constitutions. Sumak kawsay appears combined with Western-based conceptions of integral, sustainable, and alternative development and of environmental rights. Moreover, the idea of rights of nature or pachamama is itself a hybrid conception. Indeed, within the indigenous worldview, pachamama is the giver and protector of life. As such, it makes as little sense to speak of the rights of nature as to speak of the rights of God within the Christian worldview. Rights of nature is a hybrid that combines the Eurocentric conception of rights with an indigenous conception of nature. Moreover, pachamama is not totally foreign to the global North, even though in the global North it has appeared either in marginal philosophical thinking of the past (*natura naturans* in Spinoza) or in marginal scientific conceptions such as the Gaia hypothesis—Gaia, the Goddess Earth in Greek mythology—proposed by James Lovelock.

To the extent that the Andean peoples resort to the concepts of both human rights and buen vivir, they are closer to Gandhi's conceptions of these top-

ics than to dominant Eurocentric conceptions. Gandhi's approach to human rights is a good example of the kind of diatopical hermeneutics of human rights and other grammars of human dignity that I have addressed elsewhere (Santos 1995: 340–42; see also Santos 2007c: 3–40). Gandhi's approach shows the extent to which it is possible to generate hybrid conceptions mixing Eastern and Western components. According to Parel, although Gandhi is a defender of rights, he defends them in his own way: "Gandhi's defense of freedoms and rights is based on his view of human nature, which he borrows from Indian sources. Humans are body-soul composites. They are by nature social beings. . . . As bodily beings, each tends to claim things as 'mine.' This is reasonable so long as such claims remain within the bounds of natural sociability and the principles of self-rule, and so long as the principles of self-rule have their source in the spiritual soul" (2000: 9).

Gandhi does not consider humans as selfish and rational individuals (as, according to him, Eurocentric philosophy does) but considers them as part of a society and as caring individuals. Humans are not indivisibly good or bad wholes; rather, they are imperfect beings that make mistakes and who, given the choice between good and evil, will on the balance tip toward the good.[44] This view of human nature lends itself to reaching out to other people in order to bridge the gaps and understand each other's point of view. According to Parekh, "Since human beings were not masters or owners but guardians of the rest of creation, they should so organise their collective life that it respected the latter's integrity, diversity, rhythm, and inner balance, and made no more demands on it than was required by a life of moderate comfort" (1997: 75–76).

Conclusion

In the second half of the twentieth century there emerged in different regions of the world new and exhilarating expectations for a counterhegemonic globalization involving social movements, organizations, and people fighting against different kinds of domination. The impetus thereby generated did not evolve as expected. As I said at the beginning of this chapter, the causes of such unfulfilled promises reside in the internal limitations of the counterhegemonic globalization and the repressive measures taken by the national and imperial political powers to suppress peaceful social protest, giving rise to the growing criminalization of social protest. Actually, the repressive political powers proved to have a far better capacity for global articulation than the counterhegemonic movements. We are living today at a time of perplexed consternation, a time dominated by increasingly strong and aggressive neoliberal globalization, on

the one hand, and, on the other, by the stagnation, if not retrogression, of counter-hegemonic globalization.

One of the conditions needed to invert this process and reinforce the alliances between the social movements and organizations that fight against different kinds of domination is a deeper strategic interknowledge between them. Intercultural and interpolitical translation is one of the paths leading to such an objective, particularly at a time when it is becoming evident that there is no global social justice without global cognitive justice. To exemplify the method and virtues of intercultural and interpolitical translation, I engaged in an archaeology—now real, now imaginary—of the work of translation conducted by Gandhi, or inspired by it.

I have tried to show how non-Eurocentric conceptions may successfully question Eurocentric conceptions and eventually enrich them, once the latter learn how to unlearn their imperial cognitive monopolies and accept the global wealth of incomplete knowledges and worldviews. Through reciprocal questioning it is possible to envisage a nonimperial cosmopolitanism, a cosmopolitanism from the bottom up. Gandhi could not be more in tune with the famous formulation—usually attributed to Lilla Watson, an indigenous Australian visual artist—of a decolonized process of intercultural translation: "If you [the global North] come only to help me, then you can go back home. But if you consider my struggle as part of your own survival, then perhaps we can work together."[45]

I have also tried to show the immense obstacles to the workings of genuine, reciprocal intercultural translation that still exist. I have shown how two distinguished, critical Eurocentric intellectuals, Habermas and Chomsky, in spite of what separates them, sit comfortably upon the epistemological foundations of Eurocentric modernity and are solely concerned with confronting it with the need to live up to its proclaimed values, ideas, and conceptions of rationality. For both of them, the global North, as a culture, contains within itself the building blocks for the construction of a better, freer, more just society worldwide. Habermas confronts Eurocentric modernity by proposing a more robust and more inclusive form of rationality capable of resisting the colonization of the lifeworld by capitalism, which has already destroyed the public sphere. In the case of Chomsky, nothing is wrong with the Eurocentric values, ideals, and modes of rationality. What is wrong is the ruthlessness and the impunity with which Western powers (particularly the United States) pursue the interests of global capitalism in total violation of the ideals and values that they purport to defend, thereby imposing upon the world's population, and thus also upon the U.S. population, an immense and unjust suffering.

Gandhi holds a very different view, since he starts from the idea that no culture is complete in the sense of providing all the answers to the all-encompassing desire for self-determination and human liberation. But, conversely, no culture is excluded from contributing to such a task. Contributions from different cultures can only be retrieved through intercultural translation. Far from being a dilettantish exercise in eclecticism, Gandhian translation is an intercultural and interpolitical translation guided by the political needs of a struggle. Rather than considering one culture static and adopting the other, Gandhi made all of them dynamic and borrowed what he considered good from all of them in light of his political purposes and needs, always with the purpose of enriching the overarching ideas of nonviolence, noncooperation, humanity, equality of religions, and reason. Thus, Gandhi molded the existing epistemologies he encountered into a new form. This new epistemology was not born only from Hinduism or Christianity, Jainism, Islam, modernity, British culture, vegetarianism, Tolstoy, or other countercultures from the global North, or from ancient Indian civilization, but from all of them. This new epistemology had a spiritual dimension but was not dogmatic and emphasized human welfare in this world; it criticized scientism, but promoted another type of science.

The Gandhian method of translation is complex, but it is extremely relevant to the tasks of reinventing social emancipation and liberation, in tune with the epistemologies of the South, while bearing in mind the challenges facing the intermovement politics of counterhegemonic globalization in the first decades of our century. Such a method allowed me to imagine an exercise of intercultural translation between Gandhi and the struggles of the indigenous peoples of Latin America. And I did so in my capacity of rearguard intellectual committed to the struggles of the indigenous peoples and in order to fight the isolation to which such struggles and their protagonists are increasingly subjected. At a historical moment when global, neo-extractivist neoliberalism seems intent on completing the task of dispossession and extermination initiated by colonialism and patriarchy, it is crucial to stress that the indigenous peoples are not alone and that their struggles and alternatives to development, although so radically opposed to the prevailing common sense, are not esoteric idiosyncrasies or the residue left behind by an unquestionable and irreversible progress. They do have a past and a future, shared by one of the last century's most brilliant intellectuals. On their basis it becomes easier to imagine and build alliances with other social struggles.

The relations between Gandhi's political philosophy and practice and African American movements against internal colonialism offer new potentialities for intercultural and interpolitical translation. In this case, the North American

movements largely share the cultural assumptions of the global North, some more than others, but they do represent a minority subjected to abyssal exclusion, which places them at a political level similar to that of the colonized Indian minorities represented by Gandhi. As regards the concrete life experiences caused, in India, by a colonialism of foreign occupation and, in the United States, by internal colonialism, both oppressed social groups and their respective rearguard intellectuals find meeting points and points of convergence. It is at this level, and not at the level of abstract principles and cultural assumptions, that common learning can be built.

A century later, the struggles for liberation and self-determination are very different from those faced by Gandhi, and the concrete forms of political activism will be equally different. However, underlying such differences is a resilient method of translation that, by never losing sight of the concrete political circumstances and demands of the moment, holds some lesson for understanding and transforming our current social and political reality. Gandhi did not waste the immense diversity of world experience—quite the opposite. He considered the immense diversity of world experience in such creative and convincing ways that he added a valuable new dimension to that diversity. George Orwell is right when he comments, "I believe that even Gandhi's worst enemies would admit that he was an interesting and unusual man who enriched the world simply by being alive" (1950: 96).

11

PEDAGOGY OF THE OPPRESSED, PARTICIPATORY ACTION RESEARCH, AND EPISTEMOLOGIES OF THE SOUTH

In the course of this book, I have often alluded to the challenges posed by the epistemologies of the South to the institutions where Eurocentric scientific knowledge is produced: schools, universities, and research centers. Such challenges concern both research and pedagogy. I identify here the main ones: the institutional and the noninstitutional; the abyssal and the postabyssal; popular education and popular knowledge. In what follows, I go over each of them briefly. In chapter 12, I focus on two issues, the decolonization of the university and the committed polyphonic university.

The Institutional and the Noninstitutional

If, according to my analysis in the introduction, the epistemologies of the South are like an occupation of the conventional reflection on epistemology, such an occupation must also include institutions and pedagogies. The epistemologies of the South, however, are far from being limited to actions of occupation. Whereas academic and pedagogical institutions treat knowledge practices as distinct from other social practices, the epistemologies of the South, while acknowledging such practices (postabyssal science), include other knowledges and other practices of creating and transmitting the knowledge that results from social practices of resistance and struggle against domination. In such cases,

we have before us research as action and pedagogy as action in a particularly strong sense. The ecologies of knowledges aim to articulate scientific and artisanal knowledges; this is why they pose a powerful challenge to the institutions and pedagogies that are designed to promote and transmit one kind of knowledge alone. The challenge becomes even more powerful if we bear in mind that, whenever knowledges are mobilized in social practices, the distinction between the creation and the transmission of knowledge, between research and pedagogy, ends up being problematic.

The epistemologies of the South are not confined to institutional practices. They combine institutional and extrainstitutional practices. They are political to the extent that they constitute ways of knowing and validating knowledge that aim to contribute to the refoundation of insurgent policies capable of efficiently confronting the current, insidious, and techno-savage articulations between capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy. Such policies, just like the epistemologies grounding them, occur inside and outside of institutions, in parliaments, governments, and judicial systems, as well as, whether formally or informally, in streets, squares, communities, and social networks. The question is not about watertight ways of making politics or constructing and transmitting knowledges, but rather about two complementary ways. The institutional path coexists with the noninstitutional one, the formal way with the informal one. Hybrid forms are actually conceivable in which the institutional and the extrainstitutional interpenetrate. In chapter 10 I described Mahatma Gandhi as a superb intercultural translator. Both Gandhi's political practice and that of the movements I compare it with—the indigenous movements in Latin America and the civil rights movement in the United States—are eloquent examples of the tension between the institutional and the extrainstitutional, as well as of the possibility of interpenetration between them.

The centrality of social struggles in the epistemologies of the South, together with how broadly these struggles are conceived (see chapter 4), point to practices of criticism and possibility, nonconformity and resistance, denunciation and counterproposal, which may be more or less consolidated, more or less formalized, and of longer or shorter duration. Unlike what happens in the tradition of Eurocentric critical thinking, the epistemologies of the South and their practices of struggle do not get polarized or segmented by such dichotomies as revolution/reform or rupture/continuity. In their case, insurgent rebellion is radical; to conclude, however, that radicalism presupposes a given format is a serious mistake.

The extrainstitutional is often no more than testing new institutionalities and new pedagogies. The first few years of participatory budgeting in Porto

Alegre in the 1990s (Santos 1998: 461–510), the *indignados* movement in several countries in 2011 (Santos 2015c: 115–42), and the Oaxaca commune mentioned in chapter 7 are all examples of what I have been calling prefigurative institutionalities; they are extrainstitutional practices that generate new kinds of institutions. Prefigurative institutionalities and pedagogies are ways of organizing collective conviviality and promoting liberating learning processes capable of credibly accomplishing, here and now and on a small scale, another possible future world.

Abyssal and Postabyssal

The epistemologies of the North translated themselves into such institutions of knowledge production and transmission as educational systems and pedagogies, which went on producing and reproducing the abyssal line. I take for granted that, while still a part of the ecologies of knowledges, postabyssal science will be carried out largely at existing institutions—research centers, schools, and universities—and that this will be a source of tensions and conflicts (chapter 12). Even if such institutions are peripheral and perhaps less beholden to the canonical disciplines of dominant research and pedagogy, the postabyssal researcher will tend to be institutionally precarious. This means that, in the long run, the task of the epistemologies of the South will be to change radically the existing institutions and pedagogies and to promote the creation of new ones. What will the profile of these new institutions and pedagogies be? In chapter 12, I trace some aspects of such a profile. Here, I merely identify some guidelines.

First, the centrality of the abyssal line and the struggles against domination imply institutional and pedagogical contexts in which both the dialectical opposition between metropolitan sociability (and subjectivity) and colonial sociability (and subjectivity) and the resulting distinction between social (abyssal and nonabyssal) exclusions must be the objects of constant and careful reflection. Second, the institutions and pedagogies existing at a given moment are the result of past social struggles and what these have accomplished. Dominant institutions and pedagogies tend to discredit the contributions of said struggles. For the past forty years, neoliberal ideology and politics have been destroying organizations and movements, as well as discrediting, intimidating, or co-opting the collective actors that embody the social struggles; they have even attempted to eliminate the very ideas of domination and social struggle against oppression. The repeated mantra that there is no alternative to neoliberal capitalism and all it entails aims to sweep away from social thinking the will to

criticism and the possibility of an alternative. Under such circumstances, the confrontational and insurgent impulse of the epistemologies of the South is as necessary as it is arduous to sustain. The pedagogy of social conflict is harder today than forty years ago, and the existing institutions plot to block it completely. At the institutional level, therefore, the epistemologies of the South must assume a diatopical identity, keeping one foot in existing institutions with a view to changing them, and the other in new institutions of their own creation. Chapter 12 takes up this duality.

The third guideline concerns the institutional and pedagogical contexts in which the sociology of absences and the sociology of emergences may take place. To the extent that it is not confronted, the abyssal line both destroys or conceals social, political, and cultural reality (absences), and destroys or conceals potentialities, possibilities, and alternatives (emergences). From the point of view of the epistemologies of the South, confronting the abyssal line must always combine the sociology of absences and the sociology of emergences, that is to say, denunciation and alternative, critique and possibility. One of the gravest failures of Eurocentric critical thought today is that it focuses exclusively on criticism and denunciation. The absence of alternatives is intellectually convincing only for those who do not need them existentially in their everyday life.

In what kinds of institutional and pedagogical contexts is it possible to carry out a sociology of absences and a sociology of emergences? One of the major challenges concerns the different scales of analysis and intervention privileged by these kinds of sociology. The sociology of absences tends to require macroscales and long historical time frames, that is to say, the vast social and historical fields in which metropolitan and colonial sociability gradually constituted themselves dialectically. A pedagogy of conflict and struggle calls for the distinction, for example, between social groups that cause abyssal exclusions and social groups that benefit from them. Denouncing the latter may result in exempting the former. Identifying an absence at the micro level may be a way of concealing a far more disquieting and subversive absence at the macro level. On the contrary, the sociology of emergences, in order to be convincing and mobilizing, must be capable of articulating at both the micro and the macro levels. The credible potentialities, latencies, and possibilities of resistance against domination must be traced on concrete terrain inhabited by oppressed social groups, that is, at the micro level. By symbolically enlarging them, the sociology of emergences shows that said possibilities are valuable beyond their original context and are therefore credible on a much

larger level, that is to say, at a macro level. They are examples of alternatives that, being possible at a given time and place, may likewise be possible at some other time and place. In other words, in order to perform its pedagogical role and mobilize nonconformist will, the sociology of emergences has to be transscale.

Thus, a certain asymmetry between the sociology of absences and the sociology of emergences must be taken into account. Regarding the sociology of absences, the microscale may be a way of ignoring the abyssal line and thus of deradicalizing the processes that cause absences with a subversive potential once denounced. On the contrary, with regard to the sociology of emergences, the articulation between scales is crucial, since the microscale is needed to turn the disclosure of absence into concrete, realistic possibility and a credible will to fight against domination. Herein lies, indeed, another failure of Eurocentric critical thinking—the treacherous symmetry of scales. Eurocentric critical thought tends to think of alternatives using the same scale with which it denounces capitalism (for example, in capitalism versus socialism). Here, too, the epistemologies of the South assume a diatopical identity: one foot in the macro, another in the micro; one foot in the world, another in the neighborhood; one foot in the future, another in the here and now.

The fourth guideline concerns the ecologies of knowledges, intercultural translation, and the artisanship of practices. The predominant institutions and pedagogies of Eurocentric modernity function according to dichotomies, as in the creation of two groups of people, entities, or functions, each of them internally homogeneous, unequivocally distinct from each other, although related by a hierarchical relation. Examples of such well-known dichotomies include state/civil society; public officer/citizen; teacher/student; knowledgeable/ignorant; man/woman; national/foreigner; worker/migrant, physician/patient; elected representative/voter; governing/governed; majority/minority; citizens/ethnic groups; adult/child; normal/disabled; employed/unemployed. The aforementioned dichotomies are the opposite of diatopical identities. Diatopical dichotomies are grounded on the possibility of being at one or the other pole at different moments or in different contexts, and of easily switching from one pole to the other, that is to say, of accepting the dichotomies but not the hierarchies. In some situations, diatopical identities mean synthetic identities that do not recognize themselves in the dualities.

Ecologies of knowledges, intercultural translation, and the artisanship of practices are based on the idea of a mutual encounter and reciprocal dialogue that supports cross-fertilization and reciprocal exchanges of knowledges,

cultures, and practices fighting against oppression. They promote prismatic perspectives between knowledges, cultures, and practices. Thus, for example, what is considered ignorance, or normality, or a student in a given context may well be considered wisdom, abnormality, or a teacher in another context and by a completely different group. It may even happen that identities, knowledges, and practices emerge that transcend the dichotomies. The epistemologies of the South fulfill themselves therefore by means of diatopical identities, epistemic mingas, and high-intensity democracy. What kinds of institutions and pedagogies welcome, facilitate, and promote such types of fulfillment?

The complexity of this question resides in the fact that the epistemologies of the South promote both cooperation among oppressed social groups and their allies and confrontation with the oppressors and those that benefit from oppression. The construction of diatopical identities and epistemic mingas coexists with the need to define lines of confrontation and thus of nondiatopical dualities. Two such lines or dualities are paramount: metropolitan sociability/colonial sociability; oppressor/oppressed. In the context of these two dualities, diatopical identities and epistemic mingas have no place. Indeed, diatopical identities and epistemic mingas have their place with the oppressed agents and knowledges and their allies that fight against oppression by acknowledging the abyssal line and the exclusions it brings about. That is to say, the epistemologies of the South operate by polarizing the contrast between oppressors and oppressed, and depolarizing the differences between the oppressed, whether they are abyssally or nonabyssally excluded. This means that possible coalitions or articulations between social groups that are nonabyssally excluded and groups that are abyssally excluded can in no circumstance lead to the denial of the abyssal line. If priority is given to abyssal exclusions, that is only because they are the most violent and most silenced, and the ones that deny the ontological dignity of human beings.

The epistemologies of the South thus challenge institutions and pedagogies in a particularly complex way: they contradictorily require polarization and depolarization. Further and foremost, they require that the realms of polarization and depolarization be clearly distinguished. The dilemma of Eurocentric critical thinking has always been its inability to distinguish contexts. Whenever it polarized the differences between the oppressors and the oppressed, it likewise polarized the differences within oppressed groups, thus leading to dogmatism and sectarianism. Whenever it depolarized the differences within the oppressed, it depolarized as well the differences between the oppressed and the oppressors, thus leading to surrender and betrayal.

Popular Education and Popular Knowledge

In this book, as in previous books, I lay out the historical, social, and political contexts that gave rise to the epistemologies of the South. At the intellectual level, the epistemologies of the South would not have been possible without two major proposals that revolutionized pedagogy and the social sciences at the end of the 1960s and during the 1970s: Paulo Freire's pedagogy of the oppressed and Orlando Fals Borda's participatory action research (PAR).[1] These two powerful proposals helped in decisive ways to formulate the epistemologies of the South. Let me explain why.

The two proposals emerged almost at the same time in Latin America, in a context of great social upheaval. It was a time when the contradictory vibrations of the Cuban Revolution were strongly being felt, and American imperialism was trying very hard to prevent the revolution from spreading to other countries. It was a period of popular struggles and revolutionary movements that led progressive forces to power, provoked violent responses from the oligarchies and military dictatorships, strengthened—in the case of Colombia—armed struggle and guerrilla groups, and gave rise to basic ecclesial communities inspired by liberation theology, and to Augusto Boal's theater of the oppressed.

Paulo Freire's and Fals Borda's proposals were formulated autonomously, but they responded to the same problems and advanced convergent solutions. The overall context was the extreme poverty of rural and peripheral urban populations, intense conflicts in the rural world, such as the peasants' struggle for land and salaried rural workers fighting for decent wages, followed by violent repression from large landowners with the state at their service. Both Paulo Freire and Fals Borda were looking for solutions that would strengthen the resistance of peasants and poor urban populations, and they both believed that such solutions required education and knowledge. The peasants had access to neither, but, even if they did, education and knowledge would not contribute at all to strengthening their organizations and struggles. Quite the opposite, since neither a formal education nor canonical academic knowledge was relevant to the objectives of their organizations and struggles and might even serve to weaken one or the other. Something new and different was needed, which had to emerge from the practices and initiatives already in place. The proposals of Freire and Borda are distinct but convergent; both deem education and knowledge to be two inseparable dimensions of liberation politics.

Paulo Freire's starting point is popular education. As we will see later (chapter 12), popular education already had a long tradition, but Freire, inspired by liberation theology and Marxism, proposed a paradigmatic shift: turning

education (beginning with adult literacy) into a process of consciousness raising (he called it *conscientização* [conscientization]; Freire 1970: 19–25) by encouraging the production and acquisition of relevant knowledge in order to identify critically the concrete conditions of life and change them by means of a politics of liberation.[2] Freire's consciousness raising is no idealist concept turning society into the consciousness of itself. Quite the opposite, it means getting to understand social structures as modes of domination and violence, and freedom as the refusal to accept such structures as destiny. This mutual articulation between education, knowledge, and freedom turns the pedagogy of the oppressed into a pedagogy of liberation.[3] Having culture circles (instead of schools), a coordinator (instead of a teacher), generative themes (instead of syllabi), and dialogue (instead of classes) renders education into a praxis of freedom that prefigures a praxis of liberation. Freedom is worth nothing if its purpose is not for men and women to liberate themselves. Conscientization must be understood as a process that facilitates the mobilization of the popular classes, thus making it more difficult for the elites to manipulate them.

Paulo Freire's project includes an epistemological proposal for the construction and appropriation of knowledge, beginning with the learners' existential experience. The dialogic character of education implies a conception of knowledge as coconstruction. "Dialogue is the encounter between men, mediated by the world, in order to name the world. Hence, dialogue cannot occur between those who want to name the world and those who do not wish this naming—between those who deny other men the right to speak their word and those whose right to speak has been denied them" (Freire 1970: 76). The dialogic construction of knowledge concerns "the investigation" of what he terms the "people's thematic universe"—the complex of their "generative themes" (86)—that is to say, the themes that are existentially relevant for the context in which the people who are to educate themselves live; such themes are the starting point for the educational process.

Hence Freire's radical critique of dominant educational policies, which he terms the "banking concept of education" (1970: 58). Such a model of education, he argues, because it polarizes the distinction between teacher and student, eliminates dialogue and encourages the student's passivity. In a society divided between oppressors and oppressed, it cannot but promote the passivity of the oppressed. Thus, Freire's proposal is not simply educational and epistemological; it is also political in the broadest sense of the term. Actually, particularly in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Freire usually speaks of "educational and political action": "One cannot expect positive results from an educational or

political action program which fails to respect the particular view of the world held by the people" (1970: 84).[4]

In the same year that *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* was published, Orlando Fals Borda (1970) published *Ciencia Propia y Colonialismo Intelectual*.[5] In the introduction, Fals Borda admits that the book and the studies that led to it represent a "reorientation in his thought and life" (9). This is an allusion to the brief first phase of his career as a sociologist, when he followed American sociology and its focus on functionalist theories and primitivist methodologies. He wonders if a liberation sociology is possible and replies positively. According to him, this type of sociology "would be an act of scientific creation addressing, at one and the same time, the demands both of method and of the accumulation of scientific knowledge, while contributing not only to the concrete and practical tasks of the unavoidable struggles, but also to the tasks of restructuring Latin American society in a new and more important stage. Theory and practice, idea and action would be thus synthesized—in fruitful exchange—during such a period of creative dynamism" (46). Regarding methods, this kind of autonomous, rebel sociology, "from a global and historical perspective," aims at "the qualitative and the meaning of things and processes, but without rejecting the measurable or despising the sectoral. . . . The objective is to advance with the techniques, building upon what has already been achieved, which in many cases is not to be despised" (58). Fals Borda's is a committed sociology. By commitment he means "the action or attitude of an intellectual who, becoming aware of belonging to the society and the world of his own time, rejects being a simple observer and puts his thinking or art at the service of a cause" (66). He adds that, in times of crisis, "the cause is, by definition, the significant transformation of the community in order to decisively avoid the crisis and go on to replace the current society with a superior one" (66).

According to Fals Borda, commitment-action represents the social scientist's personal attitude vis-à-vis the realities of his own time. The concept is of an ideological nature but is by no means nonscientific. It conditions the choice of themes and analytical priorities, and the definition of and identification with key social groups, turning the latter into the scientist's reference groups. In Fals Borda's own words:

> In order to define the criteria of a pertinent engagement-action in our time of crisis, and to discover those, among the plethora of possible groups, movements or parties, that really deserve to be assisted by our science, the following questions, at least, must be taken care of by the man of science:

1 About a *previous commitment* [pacto]: To which group has he been committed up until now? At whose service has he been, whether consciously or unconsciously? How do his works reflect the interests—economic, political, religious or class—of the groups to which he has belonged?
2 About *objectivity*: Which groups would not fear an objective evaluation of the state of society and would therefore provide their support to the objectivity of science?
3 About *ideal service*: Bearing in mind the humanistic tradition of the social sciences, which groups, movements or political parties really endeavor to serve society as a whole, without thinking about themselves, but rather on behalf of marginalized people that have been, up until now, the victims of history and institutions? Which groups, on the other hand, profit from prevailing contradictions, inconsistencies, and incongruences? (1970: 69)

Such are the principles of Fals Borda's liberation sociology and the methodology of PAR.[6] Through PAR, the "true sociologist" or the "militant sociologist" gets inserted into the application of the politics derived from his analysis. "Thus, it would be essential," Fals Borda explains in *Ciencia Propia*, "for the sociologist's influence and example to rationalize the action of the key groups so that they become more efficient and less erratic, seriously articulating their ideals and changing their emotions into a kind of mystique. Rather than promoting dogmatism, the sociologist should resist the mythologies of the political milieus, opposing McCarthyisms and showing the path of evidence and facts, even if this is a hard and hardly appreciated task" (1970: 71). He also insists that the sociologist, as he inserts himself into political action, must bear in mind that "insertion may go out of focus and bring about counterproductive results when one does not have a consistent engagement and bursts into the community merely to 'agitate,' without taking into account the level of political consciousness of the local people, or when the objective is simply to 'manipulate' the masses" (140). In this and many other points, there is great convergence between Fals Borda and Paulo Freire.

Fals Borda denounces the intellectual colonialism of American sociology as one of the ideological tools of North American imperialism in the Latin American subcontinent and proposes, rather, liberation sociology and PAR as the expression of the desire for revolutionary change, which the Cuban Revolution had rendered so credible. He concludes by offering the idea that "the science of the tropics and subtropics is yet to be made."[7] He has in mind a kind of autono-

mous sociology, appropriate to Latin American reality but devoid of the myopic ethnocentrisms that, in the last analysis, are a sign of inferiority. And he adds, "Of course, the school of Latin American Marxism is more prone to bear the best fruit in this scientific field, which is also a strategic field for the necessary popular revolution" (Fal Borda 1970: 149).

Epistemologies of the South, the Pedagogy of the Oppressed, and Participatory Action Research

The challenges posed by the epistemologies of the South to dominant institutions and pedagogies are not very distinct from the challenges we constantly encounter in Paulo Freire and Fals Borda. But there are differences that need to be underscored. In the following I mention some of the differences that must, however, be understood as an expression of diversity within the same family.

The Historical Context

The discussion of historical contexts is complex for two reasons. On the one hand, their characterization tends to be made from the present to the past. Since there is no consensus regarding the diagnosis of the present, neither is there consensus about the characterization of the past. On the other hand, if they prove to be innovative and open-minded, the theories, epistemologies, and pedagogies proposed in a given context almost always survive that context and, with some adjustment, go on being valid in many very different contexts. Given these caveats, let's look at the contexts. The pedagogy of the oppressed and PAR emerge in a specific historical and political context. As I mentioned above, the American subcontinent was then experiencing intensely the political contradictions between two drives for social change: the Cuban Revolution and the developmentalism recommended by the U.S.-sponsored Alliance for Progress. The contradictions were enormous and had serious political consequences: violence in the countryside and the cities, military dictatorships, imperialist interventions, and guerrilla struggles. Despite certain differences that I can't go into here, both Freire and Fals Borda align with the revolutionary drive, even if this doesn't mean adopting the postrevolutionary model of Cuban society.[8] The proposals of both endeavor to give political, epistemological, and pedagogical content to the post–Cuban Revolution period in Latin America. Since they were innovative and open-minded proposals, they were easily internationalized and were able to be adjusted to very distinct contexts. Throughout his exile in Chile and his sojourn in the United States and various African countries, Paulo Freire

had the opportunity to revise his proposal in various contexts. The pedagogy of the oppressed and popular education gradually became a global proposal resulting in Freire institutes all over the world. The same is true of Fals Borda's PAR. In 1977, the first world symposium on PAR took place in Cartagena; soon after, the International Labour Organization adopted PAR as one of its research methodologies. In the introduction he wrote for *Knowledge and People's Power*, Fals Borda notes that in the previous decade PAR had been used to promote both revolutionary and developmentalist policies.

The context of the epistemologies of the South is not specifically Latin American. It is rather an international context marked by the contradiction between two counterpoised types of globalization: the hegemonic globalization of neoliberalism and the counterhegemonic globalization of social movements. Such counterposition has been symbolized for years by the parallel events of the World Economic Forum, which has taken place in Davos, Switzerland, every year since 1971, and the World Social Forum (WSF), which originally met in Porto Alegre, Brazil, in 2001, and which has since met in various cities in the global South.[9] However, counterhegemonic globalization was never restricted to the WSF. The emergence of the epistemologies of the South also owes a lot to the 1994 Zapatista uprising in Chiapas, Mexico, which was followed by several proposals for political and cultural renewal as well as by proposals for a transnational articulation that resulted in multiple international meetings and the creation of Zapatista groups in many parts of the world.

The context we are dealing with here is profoundly transnational, often having strong articulations between local and global struggles, fully recognizing the diversity of the oppressed groups, and having political orientations that go far beyond the alternative of revolution versus development. Unlike what happened in the contexts of Fals Borda and Freire, literacy tasks are today less pressing, and the oppressed groups are of such variety that they cannot be identified through the general categories of peasants and workers. They include women, indigenous peoples, Afro-descendents, Dalits, and peasants and workers with different traditions of resistance in different continents, as well as ecologists, human rights activists, and so on and so forth. Such diversity calls for new kinds of theoretical, epistemological, organizational, and pedagogical orientations. Besides, they are all today connected through the Internet, and their mobilization depends largely on social networks. This does not mean that the alternatives of another possible world are more credible today or that fighting for them is easier. Quite the opposite, as I try to show below.

As was the case with Fals Borda and Freire, the contradiction separating oppressors and oppressed is crucial in the epistemologies of the South, but

the character of the domination sustaining it is now far more complex. In the work of Fals Borda and Freire, the principal mode of domination, if not the only one, is capitalism, whereas in the epistemologies of the South, domination has three pillars: capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy. The three work together to reproduce and enlarge domination, often resorting to satellite modes of domination, such as religion, the caste system, regionalism, and age or generation.[10]

Such contextual differences no doubt explain some of the differences between the projects of Fals Borda and Freire, on the one hand, and the epistemologies of the South, on the other. But they do not put into question the great affinity and complementarity between these different approaches. Such an affinity resides in the centrality of the relation oppressor/oppressed, in the strong epistemological component of this relation, and in the common objective of strengthening the struggles against oppression by means of articulations that bring about a counterhegemonic globalization. As a matter of fact, regarding this last aspect, the world recognition of Freire's and Fals Borda's proposals contributes to making the pedagogy of the oppressed and PAR a crucial dimension of the epistemologies of the South. Afonso Scocuglia formulates it better than I possibly could:

> I think that when Boaventura poses the possible alternatives to localized globalisms and globalized localisms, at the same time that he invests in cosmopolitanism and the common heritage of humankind, while showing the importance, for example, of the networks formed in the WSF, his corpus of argument may well have in Freire his "political-pedagogical arm" in the sense of fight and conviction that is so proper to the play of hegemony. On the other hand, when Freire proposes the "dialogue as the weapon of the oppressed to fight against their oppressors," as well as probing critical consciousness as a politics of knowledge, he delivers to the militants of counter-hegemonic globalization, as is the case of Boaventura, a few secret paths of struggle for social change. (2009: 122)

Postabyssal Knowledges

I deal first with Paulo Freire and then with Orlando Fals Borda. In *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, the thematic research in which Freire engages is meant to push forward the pedagogical process. "Education and thematic investigation, in the problem-solving concept of education, are simply different moments of the same process" (Freire 1970: 101). The generative themes must be identified in

a dialectical mode to account for the opposition between the groups that wish to maintain the status quo and those that wish to change it. The pedagogical process aims to change limit situations into tasks that, by questioning limits, show the possibility of untested feasibility (92). The goal of the investigation of meaningful thematics is the critical appropriation of a given situation, along with conscientization.[11] This is a dialogic process, since "the methodology proposed requires that the investigators and the people (who would normally be considered objects of that investigation) should act as *co-investigators.* The more active an attitude men take in regard to the exploration of their thematics, the more they deepen their critical awareness of reality and, in spelling out those thematics, take possession of that reality" (97, emphasis in original). Freire concludes, "Since this investigation is to serve as a basis for developing an educational program in which teacher-student and student-teachers combine their cognition of the same object, the investigation itself must likewise be based on reciprocity of action" (99).

Regardless of reciprocity, however, the role of the researcher/coordinator is crucial. It is he or she who leads the process of conscientization, and his/her work as an educator is similar to the sociologist's or anthropologist's fieldwork. It is true that Freire, because he is focused on the educational process, always speaks of the researcher as an educator and not as a social scientist. Thus, the distinction between scientific and artisanal knowledge, crucial for the epistemologies of the South, has no place in Freire's analysis. For Freire, the crucial distinction is between the real and the possible consciousness of the oppressed.[12] It is up to educators to promote the latter, such being the process of conscientization. Nonetheless, the researcher's work is methodologically similar to that of the social scientist. "The investigators begin their own visits to the area [which means that they are outsiders] never forgetting themselves, but acting as sympathetic observers with an attitude of *understanding* towards what they see" (Freire 1970: 102, emphasis in original); "the investigators observe certain *moments* of the life of the area—sometimes directly, sometimes by means of informal conversations with the inhabitants. They register everything in their notebooks, including apparently unimportant items: the way the people talk, their style of life, their behavior at church and work. They record the idiom of the people: their expressions, their vocabulary and their syntax (not their incorrect pronunciation, but rather the way they construct their thought)" (103). Freire thus analyzes in detail the various phases of the research aimed at identifying the generative themes, the constitution of the research team, and the tasks of decodification, concluding that "representatives of the inhabitants participate in all activities as members of the investigating team" (104). However, the re-

search process has a very clear sequence, and the control of the sequence is in the hands of the researcher.

In chapters 6 and 7, I define the conventional methodologies of the social sciences as extractivist. Freire's methodology is not extractivist. As with Oruka's work of oral philosophy (see chapter 9), in Freire as well the goal is not to create knowledge unilaterally by means of the polarization of subject and object but rather to multiply the subjects of knowledge. In any case, it is important to know to what extent the researcher assumes either an abyssal or a postabyssal stance. There is the danger that the phases and sequences controlled by the researcher may turn into a recipe, that is to say, into an educational process totally disconnected from the political action it was supposed to promote.

The epistemologies of the South are based on the distinction between scientific knowledge and artisanal knowledge, as well as on the transformation of abyssal scientific knowledge into postabyssal scientific knowledge in order to be able to integrate ecologies of knowledges and the artisanship of practices. Whereas in Paulo Freire the major objective is the educational project, in the epistemologies of the South it is the ecologies of knowledges, from which the possibility of strengthening the social struggles against domination may emerge. In the latter case, it makes no sense to speak of educators; moreover, the postabyssal researcher must be a rearguard intellectual, never a vanguard intellectual.

Conscientization is crucial to the epistemologies of the South, but it is ideally and tendentially a horizontal process, according to which different groups or different activists and postabyssal researchers contribute with their respective knowledges. Of course, not all the different knowledges have the same level of consciousness. More important than debating differences in level or degree is to articulate different analyses of the context (both diagnoses and prognoses), that is, to identify common points and divergences and note possibilities of mestizaje or hybridization, as well as zones of incommensurability or incompatibility. In the large majority of cases, it is not possible to have an ecology of knowledges without intercultural translation. Awareness of the cultural and epistemological diversity of the world, and hence of the heterogeneity of all the different knowledges, as well as the need for intercultural translation—such are some of the novel contributions of the epistemologies of the South. They might actually contribute to deepening the efficaciousness of the pedagogy of the oppressed. See below the discussion of postabyssal pedagogy.

On the other hand, there is great epistemological convergence between Fals Borda's liberation sociology and the epistemologies of the South. They both value popular or artisanal knowledge, promote objectivity without neutrality,

privilege subject-subject rather than subject-object relations, and link research to social struggles against oppression. The PAR techniques understood as experiencing methodology (collective research, the critical recovery of history, the valorization of folk culture, and the production and dissemination of new knowledge) are essential to construct the ecologies of knowledges and the artisanship of practices. It is nonetheless possible to identify some differences. For the epistemologies of the South, it is crucial to keep the distinction between scientific and artisanal knowledge. The kind of science that is consonant with the epistemologies of the South, that is, postabyssal science, considers itself always as a partial kind of knowledge that engages in dialogue with other kinds of knowledge: this is what the ecology of knowledges is. On the other hand, although he often speaks of knowledge dialogues, Fals Borda aims to build one kind of knowledge alone, that is, scientific knowledge, sometimes identified with one of the disciplines of the social sciences—sociology. According to him, this is "a popular science in which the knowledge acquired and properly systematized would serve the interests of the exploited classes." He goes on to say that this "people's science would converge with the so-called 'universal science' to the point where a totalizing paradigm would be created that would incorporate the newly acquired systematized knowledge" (Fals Borda 1988: 93). The "totalizing paradigm" is Marxism.[13]

In the case of the epistemologies of the South, any totalizing paradigm, particularly if termed scientific, even popular scientific, runs the risk of generating monocultures of rigorous or valid knowledge. The risk is particularly serious when the search for objectivity is linked to social struggles, since it may generate dogmatism, sectarianism, centralism, and, in a word, authoritarianism. In the epistemologies of the South, Marxism plays a crucial role in the critical analysis of the capitalist dimension of modern Eurocentric domination; it also intervenes, along with other theories, in the critical analyses of its colonialist and patriarchal dimension. But it intervenes always as a postabyssal science, that is to say, as a partial knowledge dialoguing horizontally with other artisanal knowledges in the ecologies of knowledges and artisanship of practices. For the epistemologies of the South, this is the only way of preventing popular, artisanal knowledge from being converted into a first step, a starting point, a limited view to be superseded by scientific systematization. To my mind, the risk is there, in both Paulo Freire and Orlando Fals Borda. That they were both well aware of it is clear in their frequent warnings against the "manipulation of the masses," not by the enemies of the popular classes, but by their allies. Should this risk materialize, the possibility of cognitive justice and cognitive democracy would be destroyed.[14]

Two topics must be identified in this regard: the epistemologies of the South as a pedagogy, and how to educate toward the epistemologies of the South inside existing institutions. Let's consider the former topic. As we saw, education is center stage in Paulo Freire's proposal.[15] The distinction between teacher and student is maintained even though the pedagogical process is geared to dialogue and reciprocity. The relation is, nonetheless, still hierarchical. Since the fragmentary vision of the context is inferior to the totalizing one, it behooves the teacher to guarantee or control the passage from one vision to the other. The epistemologies of the South focus on the construction and validation of knowledge between oppressed social groups and their allies with a view to strengthening the social struggles against domination. All the different knowledges are valorized and, in the abstract, there is no hierarchy between them. Hierarchies are contextual and pragmatic in view of the relations of trust between knowledges, subjects of knowledge, and liberating practices, that is to say, in view of their dialogically assessed efficaciousness for strengthening the struggles. The relation between diverse knowledges thus becomes more important than the relation between knowledge and ignorance. The ecologies of knowledges and intercultural translation are processes of reciprocal learning where it makes no sense to distinguish teacher from student. As I have tried to show in the preceding chapters, the postabyssal researcher must undergo an intense process of unlearning in order to escape the temptation of conceiving of postabyssal scientific knowledge as the only valid one or, in any case, as the most valid one. As a matter of fact, if the distinction still holds any meaning, the teachers are not the allies of the oppressed; they are rather the ones that effectively fight and take risks, often fatal risks, in order to survive exclusion and resist domination on behalf of a more just and life-giving society.

Masters, as discussed in previous chapters, are to be distinguished from teachers. Teachers are special beings because they hold special knowledge; masters hold special knowledge because they are special beings. The epistemologies of the South assume and valorize the epistemological and cultural diversity of the world, because they consider it an essential tool for constructing alternatives to the monocultures of knowledge, scales, classifications, temporalities, and productivities that are the staple of the epistemologies of the North. The way to turn such diversity into a liberating resource lies in intercultural translation and the artisanship of practices. The liberating formation of knowledges, cultures, and practices renders totally inadequate the idea of the teacher/student dichotomy. We might say that, even given Freire's caveats,

such a dichotomy could be a hindrance to the construction of the ecologies of knowledges. The epistemologies of the South point to a kind of subaltern cosmopolitanism that avoids totalities and monoliths at all costs. The only totality in the epistemologies of the South, and one that is imposed by Western modernity, is the totality of domination, but even this is conceived of as internally diversified and heterogeneous, made up of infinite articulations and hybridisms linking capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy.

In the nonacademic contexts in which the epistemologies of the South make themselves concrete by contributing to the success of social struggles, the pedagogy of the epistemologies of the South has to do with processes both of unlearning and of the learning necessary to build the artisanship of liberation practices. In such contexts, two pedagogical processes are to be distinguished. The first one concerns members of the oppressed social groups, as well as the activists and leaders forged among them to carry out the struggles against domination. In social struggles, every beginning is a new beginning, each representing breaks and continuities with previous struggles. As I say in chapter 4, every kind of knowledge accumulated in previous struggles is an important resource, both as example (to be followed) and as counterexample (to be avoided).

The epistemologies of the South aim to promote counterhegemonic globalizations, that is to say, translocal articulations between groups and movements that fight against the global domination of capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy. As such, they require that particular attention be paid to the diversity of the world and the processes of domination. They also insist on the need to privilege transscale perspectives on the struggles, perspectives that allow one to view the local importance of the struggles and, at the same time, identify their articulation with other struggles in other places and at the global level. In both cases (diversity and transscale), the epistemologies of the South represent a break with critical thought as well as with the struggles and cultures on the left that in the past resisted oppression. In those cases, the dominant scale was the nation-state and the prevailing critical thought and culture had Eurocentric origins. As such, it tended to be theoretically and culturally monolithic. This often led to dogmatism and factionalism, in sum, to authoritarianism. The epistemologies of the South presuppose that new learnings must be preceded by unlearnings so that the failures of the past may be seen not as errors of practice but rather as errors of the thinking behind the practice.

The pedagogy of the epistemologies of the South poses specific challenges to those aspiring to become postabyssal researchers. In this respect, the previous chapters offer the kinds of orientations that must preside over the necessary

learning and unlearning processes. As I have been stressing, our time is almost a starting time for the decolonization of the social sciences, notwithstanding the gigantic work carried out by Freire, Fals Borda, and so many others in the past five decades. Postabyssal science is as yet an aspiration, an emergence. Being immensely self-reflective, postabyssal science knows how to apply to itself the sociology of absences and the sociology of emergences.

The second pedagogical topic is how to develop the epistemologies of the South within dominant institutions of education and research. After all, these institutions have assumed the role of reproducing and legitimizing the abyssal line. No wonder, therefore, that they conceive of the epistemologies of the South as a dangerous threat and attempt to eliminate or neutralize them. In the previous chapters, I speak of the difficulties faced by postabyssal researchers inside established research institutions; the same could be said of postabyssal educators inside institutions of education. To engage in research and teaching according to the epistemologies of the South implies a profound reformulation of the dominant institutions and pedagogies, and even the creation of others. This is the topic of chapter 12.

Political Orientation and Social Struggles

Political and social struggles are the domain in which the difference in historical contexts is more relevant. I have already said that the context of Paulo Freire and Fals Borda is a revolutionary or prerevolutionary context. Both the pedagogy of the oppressed and PAR have virtues that allow them to be applied in multiple contexts where social inequality is to be found—where there are oppressed and oppressors—as the following decades clearly showed. They were, however, designed in a context in which revolution was a credible and attainable objective, hence the importance of developing a kind of pedagogy and science capable of being up to the situation. In *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Freire addresses both educators and revolutionary leaders, concluding his masterpiece with the following sentence: “Only in the encounter of the people with the revolutionary leaders—in their communion, in their praxis—can this theory be built” (1970: 186).[16] Fals Borda, in turn, speaks of the need for a kind of social research “more in tune with the revolutionary or pre-revolutionary climate and reality of our countries” (1970: 26); he also alludes to an intellectual commitment “with the necessary action to transform society through revolution without losing scientific rigor” (1970: 90). The idea of the vanguard is also strongly present in both of them. According to Fals Borda, PAR aims to convert popular representatives into “efficient and enlightened leaders, members of

a new type of service vanguard who would be non-sectarian and non-messianic, and would not impose their views vertically from above" (1988: 6). He further states, "These enlightened masses which have risen up are the *real vanguard*. . . . The collective pursuit of these goals in social, educational and political practice turns all those involved into *organic intellectuals* of the working classes, without creating permanent hierarchies" (1988: 89–90). The Marxist inspiration is evident, but Fals Borda distances himself from Marxist organizations of the past: "People can be mobilised with PAR techniques from the grassroots up and from the periphery to the centre so as to form *social movements* which struggle for participation, justice, and equity, without necessarily seeking to establish hierarchical political parties in the traditional mould" (1988: 134).

As I said above, the epistemologies of the South emerge in a very different context, their space-time of reference being the anti-imperial South. If I were to link it to the idea of revolution, I would say that the time of the epistemologies of the South is too belated to be postrevolutionary and too premature to be prerevolutionary. The fall of the Berlin Wall seems to have put an end not only to the idea of revolution and socialism but also to the idea of progressive social transformation that always opposed it. I mean reformism, which had its best expression in social democracy during the five decades following World War II. The globalization of capitalism in the form of neoliberalism, which appeared as the alternative erasing of all other alternatives, is creating a time of social inequalities without precedent and of imminent ecological catastrophe, a time of xenophobic nationalisms, of wars in which only innocent civilians die, of refugees from devastated countries and desertified lands, of a cold war swiftly becoming red hot, of the glamorization of wealth, the sequestration of the state by kleptocrats, of the voiding of democracy, of social fascism in the guise of racism and violence against women, of the mercantilization of knowledge and religion, of the erosion of workers' social rights, of total surveillance of bodies, and of the criminalization of social protest.

This is a time of fear overcoming hope. Nonetheless, oppressed social groups continue to resist oppression. They refuse to conform to the status quo and firmly believe that another world is possible. For many of them, the opposition between revolution and reform makes no sense, since it would be for them truly revolutionary to conquer that which others in the past considered mere reforms: the right to education and health, the right to work with rights, and social security. They do not care to ponder whether the revolution/reform duality is still in effect. It is enough for them to know that rebellion is still in effect, as is nonconformity vis-à-vis unjust suffering. Their struggles continue to bear witness to the unfairness and indignity of such suffering. They are not

able to wait for glorious tomorrows and have no tolerance for either revolutionary educators or researchers holding privileged knowledges or powers over which they have no control. They are fully aware of the fact that autonomy, the most recent gift of capitalist, colonialist, and patriarchal domination, is false autonomy, since it has no conditions under which it can be effectively exerted. Even then, they do not discard it; they rather see it as genuine autonomy, though an autonomy in ruins. Ruins that are experienced with autonomy carry in themselves the conditions to become living ruins or seed ruins—sociologies of emergences.

This is not a time of vanguards. It is a time of rearguards, a time out of joint demanding, with short-term urgency, that which depends on long-term civilizational changes, as clearly shown by climate change. The epistemologies of the South are a witness to this time. They place themselves in this time—by the abyss. They make radical diagnoses (the sociology of absences); they do not squander and rather symbolically enlarge every possibility of nonconformity and coherent rebellion (the sociology of emergences); they multiply and democratize insurgent knowledges (the ecology of knowledges and intercultural translation); their ultimate goal is to support autonomous practices of democratic radicalization in every dimension of individual and collective life (the artisanship of practices). Thus conceived, and even though they remain still a mere aspiration, they threaten the institutions of research and education in force. Some aspects of the required institutional and pedagogical changes are analyzed in chapter 12.

12

FROM UNIVERSITY TO PLURIVERSITY AND SUBVERSITY

The conventional university will be deeply transformed by the epistemologies of the South. Out of these transformative processes two new institutional forms will emerge, forms which I call the pluriversity and the subversity. The university is being shaken by two apparently contradictory movements.[1] The first, a bottom-up movement, has to do with the social struggles for the right to university education. The university's elitism, as the utmost exemplar of class, race, and gender discrimination in society and culture at large, has thereby been exposed. To the extent that these struggles are successful, access to the university increases, and new social strata are allowed entrance, thus enlarging the social heterogeneity and cultural diversity of the student body. The other, a top-down movement, concerns the increasing global pressure upon the university to adjust and submit to the relevance and efficacy criteria of global capitalism. The financial crisis of the university, however real, works as an ideal excuse to bring about the university's adjustment and submission to such criteria. In turn, such pressure tends to highlight the fact that the university's elitism is grounded not only on socioeconomic but also on racial, ethnocultural, epistemic, and sexual discrimination. As the university becomes more and more entangled with capitalism, its entanglement with colonialism and patriarchy becomes increasingly visible as well. Thus, the expectations created by the bottom-up movement end up leading to great social frustration.

Dissatisfaction with the university on the part of social groups that only recently gained access to it tends to lead to new social struggles for the right to education and to an education otherwise. The movement devised by global capitalism compelling the university to care for its future brings about, through the university's entanglement with colonialism and patriarchy, a countermovement that challenges the university to confront its past. The university thus faces two mirrors, both of them disquieting, one of them reflecting the image of a very uncertain future, the other reflecting the image of a very problematic past. Actually, the two mirrors are one and the same. Bearing this in mind, I would like to highlight the main features of the decolonization of the university.[2] I am only referring to the decolonization of the Western or Westernized university. Focusing on the articulation between capitalism and colonialism must not make us forget that these modes of domination work in tandem with others, such as, for example, political and religious authoritarianism.

Processes of Decolonization

The processes of decolonization are complex. Areas of possible decolonizing intervention include access to the university (for students) and access to a university career (for faculty); research and teaching content; disciplines of knowledge, curricula, and syllabi; teaching and learning methods; institutional structure and university governance; and relations between the university and society at large. It is not my purpose to analyze them here in detail. All dimensions must however be approached according to the following core ideas:

1. Decolonizing interventions must always be aware of the impact they may have on capitalist and patriarchal domination. Since the relations between the different modes of domination are not always straightforward, partial interventions, if not carefully measured, may well generate perverse results. For instance, a decolonizing intervention regarding history or philosophy may contribute to reinforce patriarchy to the extent that women's knowledges and struggles are minimized or omitted.
2. Decolonizing the university is a task to be conceived of as articulated with other processes of decolonizing social and cultural relations prevailing in society. I have in mind, for example, employment and consumption, employee recruitment for public administration, health policies, family and community relations, the media, secular public

spaces, and churches. Of course, the main target is the educational system as a whole.

3. Decolonizing interventions must not resort to the methods of colonialism, not even inverted colonialism. Mere inversion would make impossible the notion of the unequal cocreation of colonialism, that is to say, that not only the colonizer but also the colonized must be the object of decolonization, though the methods used will be different in each case. This is also the reason why I maintain that the epistemologies of the South are not the inverse of the epistemologies of the North. A bad metaphor does not get better by being inverted. Moreover, the magnitude of the decolonizing task calls for alliances among different social groups. It is more important to know on which side of the decolonizing struggle people are on and what risks they are ready to run than to focus on their identity such as it presents itself, naturalized by the dominant social relations.
4. Decolonizing interventions in the university always occur in the midst of turbulence and conflict. On the one hand, they destabilize institutional inertias. On the other, they reflect long-term social conflicts occurring either covertly or overtly in other sectors of society, conflicts that, in some cases, may turn into university conflicts.[3] It is not to be expected, therefore, that the argumentative serenity of Habermas's (1984) communicative reason would prevail in such conditions. Actually, from the point of view of the epistemologies of the South, it will surely not prevail in any condition riddled with the contradictions dividing societies today.
5. It is only possible to denaturalize the present and sustain nonconformity and indignation vis-à-vis current affairs if the past is viewed as the result of processes of struggle and historical contingencies.

Decolonizing and Demercantilizing

Since the south of the epistemologies of the South is epistemic and political rather than geographical, it is imperative to decolonize the teaching materials and methods in every society in which socioeconomic inequalities combine with racial, ethnocultural, epistemic, and sexual inequalities. The neoliberal transnationalization of the university and the parallel conversion of higher education into a commodity are creating a highly segmented and unequal global university system. Inequality and segmentation are clearly apparent not only if you compare universities in different countries but also within the same

country. To be sure, inequality and segmentation have always existed, but they are now far more visible, more rigid, and better organized.

As I mentioned above, university capitalism is the main driving force behind the global university system, but it always operates in articulation with university colonialism. However, the articulations between university capitalism and university colonialism vary according to world regions. By university capitalism I mean the phenomenon that turned the university into a capitalist enterprise that functions, therefore, according to criteria proper to capitalism. Thus, the university is capitalist not because it is at the service of the reproduction of a capitalist society (this has always been the case, at least in the noncommunist world). It is capitalist when it has become a business corporation producing a commodity whose market value derives from its capacity to create other market values (e.g., diplomas that give access to highly paid jobs). Concerning the highest-ranking universities of the global North, university capitalism is a recent development in a long historical continuity. Since these universities have always been closely associated with the formation of capitalist elites, university capitalism appears to be just an intensification of the aforesaid association. That is why they were able to mobilize so swiftly to be at the forefront of this new development. On the contrary, in the case of the lower-ranking universities, and particularly the universities of the global South, the new university capitalism represents a significant break with the past and, as regards the future, almost a death foretold. By the same token, there is university colonialism when the criteria defining the curricula, the faculty, and the student body are based on an ideology that justifies the superiority of the culture upholding it by means of the following fallacy: the (presumed) superiority of said culture, however much it is based on ethnic-racial criteria, is presented as ineluctable because the culture supporting it is (supposedly) the only true one. Thus, the imposition of one culture upon another appears totally justified.

European university colonialism started at the beginning of European expansion in the fifteenth century and was first significantly established in the universities created in Spanish America from the mid-sixteenth century onward. It went on assuming different forms in the following centuries. Being articulated with global capitalism under imperialism, it ended up being a presence even in societies that were not long subjected to historical European colonialism. In such societies, university colonialism took the form of Eurocentrism or Western-centrism; in this case, its influence had more to do with teaching materials and methods than with discrimination regarding student access or faculty recruitment. I am referring to societies where non-

Eurocentric cultures are paramount but where, nonetheless, the Eurocentric or Western-centric university dominates. The dynamics between university capitalism and university colonialism gain in this case a very specific outlook. In eastern Asia, for example, the expansion of university capitalism may coexist with a deeper critique of university colonialism in the form of a critique of Eurocentrism. There are, among many other examples, interesting proposals to decolonize the university in Malaysia and Singapore (Alatas 2006a; Alvares 2012). In the societies that were subjected to European historical colonialism, political independence changed the operative modes of university colonialism; nevertheless, it survived, albeit under disguised or mitigated forms. In such societies, the expansion of university capitalism tends to go along with increasing or more visible university colonialism. This particular articulation renders university conflicts and student protests far more dramatic and upsetting to university inertias.

In Africa, the contexts of decolonizing education in general, and university education in particular, vary widely. Many factors account for such diversity, from the differences among societies prior to European colonialism to the different colonialisms and processes and struggles for liberation from occupation colonialism. One factor is common to almost all of them: recent liberation from foreign-occupation colonialism and, in the case of South Africa, of internal colonialism (apartheid). This time frame raises the crucial issue of continuities and discontinuities, and especially the issue of continuities reproducing themselves inside the processes of discontinuity. In light of this common factor, the most plausible hypothesis is that the processes of decolonizing the university cannot but be in their first stages.

More than in any other region of the world, in Africa it is imperative to bring into the picture the colonial education that existed fifty years ago. The most remarkable diagnosis was made by Julius Nyerere in March 1967:

> [Colonial education] was not designed to prepare young people for the service of their own country; instead, it was motivated by a desire to inculcate the values of the colonial society and to train individuals for the service of their colonial state. In these countries, the state interest in education therefore stemmed from the need for local clerks and junior officials; on top of that, various groups were interested in spreading literacy and other education as part of their evangelical work.
>
> This statement of fact is not given as a criticism of the many individuals who worked hard, often under difficult conditions, in teaching

> and in organizing educational work. Nor does it imply that all the values these people transmitted in the schools were wrong or inappropriate. What it does mean, however, is that the educational system introduced into Tanzania by the colonialists was modelled on the British system, but with even heavier emphasis on subservient attitudes and on white-collar skills. Inevitably too, it was based on the assumptions of a colonialist and capitalist society. It emphasized and encouraged their individualistic instincts of mankind, instead of his cooperative instincts. It led to the possession of individual material wealth being the major criterion of social merit and worth.
>
> This means that colonial education induced attitudes of human inequality and in practice underpinned the domination of the weak by the strong, especially in the economic field. Colonial education in this country was therefore not transmitting the values and knowledge of Tanzanian society from one generation to the next; it was a deliberate attempt to change those values and to replace traditional knowledge by the knowledge from a different society. It was thus a part of a deliberate attempt to effect a revolution in the society to make it into a colonial society which accepted its status and which was an efficient adjunct to the governing power. (1968: 2–3)

Given this most lucid diagnosis, any thinking, planning, or organizing with regard to the decolonization of the university in Africa today must confront two core questions: How much has the university changed since political independence? Considering that, in Nyerere's own terms, the evaluation of colonial education "does not imply that all the values these people transmitted in the schools were wrong or inappropriate," which were the right and appropriate values and which were the wrong and inappropriate ones?[4]

Twenty years later, and in spite of all the transformations the continent underwent in the meantime, Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o interrogated education in Africa with questions that echoed those asked by Nyerere:

> What should we do with the inherited colonial education system and the consciousness it necessarily inculcated in the African mind? What directions should an education system take in an Africa wishing to break with neo-colonialism? How does it want the "New Africans" to view themselves and their universe and from what base, Afrocentric or Eurocentric? What then are the materials they should be exposed to, and in what order and perspective? Who should be interpreting that material to them, an African or non-African? If African, what kind of African? One

who has internalized the colonial world outlook or one attempting to break free from the inherited slave consciousness? (1986: 101–2)

In recent years, South Africa has become one of the most visible and most polarized contexts for decolonizing the university. Both the Rhodes Must Fall and Fees Must Fall movements illustrate in a dramatic way how intimately university capitalism and university colonialism are today intertwined in the crisis of the university. I would venture to say that, in the South African case, strengthening university capitalism gives more visibility to university colonialism, so much so that the latter becomes an autonomous cause for student struggles, which include both access and recruitment issues and curricula, syllabi, and teaching/learning methods issues. The conflict becomes more intense due to the mutual reinforcement of capitalism and colonialism. More than any other, the South African case shows that it is not possible to decolonize the university without demercantilizing it.[5]

Ecologies of Knowledges as Decolonized Curriculum

The possibility of the mutual enrichment of different knowledges and cultures is the raison d'être of the epistemologies of the South. I would like to conceive of decolonizing the curriculum as corresponding to the task undertaken, at another level, by Frantz Fanon as he defines it at the beginning of *Black Skin, White Masks*: "The white man is sealed in his whiteness. The black man in his blackness. We shall seek to ascertain the directions of this dual narcissism and the motivations that inspire it. . . . Concern with the elimination of a vicious circle has been the only guideline for my efforts" (1967a: 11–12).

The point is not to search for completeness or universality but rather to strive for a higher consciousness of incompleteness and pluriversality, to not valorize knowledges according to abstract criteria founded on intellectual curiosity but rather different knowledges born in struggles against domination or, if not born in struggle, likely to be productively used in struggles. The aim is not to dilute time-spaces into abstract, cosmopolitan nonidentities, without space or time, without history or memory. It is rather to render different ways of knowing more porous and more aware of differences through intercultural translation. In the process, new time-spaces may be created, bringing about subaltern, partial, emergent, and insurgent cosmopolitanisms emerging from the resultant cross-fertilization. Rather than an undifferentiated contemporaneity, it becomes possible to think of multiple forms of being contemporaneous.

What would a curriculum look like as defined along the lines proposed by the epistemologies of the South? The social, political, and cultural context of decolonization will determine the specificities of the curriculum. At the general level, only the broad guidelines or orientations are in place. It would be oriented so as to identify the abyssal line first drawn and then erased by the epistemologies of the North, the line that since the beginning of the modern period divides metropolitan ways of sociability, being, and knowing from colonial ways of sociability, being, and knowing. The abyssal line would be made visible through the ecologies of knowledges, the copresence of different knowledges, each one validated by its own criteria, brought together and jointly discussed in light of the pragmatic needs of social struggles aimed at postcapitalist, postcolonial, and postpatriarchal futures. No single body of knowledge, no matter how ample or sophisticated, can by itself guarantee the success of any relevant social struggle, given the complex interweaving of the different modes of domination, the different time-spaces in which they operate, and the different histories-memories through which they frame individual and collective subjectivities. Herein lies the core idea of the epistemologies of the South: there is no global social justice without global cognitive justice.

Building mutual intelligibility among different knowledges would be the central task of the learning process, and it would be carried out by resorting to procedures of intercultural translation. Two pedagogies would be pursued together, the pedagogy (of the sociology) of absences and the pedagogy (of the sociology) of emergences. The pedagogy of absences would be geared to show the measure of epistemicide caused by northern epistemologies, their monopoly on valid and rigorous knowledge, and the waste of social experience thereby produced. The learning process would identify the absences in our societies (those ways of knowing and being considered irrelevant, residual, ignorant, backward, lazy) and how such absences are actively produced. The pedagogy of emergences would be oriented to amplify the meaning of the latent and potentially liberating sociabilities, the not-yets of hope that exist on the other side of the abyssal line, the colonial side, where absences are actively produced so that domination may proceed undisturbed.

One additional issue must be mentioned at this juncture: the issue of language. In many regions of the world, decolonizing the curriculum calls for a new relationship between the national languages and the language introduced by colonialism (the extent to which, after decades or centuries, it remains a colonial language being one topic for debate).[6] Among others, Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o (1986: 4–33) has cautioned against monolingualism in Africa while emphasiz-

ing the importance of recognizing the epistemological, cultural, and political relevance of plurilingualism.[7] Be that as it may, no person or collectivity can be liberated but in their own language.

Toward a Polyphonic University: The Pluriversity and the Subversity

The countermovement to university capitalism and university colonialism aims to come to terms both with the problematic past of the university and to guarantee a postcapitalist, postcolonial, and postpatriarchal future for the university. I call it the movement toward a committed, polyphonic university, a university in the process of becoming a pluriversity and a subversity. By a committed university I mean a university that, far from being neutral, is engaged in social struggles against capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy. Commitment must be distinguished from militancy. In some political contexts, the university has often been asked to be a militant university, in the sense of providing uncritical, political loyalty to whatever political force presents itself as defending the national interest and that has the power to demand partisanship on the part of the university. The committed university claims for itself a critical distance and an objective but not neutral stance.

By a polyphonic university, I mean a university that exercises its commitment in a pluralistic way, not just in terms of substantive contents but also in institutional and organizational terms. A polyphonic university is a university whose committed voice is not only composed of many voices but, above all, is composed of voices that are expressed in both conventional and nonconventional ways, both in diploma-oriented and non-diploma-oriented learning processes. It is a university that vindicates its institutional specificity by operating both inside and outside the institutions that have characterized it so far.

As I envision it, the committed, polyphonic university will assume two main forms, type 1 and type 2. Type 1 takes place within the confines of existing institutional settings, even if deeply reforming them according to the twin principles of commitment and polyphony. The objective is to build the pluriversity. The polyphonic university of type 2 takes place outside conventional institutions. It consists in occupying the idea of the university and putting it to a counterhegemonic use. The objective is to build the subversity, a term that captures both the subaltern character of social groups often involved in its initiatives and the subversive manner in which it intervenes in the conventional idea of the university.

I have dealt with this topic in greater detail elsewhere.[8] The epistemologies of the South are at the core of the pluriversity. A new, polyphonic university will emerge as the epistemological transformations called for by the epistemologies of the South unfold. I cannot but engage in some kind of an anticipatory consciousness by putting the future before us as if it were here and now. Such consciousness is grounded on the following ideas.

The pluriversity will emerge as a positive response to two main tensions, those created by university capitalism and by university colonialism. The tension created by university capitalism derives from the increasing polarization between knowledge with market value and knowledge without market value. The tension created by university colonialism will derive from multiple fault-lines, but the most polarizing one will oppose abyssal and postabyssal scientific research, that is, the epistemologies of the North and the epistemologies of the South. The two tensions are not symmetrical. All postabyssal researchers aim at knowledge without market value, but most researchers engaged in creating knowledge without market value will probably defend abyssal science. While postabyssal researchers will defend the assertion that the best way to guarantee the pursuit of knowledge without market value is by adopting the epistemologies of the South, abyssal researchers will counter that questioning the premises of the epistemologies of the North opens a Pandora's box that will further weaken the defense of the university against university capitalism. While postabyssal researchers view university capitalism and university colonialism as twin threats and indeed as two faces of the same coin, abyssal researchers tend to focus exclusively on university capitalism. The two tensions will therefore play out in complex interactions, giving rise to unpredictable conflicts and coalitions. In any case, the pluriversity is most likely to emerge from the alliances and accommodations among those defenders of the pursuit of knowledge without market value who are also defenders of postabyssal science.

Beyond a certain threshold, the tension between knowledge with market value and knowledge without market value will lead to an institutional and political split within the university as we know it. From then on and for an unspecified period of time, universities will be dual entities, split educational experiences that a common administration barely holds together. Assuming that neoliberalism fails to put a price tag on every possible piece of knowledge, the educational split will put an end to the idea of knowledge for knowledge's sake. Knowledge production and university training will be confronted with a fatal bifurcation, one that separates those for and those against the commodifi-

cation of knowledge. Researchers and teachers will experience in their skin the consequences of this bifurcation.

From then on, the question of which side you are on will be unavoidable. The conflicts will be more and more open and vicious. Researchers in the fields of knowledge with no market value will not survive if they continue to define themselves negatively, that is, in terms of what they are not (nonmarketable knowledge producers). They will therefore look for positive definitions of their identities, around the values and objectives of market-free knowledge. On this basis, questioning the seemingly all-powerful drive toward the commodification of knowledge and the capitalist industrialization of the university while offering an alternative to it becomes a worthwhile and realistic enterprise. However, given the social isolation of the university, the self-reflexivity of academics will never succeed as long as it remains indoors as a university issue to be dealt with exclusively by academics. Without external allies, non-market-oriented academics will be easily overpowered by market-oriented academics.

The university as we know it may end at this point, unless non-market-oriented academics manage to take their struggle to the world outside the university walls and find or forge alliances in the society at large. Deserted by the elites that traditionally invested in university knowledge, such academics are led to engage in new alliances, considering other stakeholders in the pursuit of nonmarketable knowledges. Such stakeholders are likely to be found in the popular and foundering middle classes. Such groups are socially and culturally very diverse, and their experiences of exclusion, injustice, and discrimination are accordingly very different. This will not be an easy alliance in light of the long history of university elitism. The university has kept itself apart from these social groups, which it has considered ignorant masses, unfit for university training.

A question then arises: under what terms will an alliance or coalition be possible between the researchers and teachers of nonmarketable postcolonial and postpatriarchal knowledge and the social groups outside the university that have been struggling against capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy? If it occurs, such an alliance is not an unprecedented endeavor. Modern critical theories, most notably Marxism, have attempted such an alliance or coalition. We may question the results, but the alliance has undeniably taken place. Truly new, however, will be the terms of such an alliance. While the previous cognitive alliance took place on the terms dictated by the Eurocentric critical social and human sciences, the new alliance will have to be negotiated on new terms, as a conversation about the relative merits of different kinds of knowledges (in

the plural), namely, scientific, erudite knowledges, as well as nonscientific, artisanal, empirical, popular, citizens' knowledges, a conversation in which nonacademic groups will demand that the relevance of the knowledges emerging from their social practices be fully recognized.

This means that the political alliances of the future will have an epistemological dimension, and postabyssal researchers will feel at home with it. Such a dimension will be characterized by an articulation or combination of different and differently relevant kinds of knowledge. The complex tasks that such an articulation or combination will entail are the raison d'être of the epistemologies of the South. The latter's five main orientations are specifically geared to steer these tasks: the sociology of absences, the sociology of emergences, the ecology of knowledges, intercultural translation, and the artisanship of practices. The epistemologies of the South will not by themselves build such badly needed alliances. However, they will give them credibility and strength once they are in place.

I have been suggesting that the new polyphonic university will be a place where the ecologies of knowledges will find a home and where academics and citizens interested in fighting against cognitive capitalism, cognitive colonialism, and cognitive patriarchy will collaborate in bringing together different knowledges with full respect for their differences while also looking for convergences and articulations. Their purpose is to address issues that, in spite of having no market value, are socially, politically, and culturally relevant for communities of citizens and social groups. Will the noncommodified side of the university become a new type of popular university? Will it produce a new type of pluriversal knowledge in which artisanal knowledge will be taken more seriously and in which decolonial, mestizo knowledges will emerge?

It is difficult to detail the types of structural changes that will occur, but a few questions will give a sense of the changes to be made. Can oral knowledge be taught as orature (on an equal basis with literature; see chapter 3) rather than as oral tradition? Can non-PhD holders known for their practical knowledge be part of PhD committees and even pass judgment on the research undertaken by PhD students when their dissertations deal with topics with which they are familiar? Can the abyssal line that divided and still divides the world into metropolitan sociability and colonial sociability be addressed and researched? Will such research be able to guide structural changes within the institutions in which it takes place? Can the classroom be polyphonic, involving two teachers, a scientific and an artisanal one, such as a medical professor and a traditional healer? Can books or other teaching tools be coauthored by

teachers of both scientific and artisanal knowledge? How much time will both teachers and students spend inside the university and outside?[9]

In the short run, the polyphonic university will amount to building the counteruniversity inside the university, seizing any opportunity to innovate on the margins. This will require the intelligent and innovative management of the institutional contradictions that will unfold in an increasingly heterogeneous university, one that is divided between the areas of market as heaven / cooperation as inferno and of market as inferno / cooperation as heaven.

The Subversity

The polyphonic university of type 2 is the subversity. It starts from the assumption that, even if the polyphonic university of type 1, the pluriversity, manages to overcome the multiple obstacles that it will encounter, it will not by itself bring about the ecologies of knowledges called for by the new and more pressing demands for cognitive, social, and historical justice. The monocultures and exclusions that have so far characterized the conventional university are crystallized in such a vast institutional magma, are so deeply entrenched in habitus and subjectivities, that the current institutional frameworks, even when extended according to the principles of committed polyphony type 1, will not guarantee the successful deployment of the more advanced dimensions of the university refoundation project.

The educational project of the subversity is building the popular university. Ideally, the subversity is based on a pedagogy of conflict, an emancipatory pedagogical project aimed toward acquiring knowledges that might produce radical and destabilizing images of social conflicts, images that are, in a word, capable of potentiating indignation and rebellion. Education for nonconformity, then, is education for a kind of subjectivity that submits the repetition of the present to a hermeneutics of suspicion, an education that refuses the trivialization of suffering and oppression by seeing in them rather the result of inexcusable options. Even if the practice of the popular university has not always been consonant with this ideal, the fact remains that the idea of the popular university kept all along a counterhegemonic vocation.

The subversity occupies the name "university" in order to carry out learning processes in institutional and social settings that bear little resemblance to those associated with the conventional university. It carries forward a long tradition in popular education, one that, from the end of the 1960s onward, was dominated by pathbreaking work such as that of Paulo Freire, whose *Pedagogy of the*

Oppressed I dealt with in chapter 11.[10] At the end of the nineteenth century, the quest for popular education led to the creation of popular universities throughout Europe and Latin America. Actually, one of the first popular universities was created in Alexandria, Egypt, in 1901, under the initiative of Italian and Greek anarchist workers (see Gorman 2005: 303–20). The idea of a popular university cropped up at a time when social problems provoked by rapid capitalist development (the social question) got worse (massive emigration from rural to urban areas and abroad, housing shortages, unhealthy environments at work and in cities, breakdown of the family, rise of crime and prostitution, etc.), and the workers' movement expanded and diversified. A great desire to study social problems had its best expression in the social sciences steadily evolving in France, particularly after 1890. The original drive for the creation of popular universities came from anarchist currents, which considered the education of the working class as the preeminent means of raising revolutionary consciousness (see Mercier 1986; Hirsch and Walt 2010). The major concern was how to democratize knowledge at such a new time, deemed to be a period of major changes and conflicts, when knowledge control would be crucial.

In 1898, the first popular university was created in Paris. Its major objective was to spread the social sciences among the elites of the workers' movement. Such elites, like the working class as a whole, were excluded from university learning, as indeed from all formal schooling. As one might expect, there was complete skepticism concerning the mere possibility of "popular university teaching" (considered a true contradictio in adjecto). Nevertheless, during the following fifteen years, 230 popular universities were created, which means that the idea of a popular university met an emergent need felt among the popular classes excluded from formal education. As I mentioned, the initiative was originally linked to anarchism, which had deep roots in Europe at the time, given its emphasis on the education of the proletariat.[11] The communists were more skeptical in this regard, for they believed that the education of workers might end up being a distraction from the most urgent task—class struggle. However, from the 1920s onward, communist parties began to get actively involved in the creation of popular universities and actually became their most enthusiastic and consistent promoters. In Latin America, the first popular university was created in Lima, Peru, in 1921, the Universidad Popular Gonzáles Prada. One of its main supporters was the great Marxist thinker José Carlos Mariátegui, right after his return from Italy, where he had become acquainted with Antonio Gramsci's revolutionary ideas. This is how Mariátegui identified the functions of the popular university: "The only discipline of popular educa-

tion with a revolutionary spirit is this discipline being created at the Popular University. Its function is, therefore, after its modest, original plan, to expound contemporary reality to the people, to explain to the people that they are experiencing one of the greatest and most transcendental times in history, [and to] contaminate the people with the fecund disquietude presently stirring all the remaining civilized peoples of the world" (Alcade 2012).

In the following decades, popular universities appeared all over Latin America and, a little later, in the United States and Canada. Today, there are many popular universities, but most of them are far from meeting the objectives of the type 2 polyphonic university. This is not the place to analyze or evaluate the world of popular universities. My purpose here is merely to stress how the subversity is part of a long and diversified tradition. The objective of popular universities was mainly to spread scientific knowledge about society (about nature as well, subsequently) that was being produced at the time. Such knowledge was inaccessible to the popular classes, especially to the working classes, either because the latter were excluded from formal schooling, because the nature of scientific knowledge made it irrelevant for the needs of workers, or because its complexity rendered it incomprehensible to those deprived of some kind of formal education.

Given the role ascribed to the social sciences in a changing society, those having more of a stake in accessing the knowledge produced by the social sciences were the ones most excluded from it. Popular universities allowed workers to be students in their scant spare time; sometimes they were taught by university professors who, out of political commitment, dedicated part of their free time to teach at popular universities. The university would have meetings in popular and familiar spaces so that the workers could be spared the solemn and hostile environment evoked by conventional university spaces. Particularly during their first years, popular universities had a pedagogical mission that is hard to imagine today (at least in Europe where they first appeared). The degradation of the working body had reached such proportions at the time that the universities would spend a lot of time teaching habits of bodily and sexual hygiene and advising against alcoholism.

The subversity distinguishes itself from first-generation popular universities on at least four accounts. First, the subversity has a broad conception of its subaltern audiences. It does not target only workers; rather, it targets all social groups that are victimized by social exclusion and discrimination on the basis of class, gender, skin color, caste, religion, and so on. In a word, the subversity targets all social groups that suffer the systemic injustices caused by capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy.

Second, the subversity does not have in mind the unilateral transmission of a given, privileged, learned, or scientific knowledge. It rather entertains a pedagogy focused on the ecologies of knowledges and intercultural translation by privileging a dialogue between scientific and artisanal knowledges. Since its audience is often composed of people that are very well informed about popular or artisanal knowledges, the subversity tries to create pedagogical contexts capable of valorizing the latter in their own terms, that is to say, contexts focusing on the reciprocity between knowledges, to such an extent that the distinction instructor/student may end up collapsing. There are no students in the conventional sense, but rather a community of people in the process of building itself as a learning community.

Third, the subversity does not conceive of the pedagogical context as something separate or autonomous. It rather sees it as part of the broader context of social struggle. It thus contemplates a pragmatic pedagogy aimed at strengthening social struggles against exclusion and discrimination. Participation may be geared to advise for or against a given project or course of action, to bring in other experiences, from the past or from other places, that might contribute to understanding the situation (the task or the conflict at hand), or to promote dialogues or facilitate communication through intercultural translation among groups coming from different cultures and holding different symbolic universes or worldviews.

Fourth, the subversity often translates itself nowadays into initiatives originating in social movements themselves. In such cases, the protagonism of people with higher academic or scientific credentials is less relevant. As a consequence, the places where it offers itself today are more varied. Indeed, the subversity takes place in areas that are distant from the main urban centers, in remote valleys or high mountains, in slums, in prisons, and so on. University professors or researchers participate on their own initiative, never following institutional instructions, never expecting to be promoted as a result of their performance in the project chosen, but rather ready to fight against an eventual demotion caused by their participation. Participation may be based on specific expertise or knowledge or on general skills developed while doing research or teaching different topics or in different geographical or temporal settings. Actually, university teachers or researchers participating in the subversity must undergo a complex process of pedagogical unlearning.[12] They must rid themselves of conventional postures in order to be able to view other bodies of knowledge on a horizontal basis. They must endeavor to think of themselves without the titles, the certificates, and the diplomas that decorate them, feel the university aura as a burden rather than an asset, and relearn

how to distinguish the authority of knowledge from the authority of the institution that holds it. Finally, they must learn a new relation between logocentric knowledge and other types of knowledge, including visual and silent knowledge. The objective is, in sum, to attain learned ignorance.[13] The most engaged participation involves physical presence, sharing everyday practices, reciprocal bodily awareness, emotional involvement, and risk taking in collective decision and action (see below the experience of the Popular University of Social Movements—UPMS).

The subversity may assume two main forms. Both of them refer to real experiences. The first form consists of the initiatives that respond to long-term needs, are focused on specific objectives and specific target groups, and require some kind of sustainable performance, which usually assumes the form of a new institution, almost always with a physical presence in a particular location. The second form consists of the initiatives that, although also responding to long-term needs, are more loosely focused on a rather vague institutional base that may dispense with a specific physical location or be multisited.

Concerning those popular universities with a physical location, I restrict myself to mention some of those initiatives of which I have firsthand knowledge and in which I have occasionally participated. Some are closer than others to the ideal of the popular university laid out above, for example: indigenous intercultural universities existing in several countries throughout Latin America; Universidad de la Tierra, UNITIERRA (Chiapas, Mexico), linked to the neo-Zapatista movement; the Florestan Fernandes National School, created by the Landless Workers Movement in Brazil; and Universidad Popular Madres de Plaza de Mayo, created in 1999 by the Asociación Madres de Plaza de Mayo (Argentina).[14]

The errant or itinerant subversity has no physical office or, if it does, it is not used as a learning location. Pedagogical processes occur in the most varied places and engage different audiences. Itinerancy may occur inside the same country or it may be transnational. Here are two examples, one of national itinerancy, the other of transnational itinerancy. La Universidad Trashumante de San Luis, Argentina, convincingly illustrates the possible bridges that can be built between the conventional and the popular university. Facing the conventional university's incapacity to open itself to the pluriversity, university professors committed to social movements took the initiative of creating a parallel institution in collaboration with local social movements and organizations. The Spanish word *trashumante* means errant, itinerant, or migratory. It refers to the university's travels throughout the poor and oppressed regions of Argentina's interior, known as the "other country."

The Popular University of Social Movements

Concerning international itinerancy, I will also mention the Popular University of Social Movements, a popular university with which I am most familiar. During the 2003 meeting of the World Social Forum (WSF) in Porto Alegre, Brazil, I proposed the creation of a popular university of social movements (UPMS is the acronym for the Portuguese name) for the purpose of self-educating activists and leaders of social movements, as well as social scientists, scholars, and artists committed to progressive social transformation.[15]

As I mentioned in chapter 6, the UPMS is an illustration of nonextractivist methodologies by means of which postabyssal research can be conducted and ecologies of knowledges can be built with the objective of strengthening the coalitions among people resisting capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy.

In the first meetings of the WSF, two problems could be easily identified that, if not addressed, would impede the articulations that the WSF was calling for and which it sought to carry out at both the transnational and national levels. The two problems were the gap between theory and practice and the lack of interknowledge among social movements, a lack that generated mistrust and facilitated the spread of reciprocally demeaning prejudices. The gap between theory and practice had negative consequences both for genuinely progressive social movements and NGOs, and for the universities and research centers where scientific social theories have traditionally been produced. Both leaders and activists of social movements and NGOs felt the lack of theories that might help them to reflect analytically on their practices and to clarify their methods and objectives. On the other hand, progressive social scientists, scholars, and artists, isolated from these new practices and agents, felt that they were unable to contribute to this reflection and clarification. They could even make things more difficult by insisting on concepts and theories that were not adequate to these new realities. The UPMS was proposed in order to assist in overcoming the mismatch between theory and practice by promoting encounters between those who mainly devoted themselves to the practice of social change and those who mainly engaged in theoretical production. After innumerable debates, the workshops of the UPMS started in 2007.

The kind of training envisioned by the UPMS is two pronged. On the one hand, it aims to self-educate activists, community leaders of social movements, and NGOs by providing them with adequate analytical and theoretical frameworks. The latter will enable them to deepen their reflective understanding of their practices—their methods and objectives—and thereby enhance their efficacy and consistency. On the other hand, it aims to educate progressive social

scientists, scholars, and artists interested in studying and participating in the new processes of social transformation by offering them the opportunity for a direct dialogue with their protagonists.

The workshops of the UPMS also aim to address the lack of interknowledge among the different protagonists of transformative social activism. Such a lack can be identified at two levels. On the one hand, there is a lack of reciprocal knowledge among movements and organizations that, while operating in different parts of the globe, are active in the same thematic areas, whether peasant, labor, indigenous, women's, or ecological issues. On the other hand, there is an even greater lack of shared knowledge among the movements and organizations that are active in different thematic areas and struggles. While the WSF meetings aim precisely at showing the importance of reciprocal knowledge, their sporadic nature and short duration have made it difficult for them to fulfill this need. Without this reciprocal knowledge, it is impossible to increase the density and complexity of movement networks.

When we compare the UPMS with previous popular universities, some of its features stand out: a greater effort to remove the distinction between teachers and students, given that all participants are equal bearers of valid knowledge; a strong determination to coproduce interesting and relevant knowledge to support the concrete struggles of social movements and activist organizations; a binding political commitment, given that it operates among politically organized participants who are involved in movements and associations; and a commitment to promote collective actions in which movements with relatively different agendas can participate (an intermovement policy).

How Does the UPMS Operate?

The UPMS is guided by two documents, the Charter of Principles and the Methodological Guidelines.[16] It consists of workshops lasting for at least two days and with a residential basis, meaning that the participants all stay in the same place, have their meals together, and share moments of leisure and conviviality. In each workshop participate, on average, forty people, two-thirds activists or leaders of social movements or organizations, and one-third intellectuals, academics, scholars, and artists committed to social struggles. The movements and organizations present must cover at least three thematic areas of a struggle linked to the central theme. For instance, if the theme is land, participants should be convened that are activists or leaders of peasant, indigenous, women's, and urban movements, or any other combination considered relevant in the particular context. Sometimes the organizers also invite the participation

of activists and leaders of movements whose struggles have, on the surface, no relation with the chosen theme. To illustrate: in a workshop in Córdoba, Argentina, in 2016, LGBT and sex worker activists played a very active role in a workshop focused on the ecological impact of mining and industrial agriculture. The geographical range of the workshop varies from a single city or rural area to a country, a subcontinent, or a transcontinent. In Maputo, Mozambique, in 2013, the workshop was organized jointly by peasant and women's movements, having brought together peasant movements from Mozambique and Brazil as well. In the latter case, the groups did not know of each other's existence, much less that they were being dispossessed of their land by the same company, the Brazilian coal multinational Vale do Rio Doce. To their great pleasure, they could easily communicate in the same language, Portuguese. In 2016, in Harare, the Via Campesina organized a UPMS workshop with peasant movements from Zimbabwe, Mozambique, and the landless peasant movement from South Africa.

The pedagogical dynamics of UPMS workshops favor horizontal relations between all participants, including facilitators. The Methodological Guidelines offer guidance about organizational procedures and workshop facilitation. The document details every step while explaining that it must be used as a guidebook, not as a recipe manual, and may be appropriated in different ways and put into practice taking into account the specificities of the workshop. A set of methodological orientations is nonetheless crucial to fulfill the objectives of the workshops and must be followed as closely as possible. The participants of the workshop generate a report that is disseminated on the UPMS webpage. Most workshops end with a public event (a press conference, seminar, public audit, open letter, rally, campaign kickoff, etc.) in which the main results of the discussions are made public.

Each workshop provides an opportunity to test new methods or formats to be shared. They usually tend to exert some influence on the next workshops. Thus it happened that, following the experience of a given workshop, UPMS went on to include a public and stronger political moment.

How Is It Organized?

The UPMS has no physical office. It maintains a virtual archive on its webpage. It has neither legal personality nor administrative structure. The workshops are funded by the organizations and movements that promote them. During the discussions that led to the current format of the UPMS, some social movements expressed the desire to keep the UPMS under the direct control of the

social movements in order to ensure that the popular university really be a school of, and not for, the social movements. A somewhat conflicting concern was the fear that the UPMS might end up being controlled by a powerful movement or NGO, the latter always suspected of having more financial resources and being politically less radical. The strongest resistance came from organizations already involved with similar educational initiatives, such as cadre schools, summer courses for activists, and citizenship schools. The discussions carried out made it clear that the novelty of the UPMS resided in its interthematic character (most of the initiatives already in existence are organized by thematic movements) and its global scope (existing initiatives have a national or regional scope). Far from aiming to compete with these other initiatives, the UPMS is meant to complement the efforts already made, focusing mainly on promoting dialogue at the global level among different political cultures and traditions of activism.

Currently the UPMS is run by some of its young activists, in general people who participated in one or more workshops and felt that such participation was a life-changing experience. They act as facilitators. There are three continental coordinations (Latin America, Africa, Europe). There is also a team that runs the most important UPMS instrument: the webpage. Given the international dimension of the UPMS, its page is crucial for keeping the archive accessible anywhere, allowing photos, videos, and documents to be shared by whoever is interested; to grant global coherence; to spread the project in the broadest way; and to receive and respond to new workshop proposals. The more the UPMS grows, the greater the relevance and dimensions of the website's contents.

Anyone interested may take the initiative to organize workshops, provided they follow the two fundamental UPMS documents. Those who are interested in proposing a UPMS workshop can simply send an e-mail to its web address. The organizers are also those who decide the main theme to be discussed. The proposal will be assessed and answered by the page team and by the regional coordinators. In practice, most of the workshops have been organized by the joint initiative of committed academics working in a university or research center and one or more social movements or organizations. In recent years, several cooperation protocols have been signed between the UPMS and the extension departments of some universities, mostly in Brazil and Mexico. These collaborations will hopefully allow a more sustained and frequent organization of workshops. Such cooperation may also occur with specific research projects. For instance, between 2011 and 2016 the UPMS became associated with a large research project funded by the European Research Council, titled Alice—Strange Mirrors, Unsuspected Lessons, of which I was principal investigator.

The methodology of the workshops seemed most adequate to develop the epistemologies of the South that grounded the project. In the ambit of this project, several workshops were organized across the world.

Partnership with universities and even with local governments has been instrumental in funding workshops, but always on condition that the autonomy of the UPMS be preserved; funding must come with no strings attached, and the Charter of Principles and Methodological Guidelines must be respected. No UPMS workshop may charge any fees to its participants.

UPMS in Action

Since 2007, twenty-nine workshops have been organized. The UPMS was born in Latin America and most workshops have taken place there. However, in recent years, the UPMS has expanded into other continents. Further internationalization of the UPMS is certainly one of its major challenges. Latin America is not only the place where the project was first conceived of and structured, or where the tradition of popular education has deep roots. It is the space where the language barrier is most negligible in terms of the affinities of the official languages of the different countries: Portuguese and Spanish. Workshops carried out in Europe, Asia, or Africa always face the problem of linguistic translation, which adds a new difficulty to intercultural translation. If in academic spaces the language barrier is often overcome by the imposition of English as a working language, the epistemologies of the South and ecologies of knowledges that the UPMS promotes are incompatible with the exclusions produced by resorting to a hegemonic language. Recourse to professional translators almost always implies an unaffordable cost. Oftentimes, the solution lies in resorting to solidary translations by participants who are capable in more than one of the working languages.

The topics dealt with in workshops have been most varied, ranging over an ample array of issues, challenges, and proposals: intercultural translation, the role of the state, the role of the university, land and food sovereignty, human rights, solidarity and popular economies, plurinationality, Afro-descendents' rights, indigenous peoples' rights, ecology, Mother Earth rights, natural resources, extractivism, health, sustainability and quality of life, European challenges, dignity and democracy, land and its appropriation or privatization, land displacement, self-determination and development, human rights, alternatives to development, buen vivir or good living, the capitalist crisis, education, culture, territorial conflicts, leftist challenges, the precariousness of life, and territory.

The UPMS's network is made up of all the social movements, organizations, communities, entities, universities, and every other institution that has participated in the workshops. At present, their number is close to five hundred, including such diverse entities as different peasant organizations, artist collectives affiliated with different movements, Quilombola communities, indigenous groups, LGBT groups, various unions, alternative radio stations, groups of solidary economy and other alternative economies, collectives of peasant women, feminists, Black women, indigenous women, workers' movements (male and female), human rights groups, ecology and agroecology groups, groups concerned with health or traditional and popular medicine, antiracist associations, Islamic collectives, groups of precarious youth,[17] associations of disabled people, *indignados*,[18] collectives for the decolonization of knowledge, neighbors' associations, groups fighting for memory recovery, associations of people living in the streets, garbage collectors, fishermen's associations, research centers, popular and conventional universities, observatories, and foundations.[19]

The landscape of the pluriversities and subversities emerging all over the world is richer and more varied than one can imagine. Many of those working in universities or engaging in their study are victims of the image of institutional rigidity and resistance to reform that the university tends to project of itself. *E pur si muove*. The idea of a committed polyphonic university goes on gaining ground in multiple ways, mainly because of the tenacity and imagination of all those who refuse to reconcile themselves with the idea that the notion of a popular university is an oxymoron.

This page intentionally left blank

Conclusion

BETWEEN FEAR AND HOPE

According to Spinoza, the two basic emotions of human beings are fear and hope. Uncertainty is how we experience the possibilities arising from the multiple relationships between fear and hope. Fear and hope are not evenly distributed among all social groups or historical periods. There are social groups in which fear outweighs hope to such an extent that the world happens to them without their being able to make the world happen for them. They live in expectancy, but with no expectations. They are alive today, but their conditions are such that they could be dead tomorrow. Today they feed their children, but they do not know whether they will be able to feed them tomorrow. Theirs is a downward uncertainty, because the world happens to them in ways that depend little on them. When fear is such that hope has been completely lost, downward uncertainty turns into its opposite, that is to say, it turns into the certainty of fate. In contrast, there are social groups for which hope outweighs fear to such an extent that the world is offered to them as a field of possibilities for them to manage at will. Theirs is an upward uncertainty, that is to say, an uncertainty concerning options mostly leading to outcomes that are desired. When hope is extreme to the point of losing all sense of fear, upward uncertainty turns into its opposite, into the certainty of the mission to appropriate the world.

In normal times, most social groups live between these two extremes. Their lives are marked by more or less fear, more or less hope, and they go through periods dominated by downward uncertainties and periods dominated by upward uncertainties. Those epochs differ according to the relative preponderance of either fear or hope and the uncertainties that result from the relationships between the two. It appears, however, that we are entering an abnormal time, a period when the interdependence of fear and hope seems to collapse as a result of the growing polarization between the world of hopeless fear and the world of fearless hope. A growing percentage of the world's population is faced with imminent risks for which there is no insurance or, if there is, it is financially unaffordable, as is the case with such risks as the risk of death in armed conflicts in which the victims, innocent civilians, are not active participants; the risk of disease caused by the massive use—whether legal or illegal—of hazardous substances; the risk of violence caused by racial, sexist, religious, xenophobic, and other forms of prejudice; the risk of having one's meager resources plundered, be they one's salary or pension or mortgaged home (austerity policies, in the name of financial crises, over which people have no control whatsoever); the risk of being expelled from one's land in the name of overriding development goals from which one will never receive benefits; the risk of job precariousness and the risk of the collapse of expectations concerning the job stability required for making plans (investment in the future) for oneself and one's family. This is the big world of the experience of hopeless fear. In contrast, smaller social groups (the 1 percent) accumulate outrageous amounts of wealth together with such disproportionate, nondemocratic economic, social, and political power as to allow them to insure themselves against virtually any possible risk. This is the small world of the experience of fearless hope.

This polarization has a long history, but it has become more transparent and perhaps more virulent as well. As Kenneth Burke rightly remarked, our time subscribes to "too restrict[ed] a concept of utility involving rigors which even the most primitive societies were spared" (1954: 269). This is due to an unprecedented feature of the polarization of wealth in our time: its epistemological aura, the aura of truth. By means of such an aura, the capitalism and barbarism of our time do not need to obtain, in light of existing alternatives, the consent of vast majorities; the resignation of vast majorities over the fact that there are no alternatives suffices. If resignation does not deliver conformity, there is an alternative way of obtaining it by finding scapegoats, such as immigrants, refugees, Muslims, the poor who deserve no better because their poverty is their own fault, and so on, and so forth. Scapegoating is an enhanced form of resignation because thanks to it the current state of affairs acquires a

double truth value: it is the only valid one and for that reason is permanently threatened by aliens, that is, by ontologically and culturally degraded beings or, in any case, by politically illegitimate ones. Resignation and scapegoating are the degree zero of democracy, even of low-intensity liberal democracy. This when the oppressed systematically elect the oppressors, and the victims elect the perpetrators.

To a large extent, this is the world built by modern science and the myth—based on the progress of science, economic science included—that all social and political problems will have technical solutions. The myth is still with us, now exacerbated by the revolution in information and communication technologies. Nonetheless, the myth begins to lose credibility. It begins to be clear that science is trapped in its own circularity: science only solves problems that science itself defines as scientific. The political, ethical, and cultural dimensions of scientific problems, no matter how evident, elude science. In such an iron cage of cognitive closure, any room given to the consideration of alternatives means gambling with scientific unknowns and political Pandora's boxes. If the alternative to rigorous knowledge is ignorance, it follows that the alternative to the status quo is chaos, the collapse of sociability and governability. In light of this, the core argument of this book is that any intervention aimed at interrupting this kind of politics requires the interruption of the underlying epistemology. What this means is that the epistemological intervention is a political intervention as well. I call this epistemological interruption the epistemologies of the South. Based on them, I claim that the world does not lack alternatives. It lacks an alternative thinking of alternatives. Herein lies the safest path to recover hope in our time—not fearless hope; rather, hope resilient enough not to be overcome by hopeless fear.

The epistemologies of the South are a vast landscape of postabyssal knowledges, postabyssal methodologies, and postabyssal pedagogies whose main objective is to generate a radical demand for the democratization of knowledge, a demand for cognitive democracy. The epistemologies of the South conceive of cognitive democracy as the necessary condition for historical, economic, social, political, racial, ethnocultural, and gender justice. Without radical cognitive democracy, the avatars of conformity and scapegoating will go on building small gated communities for the fearless hope of the few, and large wretched ghettos for the hopeless fear of the many. This is the apartheid of the new era. It can be fought against and undone only if more and more people come to realize that the hopeless fear of the powerless majorities stems from the fearless hope of the powerful minorities. To this the epistemologies of the South propose to contribute.

As argued in this book, the epistemologies of the South start from two premises: (1) the understanding of the world by far exceeds the Western understanding of the world; and (2) the cognitive experience of the world is extremely diverse, and the absolute priority given to modern science has entailed a massive epistemicide (the destruction of rival knowledges deemed to be nonscientific) that now calls for reparation. As a result there is no global social justice without global cognitive justice. My analyses in this book according to these premises allow me to advance the following conclusions. More than conclusions, they are outlines for future research programs.

We must not expect the anti-imperial epistemic South to give lessons to the global North. After five centuries of asymmetrical contacts and mestizajes, it is more correct to think of polycentric ways and sites of learning and unlearning. Resistance against the injustice, exclusion, and discrimination forced upon the global South by the capitalist, colonialist, patriarchal global North must be conceived of as a global insurgent classroom. The trustworthiness of any given way of knowing will be evaluated according to its contribution to strengthening resistance and preventing resignation. Thus, social experiences will be retrieved and valorized in enabling ways, that is, in ways that strengthen the struggles against the three main modern forms of domination: capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy.

The idea of polycentric ways and sites of unlearning and learning does not mean that the profound self-reflexivity to be exercised in the global North and in the global South will be the same. In light of historical epistemicide, self-reflexivity in the global North must be focused on the idea and value of diversity, the recognition of different ways of knowing and of being. It must include reflecting upon the non-Western experience of spirituality. Spirituality, not religion: the transcendent in the immanent. In the global South, self-reflexivity must be focused on how to represent the world as one's own and how to transform it according to one's own priorities after so much expropriation and violence. Forward-looking self-reflexivity is here grounded on the self-esteem deriving from so much resilience in the face of so much adversity for so long.

To situate resistance and struggle at the center of emergent epistemological communities in no way implies that oppressed social groups are taken into account only as long as they struggle and resist. This would mean an unacceptable, modernist reductionism. People do many things other than resisting and struggling; they enjoy life, however precarious the conditions may be; they celebrate and cherish friendship and cooperation; and sometimes they also decide not to resist and give up. Moreover, relations of domination always involve interactions other than those of domination. Focusing on resistance and struggle

aims at expanding the possibilities for such badly needed new, confrontational knowledges. The experiences of liberation struggles for self-determination will enrich a global perspective about ongoing and future struggles.

The abyssal line that divides the world between metropolitan sociability (and subjectivity) and colonial sociability (and subjectivity) is as prevalent today as at the time of historical colonialism. Civil wars, irregular wars, rampant racism, violence against women, massive surveillance, police brutality, persistent xenophobic attacks, and refugees across Europe, Latin America, Asia, and Africa—all are witnesses to the multifaceted presence of the abyssal line. Those on the other side of the line are considered not truly or fully human and therefore must not be treated as if they were human. As long as the abyssal line is not confronted, no true liberation is possible. We should learn about democracy from the perspective of slaves and slave-like workers; we should learn about citizenship from the perspective of noncitizens, refugees, undocumented migrant workers and colonial subjects; we should study the concept of civil society from the perspective of those abyssally excluded, living under conditions of social fascism; we should evaluate human rights from the perspective of large populations considered subhuman or of nature.

These cognitive tasks cannot be carried out within the premises of the epistemologies of the North since they are the ones responsible for reproducing and legitimizing the abyssal line. The new ways of knowing required to denounce and struggle against abyssal exclusions must be grounded upon the epistemologies of the South and advance by carrying out sociologies of absences, sociologies of emergences, ecologies of knowledges, intercultural translation, and the artisanship of practices. These ways of knowing are made possible by nonextractivist methodologies and postabyssal pedagogies. Nonextractivist methodologies aim at knowing-with instead of knowing-about, founding relations among knowing subjects rather than between subjects and objects. Postabyssal pedagogies aim at expanding the co-ownership of transformative and liberating knowledges. How to learn and teach a sociology of absences (produced by the abyssal line) and a sociology of emergences (the not yet, the future under the form of the present)? How to recognize and valorize the narrative of the forgotten, the voice of the silenced, the language of what has been rendered unpronounceable?

Most of the knowledge that circulates in the world and is relevant for the lives of people is oral and artisanal. However, our universities and research centers value written and scientific knowledge almost exclusively. Written and scientific knowledges (the sciences and the humanities) are precious once integrated into ecologies of knowledges that have been developed with

the objective of strengthening the struggles of the oppressed and their allies against capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy. But they must be demonumentalized, oralized, as it were, whenever possible. Insurgent archives must be created.

The centrality of resistance and struggle calls for new conceptions of the political. The disciplines and the analytical categories developed by the modern sciences and humanities prevent us from detecting and valorizing the artisanship of practices of resistance. If it is true that the understanding of the world by far exceeds the Eurocentric understanding of the world, then it is reasonable to admit that the emancipatory, liberating transformation of the world may well end up not following the script developed by Eurocentric critical thinking and political action. In such a case, some of the most paralyzing and self-defeating dichotomies characteristic of that script will vanish. Throughout this book I confront several such dichotomies: culture/nature, individual/community, mind/body, reason/emotion, immanent/transcendent. Concerning more specifically political action, two dichotomies were done away with: materialist/postmaterialist struggles and reform/revolution. As to the materialist/postmaterialist dichotomy, by showing that capitalism never operates in isolation and always in intimate articulation with colonialism and patriarchy, the epistemologies of the South show that it is self-defeating and even counterproductive to privilege in abstract one or the other face of domination. Hostages as they are to Eurocentric critical political theory, current debates on the relative merit of materialist and postmaterialist struggles fail to acknowledge that opting for one type of struggle is the same as opting for none. Concerning reform/revolution, from the perspectives of the epistemologies of the South the paths of nonconformity that lie at the core of the sociology of emergences seem to provide a much richer landscape for insurgent rebellion: ruin seeds, liberated zones, and counterhegemonic appropriations.

When we look at the past through the eyes of the present, we find huge cemeteries of abandoned futures, struggles that inaugurated new possibilities but were neutralized, silenced, or distorted, futures murdered at birth, or even stillborn futures, contingencies that determined the winning choice later ascribed to the course of history. These abandoned futures are also buried bodies, often bodies committed to wrong or useless futures. We worship or execrate them depending on whether the future they aspired to coincides with what we want for ourselves or not. That is why we mourn our dead, though never the same dead. Lest we believe that recent examples include only suicide bombers, martyrs to some, terrorists to others, two celebrations of the assassination of Archduke Francis Ferdinand and his wife, an event that would lead to the outbreak of

World War I, were held in Sarajevo in 2014. In a Sarajevo neighborhood, Bosnians, Croatians, and Muslims celebrated the king and his wife, while in a different neighborhood Bosnian Serbs were feting their murderer, Gravilo Princip, and even erected a statue in his honor.

In the early twenty-first century, the concept of abandoned futures seems obsolete, perhaps even as much as the very concept of a future. The future seems to have stopped in the present and to be prepared to linger there for an indefinite period. Novelty, surprise, indetermination follow one another so trivially that all the good and bad things that were supposed to happen in the future are happening right now. The future has anticipated itself and has fallen on the present. The speed of the time that passes is the same as the speed of the time that stops. The trivialization of innovation goes hand in hand with the trivialization of glory and horror. Many experience this with indifference. They have long given up making the world happen and therefore accept with resignation the fact that the world happens to them. These are the cynics, the professionals of skepticism. However, there are two different groups of people, very dissimilar in kind and size, for whom giving up is just not an option.

The first group consists of the overwhelming majority of the world's population. The exponential rise of social inequality, the proliferation of social fascisms, hunger, precariousness, desertification, expulsion from ancestral lands coveted by multinational companies, the rise of brutal femicide, irregular wars specialized in killing innocent civilian populations—all of this means that an increasingly large portion of the world's population is now focusing on tomorrow instead of looking to the future. The immediate tomorrow is the mirror in which the future does not like to look, because the image it reflects is the image of a mediocre, banal, uninspiring future.

The second group is a very powerful minority group. It envisions itself as making the world happen, defining and controlling the future indefinitely and exclusively so that there is no chance of an alternative future. This group is made up of two fundamentalisms. They are fundamentalist because they are based on absolute truths, they reject dissidence, and they believe that the ends justify the means. These two fundamentalisms are neoliberalism, controlled by the financial markets, and Daesh, the radical jihadists who claim to be Islamic. Although extremely different, even opposed, these two groups do share important traits. They are both based on absolute truths that do not tolerate political dissidence, be it the scientific faith in the priority of investors' interests and the legitimacy of the infinite accumulation of wealth it allows, or religious faith in the doctrine of the Khalifa, which promises freedom from Western humiliation and dominion. They both aim to control access to the most valued

natural resources. They both cause tremendous, unjust suffering, claiming that the ends legitimize the means. To disseminate their proselytism, both resort to new digital information technologies with equal sophistication. Their radicalism has the same character, and the future they proclaim is equally dystopic—a future unworthy of humanity.

Is a worthy future possible between the two unworthy futures I have just mentioned: the minimalism of tomorrow and the maximalism of fundamentalism? I believe it is, although the history of the last one hundred years recommends that we approach it with due caution. Our baseline was not brilliant. The twentieth century began with two major models of progressive change in society, revolution and reformism, and the twenty-first century begins with neither. The Russian Revolution radicalized the choice between the two models and gave it practical political consistency. With the October Revolution, it became clear to workers and peasants (or the popular classes, as we would now call them) that there were two ways of bringing about a better future, which announced itself as postcapitalist or socialist: either revolution, which entailed a (not necessarily violent) institutional breach with the mechanisms of representative democracy, a breach with legal and constitutional procedures, and sudden, dramatic changes in the land ownership system; or reformism, which involved respect for democratic institutions and gradual progress concerning workers' claims as electoral processes progressively became more favorable to them. Both models shared one and the same aim—socialism.

After the failure of the German revolution (1918–19), the idea that reformism would be the preferred approach both in Europe and in the United States (the First World) was progressively gaining ground, while the Third World (note that the Soviet socialist world gradually established itself as the Second World) would follow either the revolutionary path, as indeed happened in China in 1949, or some combination of the two models. In the meantime, as Stalin ascended to power the Russian Revolution became a bloody dictatorship and sacrificed its best children in the name of an absolute truth that imposed itself through maximum violence. In other words, the revolutionary choice transformed itself into a radical fundamentalism that preceded those mentioned above. In its turn, as the Third World freed itself from colonialism, it gradually became clear that reformism would never lead to socialism—it might, at the very best, lead to capitalism with a human face, like the one that was emerging in Europe after World War II. The Non-Aligned Movement (1955–61) proclaimed its intention to reject both Soviet socialism and Western capitalism.

Both models of social transformation collapsed with the fall of the Berlin Wall. The revolution became a discredited, obsolete fundamentalism that col-

lapsed down into its very foundations. Democratic reformism, on the other hand, gradually lost its reformist drive and with it its democratic density. Reformism became a byword for the desperate struggle to maintain the rights of the popular classes (public education and health, infrastructures and public goods, such as water) that had been acquired during the previous period. Reformism thus slowly languished until it became a squalid, disfigured entity reconfigured by neoliberal fundamentalism by means of a facelift and transformed into the sole model of exportation democracy, that is, liberal democracy converted into an instrument of imperialism with the right to intervene in enemy or uncivilized countries and to destroy them in the name of this much-coveted trophy. However, when awarded, the trophy shows its true colors: neon-lighted ruin, transported in the cargo of military and financial bombers (structural adjustment) piloted by World Bank CEOs and the International Monetary Fund.

In the present state of this journey, the revolution has become a fundamentalism similar to the maximalism of current fundamentalisms while reformism has deteriorated into the minimalism of the form of government whose precariousness prevents it from seeing the future beyond the immediate tomorrow. Have these two historical failures been the direct or indirect cause of the imprisoning choice in which we live, between dystopian fundamentalisms and tomorrows with no day after tomorrow? More important than answering this question, it is crucial that we know how to get out of here, which is the condition for the future to become possible again. I will offer a possible way out: if historically democracy and revolution were on opposite sides and both did collapse, maybe the solution lies in reinventing them so they can coexist in mutual articulation. Differently said, democratize the revolution and revolutionize democracy. The artisanship of practices proposed by the epistemologies of the South aims at such a political objective, the topic of my next book.

This page intentionally left blank

Notes

Preface

1 More on this in Marx and Engels (1974: 121–23).

2 Friedrich August von Hayek was an Austrian economist and social theorist who saw the market as the sole way of coordinating human decisions and actions on a social basis that would secure both efficiency and freedom (see von Hayek 2011).

3 This book was developed in the context of the research project Alice—Strange Mirrors, Unsuspected Lessons, coordinated by the author at the Centre for Social Studies of the University of Coimbra–Portugal. The project was funded by the European Research Council, 7th Framework Program of the European Union (FP/2007–13)/ERC Grant Agreement n. [269807] (http://alice.ces.uc.pt/en). This publication also benefits from the financial support of the Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology, under the Strategic Program UID/SOC/50012/2013.

Introduction

1 To be distinguished from the experimental epistemologies introduced by neurosciences and cybernetics.

2 The distinction between knowledge and ways of knowing (in Portuguese, *conhecimento* and *saber*, in French *connaissance* and *savoir*) is, in itself, witness to the challenges facing intercultural translation, discussed below. The difficulty is that this distinction does not exist in English nor perhaps in some other languages as well.

3 On Goethe and modern science, see Uberoi (1984).

4 These assumptions are grounded on a set of beliefs and values that define what can be called the canon of Western philosophy. According to Warren (2015), this canon comprises the following: (a) a commitment to rationalism, the view that reason (or rationality) is not only the hallmark of being human—it is what makes humans superior to nonhuman animals and nature; (b) a conception of humans as rational beings who are capable of abstract reasoning, entertaining objective principles, and understanding or calculating the consequences of actions; (c) conceptions of both

the ideal moral agent and the knower as impartial, detached and disinterested; (d) a belief in fundamental dualisms, such as reason versus emotion, mind versus body, culture versus nature, absolutism versus relativism, and objectivity versus subjectivity; (e) an assumption that there is an ontological divide between humans and nonhuman animals and nature; and (f) universalizability as a criterion for assessing the truth of ethical and epistemological principles (see also Warren 2009).

5 More on this in Santos (2014: 118–35).

6 See below the distinction between abyssal and nonabyssal exclusions.

7 Non-Western colonial knowledge is to be acknowledged and retrieved only to the extent that it is useful to Western-centric domination, as was most notably the case in indirect rule, through which the colonial state resorted to traditional or indigenous law and government to guarantee the reproduction of colonial rule at the local level.

8 These concepts are analyzed in great detail in chapter 10.

9 In the words of Ramose:

> *Ubuntu* is actually two words in one. It consists of the prefix *ubu* and the stem *ntu*. *Ubu* evokes the idea of being in general. It is enfolded being before it manifests itself in the concrete form or mode of existence of a particular entity. In this sense *ubu* is always oriented towards *ntu*. At the ontological level there is no strict separation between *ubu* and *ntu*. *Ubu* and *ntu* are mutually founding in the sense that they are two aspects of being as a oneness and an indivisible whole-ness. *Ubu* as the generalized understanding of being may be said to be distinctly ontological; *ntu* as the nodal point at which being assumes concrete form or a mode of being in the process of continual unfoldment may be said to be distinctly epistemological. Accordingly, *ubuntu* is the fundamental ontological and epistemological category in the African thought of the Bantu-speaking people. The word *umu* shares the same ontological feature with the word *ubu*. Joined together with *ntu* then it becomes *umuntu*. *Umuntu* means the emergence of *homo loquens* who is simultaneously a *homo sapiens*. *Umuntu* is the maker of knowledge and truth in the concrete areas, for example, of politics, religion and law. (2001: 2)

According to Praeg, "Ubuntu is an exercise in power, a primordial attempt to get the fact and meaning of blackness, black values, traditions and concepts recognized as of equal value to the people for whom they matter" (2014: 14).

10 See the full texts of "Bolivia (Plurinational State of)'s Constitution of 2009" at https://www.constituteproject.org/constitution/Bolivia_2009.pdf; and the Constitution of the Republic of Ecuador (2011) at http://pdba.georgetown.edu/Constitutions/Ecuador/english08.html.

11 This topic is discussed in detail in chapter 9.

12 Aldo Leopold was a conservationist, forester, philosopher, educator, writer, and outdoor enthusiast. His essay "Land Ethic" calls for moral responsibility vis-à-vis the natural world. "When we see land as a community to which we belong, we may begin to use it with love and respect" (1949: viii–ix; see also Leopold [1933] 1986). The concept of deep ecology, which calls for population reduction, soft technol-

ogy and noninterference in the natural world, was taken up by environmentalists impatient with a shallow ecology that did not confront technology and economic growth. It formed part of a broader personal philosophy that Naess (1973: 99) called ecosophy T, "a philosophy of ecological harmony or equilibrium" that human beings can comprehend by expanding their narrow concept of self to embrace the entire planetary ecosystem. The term fused *ecology* and *philosophy* (see also Naess 1989, 2002).

1. PATHWAYS TOWARD THE EPISTEMOLOGIES OF THE SOUTH

1 Notwithstanding the fact that some colonies still do exist. Aníbal Quijano coined the term "coloniality" to designate the forms of colonialism that have survived the end of historical colonialism. I have also used this term on occasion; however, as I argue in chapter 6, I prefer the term "colonialism" since there is no reason to reduce colonialism to a specific type of colonialism, that is, the historical colonialism based on territorial occupation by foreign powers. Even though capitalism has changed dramatically since the sixteenth or seventeenth century, we go on designating as capitalism the mode of domination based on the exploitation of labor power and nature.

2 This was noted very early on by the critics of European colonialism. Fanon is particularly aware of this; he quotes Marcel Péju (1960) approvingly: "To make a radical difference between the building up of socialism in Europe and our relations with the Third World (as if our only relations with it were external ones) is, whether we know it or not, to set the pace for the distribution of the colonial inheritance over and above the liberation of the underdeveloped countries. It is to wish to build up a luxury socialism upon the fruits of imperialist robbery—as if, inside the gang, the swag is more or less shared out equally, and even a little of it is given to the poor in the form of charity, since it's been forgotten that they were the people it was stolen from" (Fanon 1968: 103). Some years before, in 1958, Fanon had already denounced the ambivalence of the metropolitan working class and its leaders toward the anticolonialist, nationalist struggle: "During the various wars of national liberation that have followed one another in the last twenty years, it is not uncommon to perceive a hint of hostility, or even hatred, in the attitude of the colonialists towards the colonized. This may be explained by the fact that the withdrawal of imperialism and conversion of the undeveloped structures of the colonial state were immediately accompanied by an economic crisis, which would have been felt first by the workers in the colonial metropolis" (Fanon 1967b: 144–45). Writing in 1965, Kwame Nkrumah offers the most lucid analysis of how the compromise between capital and labor in the developed world was made possible by the ruthless exploitation of the colonies.

3 In Santos (2014: 164–87), I explain the metaphorical use of the term "sociology" in this context.

4 On the concept of learned ignorance, see Santos (2014: 99–115).

5 In Hegelian terms, one would say that the negativity of the sociology of absences is a dialectical one, the negation of a negation, the identification of realities that were

made absent, invisible, or utterly irrelevant so that capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy might be legitimated as the only valid realities by the only valid form of knowledge.

6 The term "NGO-ization" refers to a form of organization of civil, national, and international society based on NGOs concerned with specific thematic interventions (women, the environment, international cooperation, human rights, and so on and so forth). Such NGOs are supposed to have autonomy vis-à-vis the state, whether it be the state harboring them or the state where they were created (see Roy 2014).

7 On the topic of ruins, see, among others, Apel (2015), Dawdy (2010: 761–93), Hui (2016), and Zucker (1961: 119–30).

8 For a synthetic view of my approach and a reflection upon it, see Twining (2000: 194–243) and Santos (2015c: 115–42).

9 "Can Law Be Emancipatory?" is the title of the last chapter of my book *Toward a New Legal Common Sense* (Santos 2002: 439–96). On transformative constitutionalism, see Santos (2010b).

10 In my previous work, I offer detailed analyses of counterhegemonic conceptions of human rights (see Santos 2005b: 1–26; 2007c: 3–40).

11 Inspired by Foucault, I have dealt with heterotopias (Santos 1995: 479–82).

12 The remarkable specificity of the neo-Zapatista experience is that it constitutes a liberated zone also on the epistemological level (see chapters 6 and 7). In chapter 7, I present the Oaxaca commune in 2006 as an illustration of the concept of liberated zone.

13 I analyzed this movement (Santos 2015b; 2015c: 115–42).

14 Initiatives of autonomous social life, supposedly free of capitalist, colonialist, and patriarchal domination, have been taking place in Europe since the 1970s, from the autonomist movements in Italy to the squatter movements in Germany, Spain, Netherlands, and Poland, to the social centers movement in the United Kingdom (see Martínez 2007: 379–98; Hodkinson and Chatterton 2006: 305–15; Polanska and Piotrowski 2015: 274–96). These initiatives must be analyzed according to a hermeneutics of suspicion since there is often a discrepancy between what the promoters say and what they practice.

15 In chapters 6–9 I conceive of methodologies as crafts and craftsmanship. I argue that the social scientist informed by the epistemologies of the South is a craftsman. The epistemologies of the North, particularly as regards their impact on critical theory, especially Marxism, have always been in favor of grand plans and models, and of mechanization, uniformization, standardization; ultimately, they are in favor of having hands replaced by machines, whether these hands be parties, programs, regulations, or statistics.

2. PREPARING THE GROUND

1 On this debate, see, among many others, Gellner (1979), Harris (1992), Miscevic (2000), and Norris (1997).

2 Along with many others cited in the previous note, see Hollis and Lukes (1982).

3 See, among many others, Dussel (2000) and Quijano (2005).

4 For a radical critique of European universalism, see Wallerstein (2006).

5 Worlds of meaning are clusters of widely shared relations of objectivation (the construction of the other) and of subjectivation (the construction of the self).

6 I have dealt at length with these two types of knowledge (Santos 1995, 2002; Santos, Meneses, and Nunes 2007: xvix–lxii).

7 Marxism represents the most brilliant and comprehensive form of knowledge as emancipation in Western modernity. To what extent does the abyssal line prevent Marx from being a postabyssal thinker? Marx paid more attention to colonial questions than what is generally believed, yet it is disputable the extent to which he viewed non-European or noncapitalist societies through lenses other than those that he had developed to analyze the capitalist metropoles. It is true that late in his life he acknowledged the question of multilinear pathways of social development, that is, the need to analyze non-Western societies in their own terms, as exemplified in his correspondence with Vera Sassoulitch (McLellan 2000: 623–28). It is equally true that in his newspaper articles he dedicated sustained attention to the questions of colonialism, race, ethnicity, slavery, and nationalism. Kevin Anderson argues forcefully that these scientific and political interests are constitutive of his mature theoretical work: "The critique of a single overarching entity, capital, was at the center of his entire intellectual enterprise. But centrality did not mean univocality or exclusivity. Marx's mature social theory revolved around a concept of totality that not only offered considerable scope for particularity and difference but also on occasion made those particulars—race, ethnicity, or nationality—determinants for the totality" (2010: 244). Be that as it may, it remains true that, after Marx, Marxism became, in general, an exemplar of Eurocentric abyssal thinking.

8 Social power is never exerted by zero-sum mechanisms. Those who do not have any power of a specific kind almost always have some power of some other kind. A dominated social group is the social group whose powers are not strong enough to change the relations of domination dominating it. On the other hand, a dominated group may minimize the impact of power dominating it by exercising the power it has over another social group more severely dominated than itself.

9 Carl Jung's long forays into Chinese thought helped him to understand the place of modern science: "[Western science] is not indeed a perfect instrument, but it is a superb and invaluable tool that works harm only when it is taken as an end in itself. Science must serve; it errs when it usurps the throne. It must be ready to serve all its branches, for each, because of its insufficiency, has need of support from the others. Science is the tool of the Western mind, and with it one can open more doors than with bare hands. It is part and parcel of our understanding, and it obscures our insight only when it claims that the understanding it conveys is the only kind there is. The East teaches us another, broader, more profound, and higher understanding—understanding through life" (1967: 6–7).

10 "To produce knowledge is to accept the risk of putting to the test our beliefs and our ignorance without reducing what we do know to what we already know and

without dismissing as irrelevant what we cannot describe because we ignore it, but it is also to exercise prudence and precaution when dealing with the unknown or with the possible consequences of our actions" (Santos, Meneses, and Nunes 2007: xxxi).

11 I discuss these problems of the internal pluralism of science again below when dealing with decolonizing methodologies.

12 In a review of my *Epistemologies of the South* (Santos 2014), Hugh Lacey (2015: 159–62) criticizes me for never specifying the distinction between science and other kinds of knowledge. I deal with this issue in chapter 5.

13 Today, divisions inside the scientific community are more widespread than ever. Whenever the divisions are significant, the distinction must be made between the knowledge item that, in a given time-space, all the relevant scientific community considers to be pseudo-science and the knowledge item about which there is a serious debate between the part of the scientific community that considers it to be science and the part that considers it to be pseudo-science.

14 Given the porosity of the borderline between science and nonscience, the same epistemological debate may be considered by some to be about internal pluralism and by others about external pluralism. The relevance of this difference for the epistemologies of the South is that, if a given knowledge item is taken to be scientific, the ecology of knowledges may, by integrating it, benefit from its prestige as scientific knowledge. The same is not true if the knowledge item is discussed within the orbit of external pluralism and taken to be nonscientific.

15 Feminist epistemologies have also contributed significantly to consolidating the idea of the internal pluralism of science. Even if they usually remain within the sphere of the epistemologies of the North, feminist epistemologies allow for the possibility of imagining counterhegemonic uses of hegemonic scientific knowledge.

16 See the Sokal affair and its development in Fujimura (2007: 105–28).

17 In Santos (2015a: 196–410), I explain the tension between the capitalist model of development and environmental rights, especially the right to health.

18 More on this in Hart (1999: 88–114), Horton and Finnegan (1973), Galison and Stump (1996), and Goonatilake (1995).

19 On India, see, for instance, Nandy (1995), Sardar (1988), Uberoi (1984, 2002), and Visvanathan (1997). For a complex analysis of the debate on modern versus alternative science based on a study of magnetic resonance imaging conducted in the framework of social studies of science, see Prasad (2006: 219–27). On the Islamic world, among many others, see Alatas (1995: 89–111; 2006a), Dhaouadi (1996), and Shariarti (1979). To illustrate what is at stake in searching for an Islamic social science, Dhaouadi states, "Human behavior, if studied from an Islamic viewpoint, must be understood in a radically different manner than Freud's libido or Durkheim's social determinism perspectives. The impact of sexual drive or social forces on human behavior is strongly mediated by the intervention of cultural symbols" (1996: 168).

20 More on this in Singh (1988: 15–16).

3. Authorship, Writing, and Orality

1 In part II, I deal with the problem of collective authorship being often unethically (if not also illegally) appropriated by individual researchers and converted into individual authorship. For an empirical study on the extent of such conversion, see Castleden, Morgan, and Neimanis 2010: 23–32.

2 The distinction between the first and the second kind of superauthors is not always unequivocal. For instance, Oruka (1990: 32) submits that both Gandhi and Nyerere are superauthors for being protagonists of liberation struggles as well as sages.

3 Oruka distinguishes between the folk sage and the philosophical sage. The folk sage is the sage "whose thought, though well informed and educative, fails to go beyond the celebrated folk-wisdom. Such sage may not have the ability or inclination to apply his own independent critical objection to the folk beliefs." The philosophical sage, in turn, "may know, as the folk sage does, what the cardinal beliefs and wisdoms of his community are. But he makes an independent critical assessment to what the people take for granted" (1990: 28). Only the philosophical sage can be considered a superauthor in the sense adopted here. The work of Oruka has been much discussed (see, e.g., Masolo 2016; Binte Masud 2011: 874–86).

4 For instance, some of the sages presented by Oruka were literate.

5 In his novels, Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o offers a fusion of orature and literature. See, for instance, *Wizard of the Crow* (Ngũgĩ 2006). See also Colson (2011: 133–53). A similar argument about the Homeric poems as products of an oral or literature culture has been made by Goody (1987: 59–77).

6 Goody warns us: "As members of a written culture, we tend to read our own memory processes onto oral cultures, looking at them through literate eyes, whereas we need to try to look at them from within" (2000: 35). Goody has written extensively on the intersections of oral and written cultures. See, for instance, his analysis of the impact of Islamic writing on the oral societies of West Africa (Goody 1987: 125–38).

7 In the following chapters, I address the epistemological and methodological relevance of deep listening.

8 See chapter 9, on demonumentalizing written knowledge.

9 Finnegan's classic book on oral literature in Africa calls attention to the role of performance in the actualization, transmission, and composition of oral tradition: "Without its oral realization and direct rendition by singer or speaker, an unwritten literary piece cannot easily be said to have any continued or independent existence at all. In this respect the parallel is less to written literature than to music and dance; for these too are art forms which in the last analysis are actualized in and through their performance and, furthermore, in a sense depend on repeated performances for their continued existence" (2012: 5).

10 On the relation between oral and visual texts, see Somjee (2000: 97–103).

11 Peasant communities and indigenous peoples (tribal people or First Nations in North America) face today the challenge of passing on oral knowledge to younger generations through the Internet and other electronic means with which the young

are more familiar. Does the new format of recording and transmitting change the stories? Can all stories be recorded, or are some too sacred to be recorded? Who is to make the selection and based on which criteria? Who can vouch for the accuracy of the transmission in a context in which the storyteller no longer controls the narrative's authenticity or fidelity?

12 Orature, as a narrative art, crosses various temporalities of lived experience, thus allowing for a reflection on memory.

13 The oral tradition often confronts the problem of transcription. Is it adequate or even legitimate to transcribe oral texts? In the anthology of indigenous writing from New England edited by him, Siobhan Senier mentions that Leslie Marmon Silko (Laguna) "once derided transcribed oral narratives as outright cultural theft, on the ground that these traditions were either completely misrepresented in print or never should have been written down in the first place" (Senier 2014a: 7).

14 See Cusicanqui (1986: 83–88; 1993: 25–139) and THOA (1988, 1995). See also Stephenson (2002: 99–118).

15 González Casanova's monumental work in four volumes (1984–85), bringing together social scientists from the entire continent, speaks eloquently to such a complementarity. In his introduction to volume 1, Casanova writes, "The history of the emergence of the consciousness, strategy and tactics of Indians and peasants is as fascinating for its demystifications—among others, models and paradigms, and authoritarian and abstract schools and doctrines—as for the discovery of a whole culture of struggle against epistemological and political submission" (1984: 11). More than twenty years would have to go by until the social movements could see the acknowledgment of their own intellectuals ("organic intellectuals," "native intellectuals") in a rather more plural epistemological context than that of the 1970s and 1980s. I return to this topic in part II. An excellent overview of the epistemological change can be read in Esteva, Valencia, and Venegas (2008). See especially Giarraca (2008, 121–36).

16 Goody (1987: 11–18) makes a similar argument in his analysis of the Vedic recitations, the sacred texts of orthodox Hindus.

17 In the nineteenth century, Schopenhauer offered the most forceful defense of written knowledge while critically evaluating the contributions of Socrates, a supposedly oral philosopher, to Western philosophy. It calls for a long citation: "But the organ whereby one speaks to *humanity* is only writing; verbally one addresses only a number of individuals, and so what is thus said remains in relation to the human race as a private matter. For such individuals generally are a poor soil for a rich and noble seed; in such soil either it does not thrive at all, or it rapidly degenerates in what it produces; and so the seed itself must be preserved. Yet this is not done through tradition that is falsified at every step, but solely through writing, this one and only faithful preserver of thoughts. Moreover, every profound thinker necessarily has the impulse, for his own satisfaction, to fix and retain his ideas and to reduce them to the greatest possible clearness and precision, and consequently to embody them in words. But this is done to perfection only by writing; for the written report is essentially different from the verbal, since it alone admits of the highest precision, concision, and pregnant brevity, and consequently becomes

the pure ectype of the thought. As a result of this, it would be a strange presumption in a thinker to want to leave unused the most important invention of the human race. Accordingly, it is hard for me to believe in the really great intellect of those who have not written; on the contrary, I am inclined to regard them mainly as practical heroes who effected more by their character than by their brains. The sublime authors of the *Upanishads* of the *Vedas* have written, although the *Sanhita* of the *Vedas*, consisting of mere prayers, were at first propagated only verbally" (2010: 41).

18 See two excellent collections of essays on the topic in Draper (2003, 2004).

19 The gaps or cracks are the spaces of liminality theorized by Turner (1969: 94–113). On the concept of the bricoleur in this context, see Draper (2003: 63).

20 Even though the written text has its own fixity, what is meant by "written text" has likewise evolved over the course of years. Up until the eighteenth century, written literary texts were meant to be read aloud (Livy wrote his history to be read aloud), and only later did reading in silence became common. On the other hand, the texts produced since then have nothing to do with what circulates in social networks. On this topic the work of Walter Ong (1982) is still essential.

4. What Is Struggle? What Is Experience?

1 More on this in Bourdieu (1979).

2 This tension between theory and activism takes quite a personal tone in Bourdieu (2002).

3 More on this in chapter 1, note 6.

4 The historical relevance of such forms of struggle and resistance is rightly stressed when Scott says, "taking a long historical view, one sees that the luxury of relatively safe, open political opposition is both rare and recent" (1985: 199).

5 See Scott (1985: 29). Silent struggles may take many other forms, for instance, eating forbidden food, crossing lines supposedly by mistake, destroying seeds and working tools, failing to show up, and so on.

6 In the Latin American context and inspired by the work of Bolivar Echeverría, I analyzed these types of strategies of resistance and the types of knowledges that are associated with them as constituting a deceptively deviant ethos, the baroque ethos (Santos 1995: 499–506). A recently published collection of his essays can be found in Echeverría (2011).

7 Noncooperation and boycott are means of struggle usually identified with Gandhi. However, whether inspired by Gandhi or not, boycott was always present in the struggles for the liberation of Africa, both against colonialism and against the apartheid of South Africa's white regime. More recently it has played an important role in the fight against the Israeli occupation of Palestine. By way of example, I quote here from an article Julius Nyerere published on June 20, 1958, in *Sauti Ya Tanu*, the newspaper of the party for the liberation of Tanganyika (Tanzania since 1964), led by Nyerere: "It is over a month now since we called on a territorial boycott of all European drink in sympathy with the workers of the East African Breweries Ltd who are on strike. The boycott is almost 100 percent effective. It is voluntary

and peaceful. But the agents of imperialism are grumbling. They do not like this boycott. They accuse TANU of interference in Trade Unions affairs" (1967: 61).

8 The phrase belongs to Alfred Sauvy (1952: 14), who used it for the first time in 1952 in a French periodical. "We are often told 'Colonialism is dead.' Let us not be deceived or even soothed by that. I say to you, colonialism is not yet dead. How can we say it is dead, so long as vast areas of Asia and Africa are unfree? And, I beg of you do not think of colonialism only in the classic form which we of Indonesia, and our brothers in different parts of Asia and Africa, knew. Colonialism has also its modern dress, in the form of economic control, intellectual control and actual physical control by a small but alien community within a nation. It is a skillful and determined enemy, and it appears in many guises. It does not give up its loot easily. Wherever, whenever and however it appears, colonialism is an evil thing, and one which must be eradicated from the earth" (Sukarno, 1955).

9 "Ujamaa," a Swahili word that translates as extended family, is a political concept in Nyerere's political theorization of socialism, as it asserts that a person becomes a person through the people or community.

10 Nkrumah lived and studied for ten years in the United States. "I was introduced to Plato, Aristotle, Descartes, Kant, Hegel, Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, Marx and other immortals, whom I should like to refer to as the university philosophers. But these titans were expounded in such a way that a student from the colony could easily find his breast agitated by conflicting attitudes" (1970: 2).

11 Senghor's remarkable formulation is: "assimilate but do not become assimilated." Senghor, who undoubtedly was the one who better elaborated the concept of négritude, recognizes that the term was coined by Aimé Césaire in the early 1930s (see Hymans 1971: 23). On Fanon's critical relation with the concept of négritude, see Gordon (2015: 53–59).

12 More on this in chapter 6. On the complexity of the discovery of négritude between 1929 and 1948, see Hymans (1971: 23–142). Senghor formulates the contrast between négritude and Western philosophy in this way: to the Cartesian "I think, therefore I am," he counters the African "I feel, therefore I am" (1961: 100). Nkrumah (like Fanon) is very critical of Senghor's essentialism: "It is clear that socialism cannot be founded on this kind of metaphysics of knowledge" (Nkrumah 1973: 444). Nonetheless, the conceptions and origins of Senghor's African socialism are far more complex than Nkrumah wants us to believe (see Camara 2001: 55–88).

13 Tugas is a pejorative term for Portuguese people.

14 A well-documented analysis of Cabral's political thought is to be found in Chilcote (1991).

15 Eduardo Mondlane (1969), another great leader of the liberation movements in Africa, has a similar position to that of Cabral as regards armed struggle against Portuguese colonialism in Mozambique.

16 Lutuli was elected president of the ANC when this movement functioned as a leading opposition force to the white minority government in South Africa. He was awarded the 1960 Nobel Peace Prize for his role in the nonviolent struggle against apartheid.

17 For a good introduction to this theme, see Roberts (2004: 139–60).

18 It would be wrong to conclude that the struggle against abyssal exclusions must always involve violence. As we saw, in India violence was not the main form of struggle, even though there were many groups involved in armed struggle that did not share Gandhi's pacifism. Such examples illustrate the broader notion I have already mentioned above, namely, that abyssal exclusions and nonabyssal exclusions require different means, narratives, ideologies, rhythms, and strategies of struggle. As I said, to think that the struggles against domination can be conducted as if all exclusions were nonabyssal is a neoliberal prejudice.

19 An outcome to which Lewis Gordon's (1995b, 1997b, 2015) work itself crucially contributed (see also Gordon, Sharpley-Whiting, and White 1996; Gibson 1999; Gordon, Ciccariello-Maher, and Maldonado-Torres 2013: 307–24; Henry 1996: 220–43; Sekyi-Out 1996).

20 Bearing in mind the broader field of power relations, James Scott (1990) distinguishes between the public transcript and the hidden transcript in the relations between the subordinate and the dominant groups.

21 More on this in Santos (2007c).

22 Similar debates have occurred inside feminist and antiracist movements. Existentialism deals best with the philosophical dimension of lived experience, a good example being Black existential philosophy (see Gordon 1997a).

23 British colonialism may have contributed to rendering the caste system more rigid. Having lost power and social influence with the arrival of the British colonizers, the superior castes made up for their loss by intensifying their dominion over the inferior castes—a kind of internal colonialism. "Interestingly, racial humiliation, which is at the base of the colonial configuration of power, undergoes inversion into caste humiliation at the level of the local configuration of power. Within this configuration, the function of caste-based humiliation, it could be argued, is to compensate for the loss of prestige and honour that the dominant social elite tends to lose in the colonial configuration of power" (Guru 2009: 4).

24 In Hinduism, the highest three castes of Hindu society are known as the twice-born (Sanskrit द्वजि Dvija) because they have undergone the sacred thread ceremony (Upanayana), in which male members are initiated into the second stage of life (*ashrama*) of a Vedic follower. This sacred thread ceremony is considered to be a type of second birth. Traditionally, twice-born Hindus belong to the first three groups of the Hindu caste system: (1) Brahmans, (2) Kshatriyas, and (3) Vaishyas. However, in many Hindu scriptures the word "Dvija" refers only to the Brahmans who possess mythical, religious superiority.

25 See Mendes (2019) and the bibliography cited there.

26 More on this in Santos (2002: 31).

5. Bodies, Knowledges, and Corazonar

1 Among Western philosophers of the past century, Merleau-Ponty is the one that best expresses the idea of embodied knowledge and experience. He emphasizes the dialectical relation between body and soul or between physical, vital, and human

structures. As he says in *The Structure of Behavior*, there is in experience an "original text which cannot be extracted from its relationship to nature. The signification is embodied" (Merleau-Ponty 1963: 211). Against Descartes and Kant, Merleau-Ponty (1962) sustains that the conscious subject is not separated from the world. The world is inscribed in the subject. Indeed, perception is a product not of consciousness but rather of the body, not the body conceived of as an external entity existing in the physical world but rather the living and lived body. In chapter 8, I engage in a critical evaluation of Merleau-Ponty from the perspective of the epistemologies of the South. Earlier in the twentieth century on the American side of the Atlantic, John Dewey (1928) had already criticized the body/soul dualism at the core of what he called the "mind-body problem." A key constituent of his critique was his vocal opposition to approaches to the "mind" or the "psychic" as an autonomous entity, namely those held by Freud and his followers (see Dewey 1922).

2 In a line of thought that goes back to Plato, Schopenhauer views the body as an obstacle to knowledge: "Hence all knowledge brought about through the senses is deceptive; the only true, accurate, and sure knowledge, on the other hand, is that which is free and removed from all sensibility (thus from all intuitive perception), consequently *pure thought*, i.e. an operation exclusively with abstract concepts" (2010: 43). Lakoff and Johnson propose an epistemological move away from the modern consecration of a disembodied positive knowledge, informed by the idea that "there is no Cartesian dualistic person, with a mind separate from and independent of the body, sharing exactly the same transcendent reason with everyone else" (1999: 5).

3 Husserl distinguishes Leib, the prereflectively lived body or the embodied first-person perspective, from Körper, the experience of the body as an object (see Das 2007, 2015; Husserl 1973: 57).

4 Echoing Merleau-Ponty, according to Francisco Varela, the body is much more than a physical structure. It is a set of behavioral repertoires or motor and perception capacities or activities: "The actions of an animal and the world in which it performs these actions are inseparably connected. Going through life as a small fly makes a cup of tea appear like an ocean of liquid; an elephant, however, will see the same amount of tea as an insignificant drop, tiny and barely noticeable. What is perceived appears inseparably connected with the actions and the way of life of an organism" (Poerksen 2004: 87).

5 It should be acknowledged that feminist, LGBT, intercultural, and decolonial criticism of the epistemologies of the North have been calling attention to the body's epistemological and cognitive value (see Butler 1993, 2004; Csordas 1990; Haraway 1991; Mol 2002; Taussig 1993; more recently see Federici 2004; Lugones 2010a; McRuer 2006).

6 This process of disembodying through classification and organization is present even in the authors that most convincingly claimed the importance of the place of the body, from Nietzsche to Foucault to Levinas, to mention only a few.

7 Not surprisingly, dance has often been forbidden in conservative, fundamentalist social environments. This was the case in the small city of Purdy, Missouri, where

Christian fundamentalists banned dance from schools for many years on the basis that dance was sinful. During the late 1980s, parents and students in the school district argued that "the policy, reflecting the Christian fundamentalist view that social dance is sinful, violated the constitutionality required by separation of church and state" (see Misirhiralall 2013: 72–95).

8 See Parviainen 1998, 2002: 11–26. See also Sheets-Johnstone 1994; Fraleigh 1987, 1994.

9 See chapter 11 on the relations between the pedagogy of the oppressed and the epistemologies of the South.

10 This does not mean that hope and joy are the only emotions fueling resistance and struggle. The latter combine many other emotions such as anger, grief, hatred, and love, depending on the context. Fear is important also, provided it is fear with an outlet, not fear so devoid of hope and joy as to lead to resignation rather than to struggle.

11 Guerrero Arias's research relates to the distinction, drawn in chapters 6 and 7, between knowing-with and knowing-about.

12 Mauricio Ushiña, a member of the Council of Government of the Pueblo Kitu Kara, says that corazonar is a vital experience, a spiritual and political proposal to transform life: "Corazonar derives from the lived experience, it is not a category of communicative theories, whether sociological or anthropological; it is new and different; it comes from a harvest of knowledges and feelings that are miles away from Eurocentric rational thinking; actually, it is a completely different way of facing reality; it reads reality in a different way, from a different understanding of time-space. It has nothing to do with the dominant epistemology. Corazonar is a proposal-in-the-making emerging from the search of individual or collective spiritual development. It is a category built upon feeling, wisdom, spirituality; it interacts with dreams, invisible languages that are nonetheless real, interconnected with the whole, with biodiversity, with energy" (Arias 2016: 198).

13 According to Guerrero Arias, "New Age spirituality is very fashionable in the supermarkets of the soul; it sustains itself in processes of symbolic usurpation of wisdom of diverse spiritual traditions in order to make them work in the market. It is, therefore, a depoliticized spirituality; it is emptied out of the liberating sense that spirituality has always had to awaken being and consciousness/conscience. Such 'light spirituality' never wonders about relations of power and domination; all it does is lead us into self-enclosure, leaving us narcissistically indifferent before the problems of world and life, which it has no intention of changing. Thus, the whole structure sustaining the coloniality of power, knowledge and being is never called into question and is rather allowed to go on working with its daily perversity and violence" (2016: 185).

14 The words of the great Portuguese poet Fernando Pessoa in "Ela canta, pobre ceifeira" (Joy is the emotion that increases both the individual's and the collective's desires to persist) come to mind: "O que em mim sente está pensando" (What in me feels is thinking). See both the Portuguese and English versions of the poem in Sadlier (1998: 60–61).

15 Fals Borda's (2009) sentipensar illustrates the political meaning of the encounter of knowledge with feeling in the cosmovision and cosmo-existence of the peasant communities of the Colombian Caribe. Faced with much oppression and adversity, and energized by the way they combine reason and love in their lives—sentipensar—those communities keep resisting and fighting.

16 The same is true of any creative process, be it art or education.

17 The same argument is made by Asad (1993: 63). Medieval Western culture was a presence-culture.

6. Cognitive Decolonization

1 Colonialism as a form of oppression and domination is not restricted to the European expansion in the South, an issue I do not deal with in this book. See, on this topic, among others, Howe (2002), Khodarkovsky (2004), Minawi (2016), Myers and Peattie (1984).

2 As Maldonado-Torres says, "Coloniality is different from colonialism. Colonialism denotes a political and economic relation in which the sovereignty of a nation or a people rests on the power of another nation, which makes such nation an empire. Coloniality, instead, refers to long-standing patterns of power that emerged as a result of colonialism, but that define culture, labor, intersubjective relations, and knowledge production well beyond the strict limits of colonial administrations. Thus, coloniality survives colonialism" (2007: 243).

3 Examples of settler colonies, in the African context, are Mozambique, Algeria, Kenya, and Namibia. Brazil also falls into this category. What characterizes this kind of colonialism is the fact that, along with the colonial authorities of the administrative apparatus (as well as some missionaries and militaries) and the indigenous populations, the settlers are an important third force of the population.

4 My conceptual proposal aims, among other things, to prevent the phase of decolonization that leads to independence from being considered finished. Ndlovu-Gatsheni is right when he states, "Decolonization cannot just be celebrated uncritically. Such praise-oriented approaches towards decolonization have obscured the myths and illusions of freedom and tend to ignore the poor and problematic ethical, ideological, and political foundations of this project. Decolonization remained hostage to western notions of emancipation that did not seriously question the ontological and epistemic essence of colonial modernity from the snares of which it tried to free Africans" (2013: 94–95).

5 According to Ndlovu-Gatsheni, "Du Bois in 1903 announced [the] decolonial turn as a rebellion against what he termed the 'colour line' that was constitutive of the core problems of the twentieth century" (2016: 48). In the context of the Modernity/Coloniality Group, the concept of a decolonial turn was used for the first time by Maldonado-Torres during a conference in Berkeley in 2005 (see Castro-Gómez and Grosfoguel 2007; Maldonado-Torres 2011).

6 As this author insists, "while it is true that the expanded colonial library structures a Western epistemological order that shapes the thinking of Europhone intellectu-

als, it is no less true that the expanded Islamic library is creating an Islamic space of meaning" (Kane 2012: 56). This library contains the writings of non-Europhone and hybrid intellectuals, sharing an Islamic space of meaning (see also Alatas 2014; Shariarti 1979).

7 The other side of négritude was a new conception of universalism. In Césaire's words: "I'm not going to entomb myself in some particularism. But I don't intend either to become lost in a fleshless universalism. There are two paths to doom: by segregation, by walling yourself up in the particular; or by dilution, by thinning off into the emptiness of the 'universal.' I have a different idea of a universal, it is a universal rich with all that is particular, rich with all the particulars there are, the deepening of each particular, the coexistence of them all" (1957: 15).

8 Gandhi, Nkrumah, Senghor, Cabral, and Nyerere harbored the same proviso (see chapter 4).

9 More on this in Hountondji (1997, 2002).

10 One such reality is the state I have characterized as a "heterogeneous State" (Santos 2006b: 39–76).

11 A series of collections of essays on South Asian history and society was published during the 1980s under the editorship of Ranajit Guha. Among many others, see Guha's own study on colonialist historiography in India (Guha 1989).

12 Retamar's pioneering work started to be published in 1965 (see Fernández Retamar 2016).

13 Among the major concepts of Latin American decolonial thinking, the following must be underscored: Quijano's coloniality of power, liberation philosophy, and Dussel's transmodernity.

14 Homi Bhabha's notion of in-between spaces is similar to Mignolo's concept of border thinking. The only difference resides in the context: Bhabha's place of enunciation is literary studies and subjectivity, in-between space being for him those moments or processes produced in the articulation of differences. It is in such interstices or frontiers that new signs, meanings, and discourses are negotiated. In the field of education, as early as 1992 Henry Giroux spoke of border pedagogy. In 1995, I myself proposed the frontier metaphor as one of the three metaphors that marked the paradigm shift that I would later formulate as epistemologies of the South. The other two metaphors were the South and the baroque (Santos 1995: 489–518).

15 The intellectual dimension of the discussions advanced by this group has contributed to enlarge the humanist ideals of Pan-Africanism, by combining reflections produced in Africa with studies of the African diaspora. Some universities in the United States have African studies departments that harbor African together with African-American studies (or studies of the African diaspora). Sustaining a global and comparative perspective, they often converge with Afrocentric and Afropolitic proposals (Asante 1998; see also Tutton 2012). The goal of such proposals is to redefine African phenomena in the world, highlighting African life and struggles as part of a cosmopolitan experience.

16 On Glissant, see also Wynter (1989).

17 Regarding the different strands of Islamic feminism, Grosfoguel (2014: 26) admits not all of them are decolonizing.
18 On the philosophy of Afrocentricity, see also Mazama (2003).
19 See, for example, Khodarkovsky (2004). On the Roma people, see Maeso (2015: 53–70).
20 On Portuguese colonization in the Indian Ocean, see Subrahmanyam (1998, 2012).
21 Meneses is right when she affirms that "we often continue to make our interpretations from a center that still has not been 'decolonized.' It is hence through the eyes of Imperial Europe that these African spaces are still perceived through epistemically colonial lenses. On the other hand, while we want to (re)construct other histories and (re)introduce ourselves to the debate of other memories, the situation we observe reflects the difficulty of constructing another analytical grid which would escape from dominant interpretations and allow us [Africans] to introduce the memories of other actors" (2011: 133).
22 In the introduction to the special issue of *Sociology* edited by Gurminder Bhambra and myself, we stress the complementarity between our approaches (Bhambra and Santos 2017: 3–10).
23 See also Bhambra's (2018) analysis of the Haitian revolution.
24 Early on, Fanon called our attention to such limits: "In the colonies the economic infrastructure is also a superstructure. The cause is effect: You are rich because you are white, you are white because you are rich. This is why a Marxist analysis should always be slightly stretched when it comes to addressing the colonial issue" (1967a: 40).
25 The same applies to subaltern European cultures considered useless for the tasks of capitalist evangelization, colonization, and appropriation from the sixteenth century onward. I analyzed this topic (Santos 2014: 99–116).
26 This conception of contemporaneity differs from the one proposed by Oswald Spengler, inspired by Nietzsche, according to which things not existing at the same time in history may be considered contemporaneous if they exist at corresponding stages in different cultures. The pre-Socratics of the sixth and fifth centuries BCE would be contemporaneous with Galileo, Bacon, and Descartes; Socrates would be contemporaneous with the French Encyclopedists; Hellenism with Schopenhauer and Nietzsche, and so on (see Burke 1954: 89).
27 Of Nietzsche, Burke says, "Nietzsche's later style is like a sequence of *darts*. . . . His mind seemed somewhat like that of a spring without a ratchet; it unwound with a whirr, except that it miraculously did this over many decades" (1954: 88).
28 For example, in chapter 10 I mention the intercultural translation between the Eurocentric concept of development and the concept of buen vivir / sumak kawsay / good living of the indigenous peoples of the Andes.
29 According to Alberto Acosta, "Extractivism is a mode of accumulation that started to be established on a massive scale 500 years ago. . . . We will use the term extractivism to refer to those activities which remove large quantities of natural resources that are not processed (or processed only to a limited degree), especially for export. Extractivism is not limited to minerals or oil. Extractivism is also present in

farming, forestry and even fishing" (2013: 62). The connection between capitalism and colonialism becomes very clear in this definition; Federici (2004) demonstrates the connection between both of them and patriarchy (see also Lugones 2010b: 742–59). In computer science and language, the concept of knowledge extraction also refers to the creation of knowledge from structured and nonstructured sources. The phrases "information extraction" and "data mining" from texts and documents in natural language are also used.

30 See the complete conversation (in Spanish): Santos and Cusicanqui (2013).

31 The broader case for the normative framing of science can be found in Latour (1987, 1999). For a more recent discussion, see the debate between Rouse (2003), Fuller (2003), and Remedios (2003). Within the local contexts of scientific work, such as laboratories or field settings, recent work in social studies of science and philosophy of science has focused on the way scientific practices generate their own constitutive normativity, through what Joseph Rouse has called the mutual accountability of practices (2002; 2007: 45–56). In research areas that are particularly sensitive to ethical or political implications, attempts have been made to modulate scientific practice through specific forms of dialogue and joint work among natural and social scientists. See, in particular, for a thoughtful reflection on a flawed but highly instructive experience in the emerging field of synthetic biology, Rabinow and Bennett (2012). A major topic of recent discussion is the ontological politics of scientific work, or, in other words, how scientific activity inevitably requires choices and decisions that generate (intentionally or unintentionally) changes in the world, for which scientists and other actors in the worlds of science and technology should take responsibility. For a general discussion, see Mol (1999: 74–89). This topic has been recently taken up in anthropology. See the posts to the forum promoted by *Cultural Anthropology* in Holbraad, Pedersen, and Viveiros de Castro (2014). Feminist scientists and critics have both pioneered and been particularly active in thinking through these topics and, more recently, the issue of what they describe as the "response-ability" of scientists to the contexts and to the political and ethical implications of scientific work (see, for instance, Barad 2007; Despret 2002; Haraway 2016; Rouse 2016 [on Barad]; Stengers 2013). See also the discussion of Despret and Stengers by Latour (2004: 205–29).

32 The new buzzword "knowledge society" (not knowledges in the plural, of course) is the expression of the use of science to further hegemonic interests.

33 On the Lysenko affair see, among others, Jorasvsky (1970).

34 When I speak of the question of method, in the singular, I have in mind methodology, that is to say, the theoretical and analytical issues of how research must be conducted regarding its own context and the objectives in view. When I speak of methods, in the plural, I have in mind the techniques for collecting information or the concrete settings in which the cocreation of knowledge occurs.

35 In my research in the 1990s on participatory budgeting in the Brazilian city of Porto Alegre, I witnessed how difficult it was for the municipal engineers charged with the water and sewer services to engage in a meaningful conversation with the

members of the community whenever the latter, with their artisanal knowledge gained by the sheer experience of having to put up with floods every year, dared to challenge the engineers' scientific views (see Santos 1998: 461–501).

36 In my research in 2008 on the constitutional assembly of Ecuador, I observed that some indigenous leaders defended their ancestral knowledge on good living (sumak kawsay in Quechua, buen vivir in Spanish) with little consideration for the difficulties in putting those ideas into practice in contemporary Ecuador (more on this in chapter 10; see Santos 2010b).

37 As regards religious struggles, the weight of the agents tends to be closely connected to the knowledge they mobilize and the authority they invoke to do so. In ecological struggles or aid to development conducted by international NGOs, scientific knowledge gets entangled with the geopolitical interests of the dominant countries.

38 I draw on Gramsci (1971) to designate the two moments, but it should be clear that my use of the phrases is different from Gramsci's "war-as-position" and "war-as-movement."

39 For instance, the Via Campesina and the World March of Women are two transnational social movements with experience in simultaneously setting similar issues into motion and pushing them into the political agenda of different countries. The preparatory work leading to the meetings of the World Social Forum is another good example of both multisited action as position and action as movement (see Santos 2006c). In 2013, I co-organized, together with Brazilian and Mozambican social movements, a workshop of the Popular University of Social Movements, in Maputo, Mozambique, to engage in multisited conversation on issues of land grabbing, megaprojects, and industrial agriculture affecting the livelihoods of peasants in both countries. On the Popular University of Social Movements, in itself a good example of action-as-position, see chapter 12.

40 For this classification, I am indebted to Oruka's (1990: 27–40) distinction between folk sages (bearers of what I call mirror knowledge) and philosophical sages (bearers of what I call prism knowledge).

41 The most obvious cost concerns subsistence itself, unless the scientist's private income allows her to adopt the attitude of Schopenhauer, who decided to live off his personal funds in order to escape the philosophical orthodoxy of the German university, which he considered to be plagued with, as he put it, philosophasters and Hegelerei.

7. ON NONEXTRACTIVIST METHODOLOGIES

1 These features encourage many analysts to refer to the Oaxaca struggle as the Oaxaca Commune, by analogy with the 1871 Paris Commune. Esteva notes that when once confronted with this analogy, the Oaxacans responded that the Paris Commune had lasted fifty days, while theirs had already lasted more than one hundred. Esteva has published many studies dealing with the Oaxaca Commune (see, for example, 2006, 2007a, 2007b, 2007c; see also Nasioka 2017; Nahón 2017).

2 Hence, the subaltern groups' claims of difference and of the right to difference necessarily assumed a counterhegemonic trait.

3 A concept originally used by Max Gluckman (1955).

4 In other continents or regions of the world, indigenous scholars have also undertaken the decolonization of the methodologies with which abyssal science converted them into research objects, developing indigenous methodologies. An early and brilliant example is the Taller de Historia Oral Andina of Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui and René Arze (1986: 83–99). A very diverse and rich bibliography is already unfolding. As examples, for the case of Canada, see Kovach (2009); for the case of the United States, see Wilson and Bird (2005).

5 In "Chapter Three in the Mirror" (Santos 1995: 243–49), I discuss the difficulties and even antinomies involved in devolution.

6 There is today an abundant bibliography on transitional justice and truth and reconciliation commissions. See, for instance, Gready (2011; South Africa), Niezen (2013; Canada), Ferrara (2015; Chile), and an overview by Roht-Arriaza and Mariezcurrena (2006).

7 Such a dimension is a curse to modern abyssal science, as are many other dimensions of postabyssal research.

8 Another of the projects worth mentioning is Taller de Historia Oral Andina, created in 1983 by Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui together with indigenous intellectuals, which aims to valorize the identity and the oral knowledges of the popular Aymara movements. I have also already mentioned the research conducted by indigenous researchers in New Zealand as reported by Linda Smith. In North America, see, among many others, Writing of Indigenous New England (https://dhcommons.org/projects/writing-indigenous-new-england) a project coordinated by Siobhan Senier and indigenous leaders. Also see Senier (2014a), edited with eleven tribal editors, and Senier (2014b).

8. THE DEEP EXPERIENCE OF THE SENSES

1 The bibliography on the physiology of the senses is immense, but it is relatively scarce as regards the cultural history of the senses and even scarcer on the intercultural history of the senses. See, however, among others, Ackerman (1995), Di Bello and Koureas (2010), and Taussig (1993). The volume of Western studies on the physiology of the senses is revealing at several levels. On the one hand, it shows the hegemony of the scientific culture projecting onto the senses its more familiar perspectives. On the other, it shows the aversion of Christianized Western culture to the senses as instigators of sin (even sins of thought imply the exercise of the senses). Besides, the transparency of the mind is favorably compared with the opacity of the body, against which physiology ceaselessly works.

2 In the Western cultural paradigm, the deep experience of the senses has been reserved for the domain of aesthetic-expressive rationality, that is, for the artistic experience in general. Reflection on this kind of experience has been left to aesthetics, the philosophy of art, and the phenomenology of perception. I have already cited Merleau-Ponty,

but see also Chrétien (2003), to my mind, one of the subtlest reflections on the work of art. Also relevant in this context is Adorno's (1997) aesthetic theory.

3 Darwin believed that smell was more developed among the "savages" (see Classen 2014: 19).

4 Actually, "reciprocity" may well be an incorrect term inasmuch as it presupposes two distinct, previously constituted beings or entities. As a matter of fact, seeing changes both the one who sees and the one seen. In the process, a double penetration occurs, subverting the distinction between inside and outside, and creates something like a mixture: a third entity (Merleau-Ponty 1978: 284). "There is a human body when, between the seeing and the seen, between the touching and the touched, between one eye and the other, between hand and hand, a blending of some sort takes place—when the spark is lit between sensing and sensible, lighting the fire that will not stop burning until some accident of the body will undo what no accident would have sufficed to do" (1964b: 163–64).

5 On this topic, see the important work by Viveiros de Castro (2014) and also Danowsky and Viveiros de Castro (2017).

6 Or as what the poet John Keats called "a Man of Achievement," that is to say, "when a man is capable of being in uncertainties, mysteries, doubts, without any irritable reaching after fact & reason" (1958: 193–94).

7 Foucault (1995) develops his political philosophy based on the panopticon in *Discipline and Punish*.

8 Multiple angles as in Cubism, curious perspectives as in Flemish or Dutch art (see Santos 2014: 161–62).

9 I do not deal here with Merleau-Ponty's philosophical discussion of the dimensions of invisibility contained in the visible, and vice versa. Nonetheless, Merleau-Ponty (1964a) does help us to understand relativity and complementarity regarding the visible and the invisible. Only in relation to the visible is something considered invisible, and vice versa.

10 Between the visible and the invisible, there may be intermediate gradients and perceptions according to scale, distance, or any other variable contributing to the ambiguity between what is seen and not seen. In certain social contexts, such ambiguity may be a precious resource.

11 Modern science in general, as well as modern critical theories, provides ample examples of the conservative nature of excluded social groups, even though, in the eyes of analysts and theoreticians, excluded social groups have every reason not to be conservative, since they have nothing to lose other than their own chains.

12 I deal with scales in great detail (Santos 1987: 279–302).

13 The Marxist idea that the struggle is expected to come from those social groups that have nothing to lose but their chains tends to forget that existentially the chains never chain everything or never chain the totality of whatever is chained. Unchainable is the dignity and the wonder of being alive in unimaginably dire conditions. The aspiration to continue to be alive is inscrutable.

14 Even while not agreeing entirely with his psychoanalytical theory, it must be recognized that Freud interrupts the Western tradition by valorizing listening as an inter-

subjective process. To be sure, it was revolutionary to ascribe to the physician, who was used to formulating judgments promptly, the task of listening to the patient, and for long stretches. However well in tune with the logic of Western science, this training for listening had an instrumental and extractivist purpose: to extract from patients the resources needed for their cure.

15 For an early focus on listening in education, see Duker (1966).

16 On kinds of silence and how to interpret them, see Santos (1995: 146–56).

17 If there is a subaltern inaudible, there is also a dominant inaudible, made of strategic and purposeful silences decided by the oppressors in order to increase and strengthen domination. In a world of overabundant media, strategic silences on the part of governing or dominant elites are as important as they are insidious.

18 Active listening is a communication technique used in counseling, training, and conflict resolution, which requires listeners to say what they hear back to the speaker, as a way of restating or paraphrasing in their own words what they have heard, to confirm what they have heard and, moreover, to confirm the understanding of both parties. This technique is widely used by the abyssal social sciences, often under the pretense of increasing the quality of information and exalting the qualitative methodologies being utilized.

19 The taste I engage here is the sense of taste, gustatory perception or gustation, having today its privileged domain in culinary or food taste. Broader, however, is the concept of taste as a mechanism of social discrimination, brilliantly analyzed by Bourdieu (1979). It includes, besides food, dress, and fashion, art, music, entertainment, and so on. Of course, both concepts share perceptions that are largely socially constructed.

20 According to Paterson, "We have an enduring cultural assumption, present in Plato and compounded in the Enlightenment, of the primacy of vision. In Aristotle's famous hierarchy of the five senses in *De Anima* of c.350 BC, sight is the superior sense while touch is relegated to the lowest, basest position. He reserves contempt for the 'bestial' pleasures of taste but especially erotic touch in his *Ethics* (1118a24–25)" (2007: 1).

21 It is not an exclusive characteristic of Christianized culture. Suffice it to mention the caste system in Hinduism and the role played by untouchability discussed above.

22 Touch has also been saved for religious reasons. One of the rules of the Society of Jesus (the Jesuits) stipulated, "No one may touch another, even in jest" (Barrett 1927: 130). On the cultural history of touch, see Classen (2005).

23 In the same vein, Ruth Finnegan says, "In the 'bubble' of privacy that people maintain around themselves, touch perhaps represents the most direct invasion. It is scarcely surprising that its practice is regulated. . . . When people accidentally or unavoidably touch strangers or non-intimates, especially in public places, they often apologize verbally to make clear that the intrusive claim seemingly implied through this tactile pressure was not in fact intended" (2005: 18–25).

24 These two senses are related to each other, since taste often originates in smell.

25 Being considered objects of sociability is how Black slaves were believed to be less sensitive to pain. According to Bourke: "Failure of willpower was portrayed as particularly despicable since many of these 'outsiders' were believed to possess dulled sensibilities in the first place. Slaves, 'savages,' and dark-skinned people generally were depicted as possessing a limited capacity to truly feel, a biological 'fact' that conveniently diminished any culpability amongst their so-called superiors for any acts of abuse inflicted on them" (2014: 302).

26 The greatest challenge the postabyssal researcher faces concerns food that she can't help but find repulsive. Of course, this problem exists or becomes significant only in the context of knowing-with and feeling-with research. In this (as perhaps in other domains), Charles Darwin is at the antipodes of the postabyssal researcher's situation. "In Tierra del Fuego a native touched with his finger on some cold preserved meat which I was eating at our bivouac, and plainly showed utter disgust at its softness; whilst I felt utter disgust at my food being touched by a naked savage, though his hands did not appear dirty" (1872: 257). The mutual repugnance caused by the enormous cultural distance urged Darwin to register his perplexity: two worlds touching each other physically but incommensurable regarding everything else. On reactions to disgusting food, see Prescott (2012).

9. DEMONUMENTALIZING WRITTEN AND ARCHIVAL KNOWLEDGE

1 On the difference between science as a belief and science as a body of knowledge, see Ortega y Gasset (1942).

2 Argumentative rhetoric is well documented today. See the bibliography referred to in Santos (2007c).

3 I focus here on science, the most influential monumental knowledge of our time. In the past and for many centuries the most influential monumental knowledge was religion or theology. In some societies this is still the case today.

4 Alice—Strange Mirrors, Unsuspected Lessons, http://alice.ces.uc.pt/en/.

5 Conversations of the World may be accessed at Alice, http://alice.ces.uc.pt/en/index.php/homepage-videos/conversations-of-the-world/.

6 In the philosophy of science there is great debate on the distinction between the context of discovery and the context of justification, a distinction that is not consensually accepted. See the entry on scientific discovery in the *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Schickore 2014; see also Schickore and Steinle 2006; Kordig 1978: 110–17).

7 In the case of written scientific knowledge, the default attitude vis-à-vis common sense is to stigmatize it in order to refute it more easily.

8 On African philosophy, see Santos (2014: 202–4).

9 On race and racism, see, for instance, Babbitt and Campbell (1999), Bernasconi (2003), and Valls (2005). On gender biases in philosophy, see Tuana (1992), Tuana and Tong (1994), Warren (2009), and Zack (2000). On older but still very important perspectives on the topic see Gould (1983), Lloyd (1984), Spelman (1988), and Waithe (1987).

10 The conversation with Professor Mudimbe can be accessed at Mudimbe and Santos (2013) and with Professor Ramose at Ramose and Santos (2014). I recognize that so far I have not been able to confront the gender dimension of the abyssal line in philosophy in Conversations of the World.

11 In Mozambique, see Castiano (2015).

12 Oruka's advice to researchers points in that direction: "The role of the interviewer is to act as the provocateur to the sage. The interview is to help the sage give birth to his full views on the subject under consideration. During the discussion, the interviewer should use the tape recorder to record everything discussed. Some sages, however, may be annoyed with the persistent provocations. Others, however, will enjoy them and wish to carry on" (1990: 31).

13 Reinventing Social Emancipation, http://www.ces.uc.pt/emancipa/en/index.html. This project resulted in the following major publications in English: Santos (2005a, 2006a, 2007a, 2010c).

14 The selection did not follow any general criterion of representativeness, whether of regional diversity, the type or theme of struggle, or gender balance. In this last case, an effort was made but unfortunately it was not successful. There are five female voices and nine male voices.

15 "All men are intellectuals . . . but not all men have in society the function of intellectuals" (Gramsci 1971: 9). One of the most important characteristics of any group that is developing toward dominance is its struggle to assimilate and to conquer ideologically the traditional intellectuals, but this assimilation and conquest are made quicker and more efficacious the more the group in question succeeds in simultaneously elaborating its own organic intellectuals (10).

16 A subsidiary criterion was used regarding the exposure of leaders or activists to the media. I thought at the time (and still think) that, with rare exceptions, it is better to select activists or leaders who have not been exposed to the media too much. Such exposure often implies a kind of perverse training for a narcissistic discourse, sprinkled with banalities or even lies, whenever the latter serve the purpose of the interviewee's self-aggrandizement.

17 In Santos (2014: 118–35), I argue that one of the manifestations of the persistence of the abyssal line in our time is what I designate as the return of the colonial symbolized in the figure of the undocumented migrant worker, the asylum seeker, and the person suspected of being a terrorist.

18 More on this in Santos (2014: 160–63).

19 I abstain from engaging in the polemic over whether or not there is a difference between rap and hip-hop (see Shaw 2013).

20 In Portugal, a pathbreaking journal in this field, *Cadernos de Sociomuseologia*, began publication in 1993.

21 The Maré favelas are made up of the following localities or communities: Baixa do Sapateiro, Morro do Timbau, Parque Maré, Nova Maré, Nova Holanda, Rubens Vaz, Parque União, Conjunto Esperança, Conjunto Pinheiros, Vila do Pinheiro, Vila do João, Salsa e Merengue, Marcílio Dias, Roquete Pinto, Praia de Ramos, and Bento Ribeiro Dantas. A movement to include Mandacaru favela has already begun.

22 Dona Orosina Vieira is said to have been the first resident, and therefore the founder, of Maré. According to Mário Chagas, she was "a poor, black, *favela* woman, capable of supporting herself (like so many other poor, black, *favela* women), capable of founding a *favela* and sending a cable that staked her claim to the President of the Republic, Getúlio Vargas. She remains a powerful rallying point and is a major reference for the struggles of other women and men" (personal communication).

10. Gandhi, an Archivist of the Future

1 I have analyzed elsewhere the WSF process (see Santos 2006c).
2 Here is a dramatic example: the liberal government of Canada refused four hundred visas to leaders of social movements in the global South who wished to travel to Montreal in August 2016 in order to participate in the twelfth meeting of the WSF. Many more were discouraged from requesting visas.
3 Propaganda by deed consisted of "spectacular *attentats* on reactionary authorities and capitalists, intended to intimidate them and to encourage the oppressed to re-prepare themselves for revolution" (Anderson 2005: 72). In the last quarter of the nineteenth century, international anarchism was the dominant ideology in the global fight against capitalism, authoritarianism, and imperialism. According to trustworthy statistical data on "serious activist and sympathizer anarchists," in Spain alone there were 25,800 activists and 54,300 sympathizers, half of whom were in Andalusia (Anderson 2005: 173).
4 Anthropophagy is a metaphorical appropriation of otherness. Oswald de Andrade's (1990) "Manifesto antropófago" (Cannibalist Manifesto, originally published in 1928) was the seminal text of Brazilian modernism.
5 In this regard, a very telling observation by Eduardo Mondlane, the liberation leader of Mozambique: "We have no chance to inherit anything from Portugal, or to accumulate wealth on our own. So what do we do? We have to start with whatever is available. And what is available is the state. The state will have control of all natural resources, and the people will invest their energies in the activities of the state" (Kitchen 1967: 51).
6 See Nkrumah (1965); see also Rodney (1981).
7 Given the extent of the genocide of Native Americans, it may be surprising that some struggles are still ongoing. Activists at the Standing Rock Sioux reservation spent months staging massive protests against the Dakota Access Pipeline, which would carry oil over 1,900 kilometers from North Dakota wells, through South Dakota and Iowa, to a shipping port in Illinois. Protesters say the construction and size of the pipeline would put the reservation's only supply of drinking water at risk of oil spills and contamination as well as harming sacred sites. As I write this note (April 2017) oil is already in the Dakota Access Pipeline. The fight ended abruptly when, as one of his first acts, President Donald Trump reversed an order from his predecessor, President Barack Obama, and canceled a new environmental impact study. "Since Columbus 'discovered' America, Native Americans

have had to endure the worst of the worst," said Steven Willard, a resident of the Standing Rock reservation living in Fort Yates, downstream from the pipeline. "This is just going to be another object thrown at us that we will have to find a way to endure" (McKenna 2017).

8 See chapter 6, note 29.

9 On the contrary, I am much aware of Gandhi's ambiguities concerning not only caste discrimination in India but also concerning the British Empire during his life in South Africa. Desai and Vahed portray Gandhi as a "stretcher-bearer of Empire": "This book shows that Gandhi sought to ingratiate himself with Empire and its mission during his years in South Africa. In doing so, he not only rendered African exploitation and oppression invisible, but was, on occasion, a willing part of their subjugation and racist stereotyping. This is not the Gandhi spoken of in hagiographic speeches by politicians more than a century later. This is a different man picking his way through the dross of his time; not just any time, but the height of colonialism; not through any country, but a land that was witness to three centuries of unremitting conquest, brutality and racial bloodletting" (2016: 16).

10 There is an immense literature about Gandhi's Western sources and comparisons between Gandhi's thinking and that of some high-profile Western thinkers, such as Rousseau (Dalton 1996), Marx (Bondurant 1964), and, in particular, those critics of modern civilization who directly influenced the young Gandhi such as Thoreau, John Ruskin, and Tolstoy, as I address below. Mukherjee (2010) criticizes the four main schools of historiography on modern India—Marxist, Cambridge, nationalist, and subaltern—for their failure to recognize the theoretical and epistemological difference between the Gandhian conception of freedom and the liberal Western conception of freedom.

11 "[Gandhi's] concept of Hinduism was wider that that adopted by most Indians: to him the term Hinduism always included both Jainism and Buddhism under its wide umbrella" (Jordens 1998: 151).

12 The contradictio in adjecto is that if Hinduism is superior for having the greatest capacity to accept the plurality of other religions, then Hinduism is just one of them and cannot claim any superiority.

13 On women's participation in nationalist struggles in India, see Kasturi and Mazumdar (1994) and Menon (2011).

14 Santos (2014); see also chapter 6.

15 I argue in chapter 6 that such defamiliarization takes different forms when conducted either in the global North or in the global South.

16 When modern (and postmodern) critical thinking critiques the empire, it does so by conceiving it as "us" and not as "us" and "them." This explains why extra-European realities are so absent from such thinking. In relation to Foucault's Eurocentrism, see Slater (1992).

17 Among other political writings, see Chomsky (2010, 2014, 2016).

18 Chomsky's acritical acceptance of the modern distinction between science and politics explains some eventual contradictions between his anti-imperialistic political activism and his scientific and professional politics. A progressive stance, in the

former, may thereby coexist with a conservative one, in the latter. On the politics of Chomsky's conception of "autonomous linguistics," see Newmeyer (1986).

19 In the following, I concentrate on Gandhi, but as the crisis of modernity has deepened and its imperialistic character has become more evident, an intellectual and political ferment has emerged in the South over the last decades, inspired by a conception of the anti-imperial global South, and has attempted to develop an emancipatory politics outside the Western mold. Along this path, many political and intellectual African leaders have called for a new emancipatory politics in Africa (see, among many, Kagame 1956; Hountondji 2002, 2007; Oruka 1990; Wamba dia Wamba 1991; Ramose 1992; Masolo 2003; Wiredu 1996). Concerning Asia, starting from the idea that a significant aspect of postcolonial structures of knowledge in the Third World is a peculiar form of "imperialism of categories," Nandy (1988: 177) sets out to establish a foundation for ethnic and religious tolerance that is independent of the hegemonic language of secularism popularized by Westernized intellectuals and middle classes exposed to the globally dominant language of the nation-state in South Asia. Paul Gilroy (1993) argues forcefully for a "black Atlantic culture" as a counterculture of modernity, inviting us to learn from the South within the imperial global North. This is the broader landscape of non-Eurocentric thinking to which decolonial literature (see also chapter 6) has made a decisive contribution in more recent times.

20 A comparison between Gandhi's defense of nonviolence and Fanon's defense of violence is most instructive. An interesting approach to this debate is provided by Odera Oruka, in an article published in 1997.

21 The ideas and politics of Gandhi are the subject of much debate. Nandy (1987) emphasizes the fact that Gandhi escaped colonial cultural domination, thus formulating an authentic and effective Indian nationalism. Based on a Gramscian framework, Chatterjee (1984: 156) considers that Gandhian ideology, while fundamentally subverting elite-nationalist thought, provided at the same time the historical opportunity for the political appropriation of the popular classes within the evolving forms of the new Indian state. Fox (1987) stresses the dilemmas of Gandhi's cultural resistance in a world system of cultural domination.

22 See, as an illustration, the controversy in India sparked by Nirmalangshu Mukherjee's "Open Letter to Noam Chomsky," posted on October 21, 2009. Mukherjee critiques Chomsky's signing of a statement condemning the brutal repression of Maoist guerrillas and tribal people by the Indian state while failing to condemn the violent strategies of the Maoists.

23 As a political practice, anarchism only flourished in the south of the North, and had its fullest concretization in republican Spain in the 1930s. In other words, it flourished on the margins of the system of domination, where hegemonies asserted themselves with greater weakness. However, this explanation does not quite account for the reemergence of anarchism in some Indignados and Occupy movements of 2011 in different regions of the world.

24 On the affinities between Gandhi's thought and that of Ruskin and Thoreau, there is abundant bibliography. Thoreau's essay that most influenced Gandhi was "Re-

sistance to Civil Government" or "Civil Disobedience" (1849; see also Thoreau 1957). In the case of Ruskin, see, for example, among many others, Dantwala (1995: 2793–95), Mehta (1962: 252–57), and Hendrick (1956: 462–71).

25 On Brazilian modernists, see n. 4 above. For a fine analysis of the relations between Gandhi and the West, see Lal (2009: 281–313).

26 Gujarati is a native language of Gujarat State, India, where Gandhi was born.

27 The case of vegetarianism is particularly revealing. Not only did Gandhi discover in it a version of Europe's counterculture, but he also envisioned it as validating and reinforcing his own Indian civilization.

28 On peasants, see the discussion of Tolstoy below. Ruskin, in turn, has this to say: "nothing in history has ever been so disgraceful to human intellect as the acceptance among us of the common doctrines of political economy as science. . . . The rich not only refuse food to the poor; they refuse wisdom; they refuse virtue; they refuse salvation" (1872: 88, 129). Gandhi saw in Ruskin the symbol of radical opposition to the individualism typical of nineteenth-century industrial Manchester, and opposition as well to the polarization between the individual and community. When he translated Ruskin's book into Gujarati, Gandhi titled it *Sarvodaya* (Welfare for all).

29 Gandhi sent a copy of his manifesto *Hind Swaraj* to Tolstoy along with the Reverend Joseph Doke's 1909 Gandhi biography (the first of many). Tolstoy read both. In Green's words, "miraculously, in the last months of Tolstoy's life, he learned to know the very remote figure who was to be his heir. The last long letter Tolstoy wrote was to Gandhi" (Rudolph 1996: 38).

30 On this topic see, among others, Fox (1997: 65–82) and Chabot and Duyvendak (2002: 697–740).

31 Du Bois privileged legislative and judicial struggle, as well as propaganda in the public space, as weapons to fight racism and white supremacy.

32 Concerning Rustin, and showing the contradictions inside the movements, it is interesting to note that, in spite of his experience and knowledge, Rustin was received in Montgomery with distrust by some members of the movement. As David Garrow says, "His public record, they pointed out, included a brief membership in the Young Communist League, a prison term for draft resistance, and a conviction three years earlier for homosexual activity with two other men in a parked car. Any or all of those could be used to smear the Montgomery leadership should Rustin become associated with them publicly" (1986: 66). For one reason or another, perhaps because of his homosexuality, Rustin never won the public recognition that was due him for his contribution to civil rights movements (see Young 2015). His more emblematic texts are published in Rustin (1971).

33 Given the internal diversity of India, an exercise in South-South intercultural translation involving Gandhi should include the complex relations between Gandhi and the struggles of the Dalits (well documented in the exchanges between Gandhi and Ambedkar) and the struggles of the Adivasi, the tribal people of India. It is important not to conflate Adivasi with Gandhian concepts and movements, even when there are affinities among them. Instances of Gandhian leaders trying to convert

(the opposite of translating) the Adivasi to Hindu principles and norms of conduct are well documented (Hardiman 2003: 148).

34 On this topic, see Schavelzon (2015) and Lupien (2011: 774–96). In some African countries, plurinationality is designated as ethnic federalism (see Akiba 2004: 121–55; Keller 2002: 33–34). In Spain, the party Podemos (2016) has called for the constitutional recognition of Spain as a plurinational state.

35 Elsewhere I have analyzed the refoundation of the state in terms of what I call, following Upendra Baxi, transformative constitutionalism (Santos 2010a).

36 Constitution of Bolivia, article 3: "The Bolivian nation is formed by the totality of Bolivian men and women, the indigenous originary peasant nations and people, and the intercultural and Afro-Bolivian communities which altogether make up the Bolivian people" (Ayma 2009).

37 The other side of intercultural difference is intracultural difference. The different nations or cultural identities in presence are far from being internally homogeneous.

38 There are also obvious affinities with the current demands for self-government of the Adivasi movements in India, very often resorting to the same international instruments that guarantee indigenous self-government.

39 Comparing the well-articulated, even if at times contradictory, formulations of such a brilliant individual as Gandhi with collective, internally differentiated, never fully developed conceptions of indigenous movements is not without its problems.

40 The concept of internal colonialism partly explains this (see González Casanova 1969; Santos 2010a). It is, to my mind, a partial account, to the extent that the most common versions of the concept underline class rather than racial or ethnic oppression.

41 In Aymara, the dominant indigenous language in Bolivia, the corresponding concept is *suma qamaña*.

42 There is today a rich bibliography on the concept of sumak kawsay. Among others, see Acosta (2014: 93–122), Chancosa (2010), Giraldo (2014), Gudynas (2011: 441–47), Hidalgo-Capitán, García, and Guazha (2014: 13–23), Tortosa (2011), Waldmüller (2014), Walsh (2010: 15–21), and Unceta (2014: 59–92).

43 For centuries, tribal people have also conceived of nature as Mother Earth. For instance, for the tribal people living in the Thane district of Maharashtra, nature and land is Dharitri, Mother Earth (AYUSH 2010).

44 In this regard it is crucial to distinguish between people and their beliefs or between individuals and systems. Because of this, Gandhi does not blame the English people for colonization, but blames modernity itself.

45 There are some doubts about the real authorship of this quote. In this context what the quote says is much more important than its real authorship.

11. PEDAGOGY OF THE OPPRESSED

1 In the original Spanish: "investigación-acción participativa" (IAP; see Fals Borda 1986, the Spanish edition). Here I quote from Fals Borda (1988).

2 Liberation theology and Marxism in his thinking become more evident after his exile in Chile following the 1964 military coup in Brazil. Almost at the same time that Paulo Freire's (1970) *Pedagogia do Oprimido* was published, Gustavo Gutiérrez (1971) came out with *Teologia de la Liberación*, also a pioneering work bringing together liberation theology and Marxism. On the Marxist component of Paulo Freire's work, see Donaldo Macedo's (2004: ix–xxv) pertinent remarks in his foreword to Freire's *Pedagogy of Indignation*. When Freire started his project on popular education, half of the Brazilian population was illiterate and impoverished by a brutal system of inequality and social oppression. The situation was even worse in the northeast, where Freire began his movement in 1962. Among a population of 25 million, 15 million were illiterate.

3 The first large theoretical formulation of Freire's (1967) proposal is *Educação como Prática da Liberdade*, with a remarkable preface by Francisco Weffort. This book was followed by *Pedagogia do Oprimido*, written in 1968 during its author's exile in Chile and published later in the United States as *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (Freire 1970). Freire continued working on the pedagogy of the oppressed, adding reflections on his passage through the United States and several stays in Africa in countries just liberated from Portuguese colonialism.

4 As Henry Giroux (1985: xiii) states in the introduction to *The Politics of Education: Culture, Power, and Liberation*, "Education represents in Freire's view both a struggle for meaning and a struggle over power relations."

5 My translation. Page numbers included in the text.

6 Fals Borda (1970: 57) distinguishes between participant-observation, observation-intervention, and observation-insertion, the last one corresponding to PAR.

7 The topic of the epistemological value of the tropics continued to capture Fals Borda's attention (see Fals Borda and Mora-Osejo 2007: 397–406).

8 Their convergences are far more significant than their differences. See an excellent comparative work in Carrillo (2015: 11–20).

9 It is no coincidence that the WSF should emerge in Brazil, in a context of great activism among social movements, which led to the election of progressive governments in several countries on the continent, from Venezuela to Argentina, from Bolivia to Ecuador, from Brazil to Chile. Most of the progressive political transformations occurred in the first decade of the 2000s. Many of these governments faced crises in the following period (see Santos 2006c; 2008: 247–70; 2010b).

10 It must be kept in mind, however, that Fals Borda, in tune with some Latin American critical sociology, often speaks of colonialism and intellectual colonialism, even though he always gives theoretical and political priority to his criticism of capitalism.

11 The critical perspective depends on how the entire context is viewed: "When men lack a critical understanding of their reality, apprehending it in fragments which they do not perceive as interacting constituent elements of the whole, they cannot truly know that reality" (Freire 1970: 94–95).

12 Freire (1970: 105) explicitly borrows this distinction from Lucien Goldman. In fact, in Freire the work of the research team is generally conceived of by recourse to

Marxist categories, such as the distinction between primary and secondary contradictions: "the more the group divide and reintegrate the whole, the more closely they approach the nuclei of the principal and secondary contradictions which involve the inhabitants of the area" (1970: 104).

13 Both Freire and Fals Borda harbor a materialist analysis of history inspired by Marxism. But they both entertain Marxism without any shred of dogmatism and try to adjust it to the conditions of the popular masses of the Latin American subcontinent. Furthermore, they both confer a central place on education, knowledge, representations, and the construction of conscious subjectivity (Freire's conscientização). That is to say, they privilege themes that a certain narrow Marxism would consider idealist deviations. Fals Borda even remarks, "It is obvious that in this context the forms and relations of the production of knowledge have the same or even more importance than the forms and relations of material production" (1988: 137).

14 I do not have to repeat here that neither cognitive justice nor cognitive democracy has anything to do with relativism (see chapter 2).

15 Fals Borda, in his turn, conceives of PAR as research techniques, but he is also aware of its worth as popular education: "From our definition it may be deduced that PAR is not exclusively research oriented, that it is not only adult education or only socio-political action. It encompasses all these aspects together as three stages or emphases which are not necessarily consecutive. They may be combined into an experiential methodology, that is, a process of personal and collective behaviour occurring within a satisfying and productive cycle of life and labour" (1988: 85).

16 For example: "This task implies that revolutionary leaders do not go to the people in order to bring them a message of 'salvation' but in order to come to know through dialogue with them both their objective situation and their awareness of that situation" (Freire 1970: 84).

12. FROM UNIVERSITY TO PLURIVERSITY AND SUBVERSITY

1 In the analysis that follows, I refer exclusively to the modern public university.

2 I deal with this topic at great length in chapters 7 and 8 of my book *Decolonising the University: The Challenge of Deep Cognitive Justice*. I present here a summary of the arguments made there.

3 On the relation between social and student movements, on the one side, and university reforms, on the other, see, for the case of Spain, the excellent study by Buey (2009).

4 Similar critiques were produced in various African contexts. See, for example, Memmi (1953) for Tunisia and Kadri (2007) for Algeria. "From very early on and until quite late, colonial educational policy was prey to an insurmountable trap: schooling means acculturing, but it also means conscientiousness raising, and thus running the risk of putting the colonial relation in question. Such ambiguity appeared to be constitutive of the colonial project and inherent to colonization itself. From this point of view, the hesitations that characterized the period right

after colonial intrusion are the beginning of a feature that was to traverse the entire colonial educational policy up to the eve of independence" (Kadri 2007: 20).

5 On the university unrest in South Africa, see Mbembe (2016) and Maldonado-Torres (2016), as discussed in Santos (2017). See also Nyamnjoh (2016).

6 Chinua Achebe wrote in 1964 a speech titled "The African Writer and the English Language," in which he asked, "Is it right that a man should abandon his mother tongue for someone else's? It looks like a dreadful betrayal and produces a guilty feeling. But for me there is no other choice. I have been given the language and I intend to use it" (1975: 62).

7 In many African countries the colonizer's language is the official language, whereas the indigenous African languages are recognized formally as national languages. For example, South Africa has eleven official (national) languages. In Latin America, the constitutions of Ecuador (2008) and of Bolivia (2009) understand the recognition of indigenous languages as national languages to be part of the process of decolonizing the state and society.

8 In my book *Decolonising the University: The Challenge of Deep Cognitive Justice*, I identify the following main tasks guiding the building of the pluriversity: confronting the new with the new, fighting for the definition of the crisis, democratic access, extension as service provision of public interest for nonsolvent publics, action research and ecology of knowledges, relinking the university and the public school, South-South networking, internal democratizing, and participative evaluation.

9 Recently, in Brazil, during the administration of the Workers Party (2003–16), a few public universities were created that described themselves as popular or communitarian universities. They offered some institutional innovations geared to bring the university closer to the surrounding communities and to commit the university strongly to public policies such as regional integration or affirmative action against ethnoracial discrimination. Among others, consider the following: the Regional Community University of Chapecó, the Interuniversity of Latin-American Integration, and the University of Luso-African Lusophone Integration (see Santos, Mafra, and Romão 2013; Benicá and Santos 2013: 51–80; Romão and Loss 2013: 81–124; Morris 2015). The issue at stake is to find out to what extent a public university, bureaucratically organized, focused on scientific knowledge and oriented to conceding diplomas may, indeed, be considered communitarian or popular.

10 See also Freire (1970) and Esteva, Stuchul, and Prakash (2005: 82–98). In Latin America, popular education was also associated with liberation theology, the Cuban Revolution (1959), and the socialist experience of Salvador Allende in Chile (1970–73). On popular education in Latin America see Puiggrós (1984) and Torres (1990, 1995, 2001). From the 1970s onwards, in Latin America and elsewhere, popular education became associated with Antonio Gramsci, in light of his writings on adult education and his active involvement in workers' education circles, including the Club di Vita Morale and the setting up of an Institute of Proletarian Culture, its correspondence school, and the *scuola dei confinati* (school for prisoners) at Ustica (see Mayo 1995: 2–9).

11 Other ideologies were involved in the creation of popular universities. For example, the Popular University of Turin, created in 1900, at its onset had a philanthropic impulse and benefited from the support of the University of Turin. In 1916, Gramsci published a radical critique of this university in the Italian communist paper *Avanti*: "I sometimes wonder why it has not been possible in Turin to develop a solid institution for the popularization of culture, why the Public University has remained the poor thing it is and has been unable to win the public's attention, respect and love, why it has not succeeded in forming a public of its own. The answer is not easy, or it is too easy. There are clearly problems with organization and with the criteria which inform the university. The best response should be to do better, to show concretely that it is possible to do better and to gather a public round a cultural heat source, provided it is alive and really gives off heat. In Turin the Public University is a cold flame. It is neither a university, nor popular. Its directors are amateurs in matters of cultural organization. What causes them to act is a mild and insipid spirit of charity, not a live and fecund desire to contribute to the spiritual raising of the multitude through teaching. As in vulgar charitable institutes, they distribute food parcels which fill the stomach, perhaps cause some indigestion, but then leave no trace, bring about no change in people's lives" (in Forgacs 2000: 65).

12 Such pedagogical unlearning is as demanding as the methodological unlearning inherent in conducting research in consonance with the epistemologies of the South (see chapter 6 and following chapters).

13 On the concept of learned ignorance see Santos (2014: 99–117).

14 I analyze these different subversities in detail in my book *Decolonising the University: The Challenge of Deep Cognitive Justice.*

15 On this popular university see Santos (2006c: 148–59; 2017).

16 Both documents can be accessed on its webpage: UPMS, http://www.universidadepopular.org/site/pages/en/highlights.php?lang=EN.

17 On the notion of precariat see, among others, Standing: "People who have minimal trust relations with capitalism or the state, making it quite different from the salariat. And it has none of the social contract relationship of the proletariat, whereby labour securities were provided in exchange for subordination and contingent loyalty, the unwritten deal underpinning welfare state" (2011: 9).

18 This term is originally a Spanish and Portuguese word which may be loosely translated as *indignant*. It is usually associated with the protest movements in southern Europe (especially Portugal and Spain) against the economic crisis and austerity, which call for basic rights of home, work, culture, health, and education. Here the word is used to name the people that feel revulsion against an extremely unjust state of affairs that deprives people or groups of their basic human dignity. See Santos, 2015c.

19 To illustrate, I will briefly describe the last three UPMS workshops held in 2016. The Xakriabá workshop was carried out simultaneously in three indigenous villages: Xakriabá Barreiro Preto, Brejo Mata Fome, and Sumaré, a remote area in the state of Belo Horizonte, Brazil. The title chosen by the movements was Territory, Culture and Rights: Intercultural Education in Minas Gerais. It had the distinction of

being jointly organized by the indigenous and the Quilombola (Afro-descendents) movements, with the collaboration of faculty members of the Federal University of Minas Gerais. The Buenos Aires workshop was organized by indigenous and different urban social movements with the support of the Rosa Luxemburg Foundation. The workshop had the participation of leaders of social movements from Brazil, Colombia, and Mexico. The title chosen by the participants reflects the context: Challenges of the Left, Facing a New Political Scenario: Criminalization, Extractivism, and the Precariousness of Life. The Harare workshop was organized by the Zimbabwe Small-Holder Organic Farmers Forum, the Rural Women's Assembly, members of Via Campesina, the African Institute for Agrarian Studies, and the Centro de Estudos Sociais of Coimbra University with the participation of peasant and other social movements and academics from Zimbabwe, Mozambique, South Africa, Ivory Coast, Spain, and Portugal. The title was People, Land, Seeds, Food: 15 Years after the Agrarian Reform in Zimbabwe.

This page intentionally left blank

References

Achebe, Chinua. 1975. *Morning Yet on Creation Day: Essays*. London: Heinemann.

Ackerman, Diane. 1995. *A Natural History of the Senses.* New York: Vintage.

Acosta, Alberto. 2009. "Siempre más democracia, nunca menos." In *El Buen Vivir: Una vía para el desarrollo*, edited by Alberto Acosta, Esperanza Martínez, and Martínez Yánez, 19–38. Quito: Abya-Yala.

Acosta, Alberto. 2013. "Extractivism and Neoextractivism: Two Sides of the Same Curse." In *Beyond Development: Alternative Visions from Latin America*, edited by M. Lang and D. Mokrani, 61–87. Quito: Fundación Rosa Luxemburg.

Acosta, Alberto. 2014. "Post-crecimiento y post-extractivismo: Dos caras de la misma transformación cultural." In *Post-Crecimiento y Buen Vivir: Propuestas globales para la construcción de sociedades equitativas y sustentables*, edited by Gustavo Endara, 93–122. Quito: Friedrich Ebert Stiftung (FES-ILDIS).

Adorno, Theodor. 1997. *Aesthetic Theory*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Akiba, Okon, ed. 2004. *Constitutionalism and Society in Africa*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.

Alatas, Syed. 1974. "The Captive Mind and Creative Development." *International Social Science Journal* 36 (4): 691–99.

Alatas, Syed. 1993. "A Khaldunian Perspective on the Dynamics of Asiatic Societies." *Comparative Civilizations Review* 29: 29–51.

Alatas, Syed. 1995. "The Sacralization of the Social Sciences: A Critique of an Emerging Theme in Academic Discourse." *Archives de sciences sociales des religions* 91: 89–111.

Alatas, Syed. 2006a. *Alternative Discourses in Asian Social Sciences: Responses to Eurocentrism.* New Delhi: Sage.

Alatas, Syed. 2006b. "From Jãmi'ah to University." *Current Sociology* 54 (1): 112–32.

Alatas, Syed. 2006c. "Ibn Khaldūn and Contemporary Sociology." *International Sociology* 21 (6): 782–95. doi:10.1177/0268580906067790.

Alatas, Syed, ed. 2006d. *The Idea of Autonomous Sociology: Reflections on the State of the Discipline.* London: Sage.

Alatas, Syed. 2014. *Applying Ibn Khaldun: The Theory of a Lost Tradition in Sociology*. London: Routledge.

Alatas, Syed, and Vineeta Sinha. 2001. "Teaching Classical Sociological Theory in Singapore: The Context of Eurocentrism." *Teaching Sociology* 29 (3): 316–31. doi:10.2307/1319190.

Alcade, José. 2012. "La universidad popular desde José Carlos Mariátegui." *Con Nuestra América*, June 2. http://connuestraamerica.blogspot.pt/2012/06/la-universidad-popular-desde-jose.html.

Alvares, Claude. 2012. "A Critique of Eurocentric Social Science and the Question of Alternatives." In *Decolonizing the University: The Emerging Quest for Non-Eurocentric Paradigms*, edited by Claude Alvares and Shad Faruqi, 135–61. Pulao Pinang: Penerbit Universiti Sains Malaysia.

Amin, Shahid. 2015. *Conquest and Community: The Afterlife of Warrior Saint Ghazi Miyan*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Amin, Shahid. 2018. "Making the Nation Habitable." In *Knowledges Born in the Struggles: Constructing Epistemologies of the South*, edited by Boaventura de Sousa Santos and Maria Paula Meneses. London: Routledge.

Anderson, Benedict. 2005. *Under Three Flags: Anarchism and the Anticolonial Imagination*. London: Verso.

Anderson, Kevin. 2010. *Marx at the Margins: On Nationalism, Ethnicity and Non-Western Societies*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Andrade, Oswald de. 1990. *A utopia antropofágica*. São Paulo: Globo.

An-Na'im, Abdullahi Ahmed. 2006. *African Constitutionalism and the Role of Islam*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Apel, Dora. 2015. *Beautiful Terrible Ruins: Detroit and the Anxiety of Decline*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Arboleda, Santiago. 2002. "Paisanajes, Colonias y Movilización Social Afrocolombiana, en el Suroccidente Colombiano." In *Afrodescendientes de las Américas: Trayectorias sociales e identidades. 150 años de la abolición de la esclavitud en Colombia*, edited by Claudia Mosquera, Mauricio Pardo, and Odile Hoffman, 399–420. Bogotá: Universidad Nacional de Colombia ICAH/IRD/ILSA.

Arias, Patricio Guerrero. 2016. *Colonialidad del Saber e Insurgencia de las Sabidurías Otras: Corazonar las Epistemologías Hegemónicas, Como Respuesta de Insurgencia (de)colonial*. Quito: Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar Sede Ecuador.

Asad, Talal. 1993. *Genealogies of Religion: Discipline and Reasons of Power in Christianity and Islam*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Asante, Molefi. 1980. *Afrocentricity: The Theory of Social Change*. Buffalo, NY: Amulefi.

Asante, Molefi. 1998. *The Afrocentric Idea*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Asante, Molefi. 2009. "Afrocentricity." *Dr. Molefi Kete Asante* website, April 13. http://www.asante.net/articles/1/afrocentricity.

Atalay, Sonya. 2006. "Indigenous Archaeology as Decolonizing Practice." *American Indian Quarterly* 30 (3): 280–310. doi:10.1353/aiq.2006.0015.

Atalay, Sonya. 2012. *Community-Based Archaeology: Research with, by and for Indigenous and Local Communities*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Ayma, Evo Morales. 2009. *Constitution of the Plurinational State of Bolivia*. Translated by Luis Francisco Valle Velasco. La Paz, Bolivia: LFVP.

AYUSH. 2010. “We Are the Adivasi from Thane!” Adivasi Yuva Shakti. http://adivasiyuva.blogspot.com/2010/07/we-are-adivasi-from-thane.html.

Babbitt, Susan, and Sue Campbell, eds. 1999. *Racism and Philosophy.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Barad, Karen. 2007. *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Barrett, Boyd. 1927. *The Jesuit Enigma*. New York: Boni and Liverlight.

Bawa, Vasant. 1996. “Gandhi in the 21st Century: Search for an Alternative Development Model.” *Economic and Political Weekly* 31 (47): 3048–49.

Ba-Yunus, Ilyas, and Farid Ahmad. 1985. *Islamic Sociology: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Islamic Academy.

Benicá, Dirceu, and Eduardo Santos. 2013. “O caráter popular da educação superior.” In *Universidade popular: Teorias, práticas e perspectivas*, edited by Eduardo Santos, Jason Mafra, and José Romão, 51–80. Brasília: Liber Livro.

Benjamin, Walter. 1968. “Thesis on the Philosophy of History.” In *Illuminations*, 253–64. New York: Schocken.

Bernasconi, Robert. 2003. *Race and Racism in Continental Philosophy*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Bhambra, Gurminder. 2007. *Rethinking Modernity: Postcolonialism and the Sociological Imagination.* Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bhambra, Gurminder. 2014. *Postcolonial and Decolonial Reconstructions in Connected Sociologies*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Bhambra, Gurminder. 2018. “Global Social Thought via the Haitian Revolution.” In *Knowledges Born in the Struggles: Constructing Epistemologies of the South*, edited by Boaventura de Sousa Santos and Maria Paula Meneses. London: Routledge.

Bhambra, Gurminder, and Boaventura de Sousa Santos. 2017. “Introduction: Global Challenges for Sociology.” *Sociology* 51 (1): 3–10. doi:10.1177/0038038516674665.

Bilgrami, Akeel. 2002. “Gandhi’s Integrity: The Philosophy behind the Politics.” *Postcolonial Studies* 5 (1): 79–93.

Binte Masud, S. 2011. “Sage Philosophy: Revisiting Oruka’s African Ideology.” *Journal of Black Studies* 42 (6): 874–86.

Bondurant, Joan. 1964. *Satyagraha vs. Duragraha: The Limits of Symbolic Violence*. Berkeley: Center for South Asia Studies, Institute of International Studies, University of California.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1979. *Distinction: La critique sociale du jugement*. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1990. *In Other Words: Essays towards a Reflexive Sociology*. Translated by Matthew Adamson. Cambridge: Polity.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 2002. *Si le monde social m’est supportable, c’est parce que je peux m’indigner : Entretiens par Antoine Spire*. La Tour d’Aigues: Éditions de l’Aube.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 2003. *Méditations Pascaliennes*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

Bourke, Joanna. 2014. “Pain Sensitivity: An Unnatural History from 1800 to 1965.” *Journal of Medical Humanities* 35 (3): 301–19. doi:10.1007/s10912-014-9283-7.

Bragança, Aquino de. 1976. *Amílcar Cabral*. Lisbon: Iniciativas Editoriais.

Bragança, Aquino de, and Immanuel Wallerstein. 1982. "The Road to Armed Struggle." In *The African Liberation Reader: Documents of the National Liberation Movements*. Vol. 2, *The National Liberation Movements*, edited by Aquino de Bragança and Immanuel Wallerstein, 33–78. London: Zed.

Buey, Francisco. 2009. *Por una universidad democrática: Escritos sobre la universidad y los movimientos universitarios (1965–2009)*. Barcelona: El Viejo Topo.

Burke, Kenneth. 1954. *Permanence and Change: An Anatomy of Purpose*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.

Butler, Judith. 1993. *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex."* New York: Taylor and Francis.

Butler, Judith. 2004. *Undoing Gender*. New York: Routledge.

Cabral, Amílcar. 1969. "The Weapon of Theory." In *Revolution in Guinea*, 90–111. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Cabral, Amílcar. 1971. *Our People Are Our Mountains: Amilcar Cabral on the Guinean Revolution*. London: Committee for Freedom in Mozambique, Angola and Guiné.

Cabral, Amílcar. 1975. *Análise de Alguns Tipos de Resistência*. Lisbon: Seara Nova.

Cabral, Amílcar. 1976. "Libertação nacional e cultura." In *Obras escolhidas de Amílcar Cabral*. Vol. 1, *A arma da teoria: Unidade e luta*, 221–33. Lisbon: Seara Nova.

Cabral, Amílcar. 1982. "A Situation of Permanent Violence." In *The African Liberation Reader: Documents of the National Liberation Movements*. Vol. 2, *The National Liberation Movements*, edited by Aquino de Bragança and Immanuel Wallerstein, 63–65. London: Zed.

Camara, Aliou. 2001. *La philosophie politique de Léopold Sedar Senghor*. Paris: L'Harmattan.

Carrillo, Alfonso. 2015. "La investigación acción participativa: Entre las ciencias sociales y la educación popular." *Pirágua* 41: 11–20.

Castiano, José. 2015. *Filosofia Africana: Da Sagacidade à Intersubjectivação com Viegas*. Maputo: Educar, Universidade Pedagógica–Maputo.

Castleden, Heather, Vanessa Morgan, and Aelita Neimanis. 2010. "Researchers' Perspectives on Collective/Community Co-authorship in Community-Based Participatory Indigenous Research." *Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics* 5 (4): 23–32. doi:10.1525/jer.2010.5.4.23.

Castro-Gómez, Santiago, and Ramón Grosfoguel, eds. 2007. *El giro decolonial: Reflexiones para una diversidad epistémica más allá del capitalismo global*. Bogotá: Siglo del Hombre Editores.

Césaire, Aimé. 1955. *Discours sur le colonialisme*. Paris: Présence Africaine.

Césaire, Aimé. 1957. *Letter to Maurice Thorez*. Paris: Présence Africaine.

Chabot, Sean, and Jan Duyvendak. 2002. "Globalization and Transnational Diffusion between Social Movements: Reconceptualizing the Dissemination of the Gandhian Repertoire and the 'Coming Out' Routine." *Theory and Society* 31 (6): 697–740.

Chagas, Mário, and Inês Gouveia. 2014. "Museologia social: Reflexões e práticas." *Cadernos do CEOM* 27 (41): 9–22.

Chakrabarty, Dipesh. 2010. "The Legacies of Bandung: Decolonization and the Politics of Culture." In *Making a World after Empire: The Bandung Moment and Its Political Afterlives*, edited by Christopher Lee, 45–68. Athens: Ohio University Press.

Chambers, Iain. 2012. "The Museum of Migrant Modernities." In *Cultural Memory, Migrating Modernities and Museum Practices*, edited by Beatrice Ferrara, 13–32. Milan: MELA.

Chambers, Iain, Alessandra De Angelis, Celeste Ianniciello, Mariangela Orabona, and Michaela Quadraro, eds. 2014. *The Postcolonial Museum: The Arts of Memory and the Pressures of History*. Farnham, UK: Ashgate.

Chambers, Iain, Giulia Grechi, and Mark Nash, eds. 2014. *The Ruined Archive*. Milan: MELA.

Chancosa, Blanca. 2014. "Sumak Kawsay desde la visión de la mujer." In *Sumak Kawsay Yuyay Antología del Pensamiento Indigenista Ecuatoriano sobre Sumak Kawsay*, edited by Antonio Hidalgo-Capitán, Alejandro García, and Nancy Guazha, 221–28. Huelva y Cuenca: FIUCUHU.

Chatterjee, Partha. 1984. "Gandhi and the Critique of Civil Society." In *Subaltern Studies: Writings on South Asian History and Society*, vol. 3, edited by Ranajit Guha, 153–95. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Chilcote, Ronald. 1991. *Amilcar Cabral's Revolutionary Theory and Practice: A Critical Guide*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Chomsky, Noam. 1987. *The Chomsky Reader*. New York: Pantheon.

Chomsky, Noam. 2010. *Making the Future: The Unipolar Imperial Moment*. San Francisco: City Lights.

Chomsky, Noam. 2014. *Masters of Mankind: Essays and Lectures, 1969–2013*. Chicago: Haymarket.

Chomsky, Noam. 2016. *Who Rules the World?* New York: Metropolitan.

Chrétien, Jean-Louis. 2003. *Hand to Hand: Listening to the Work of Art*. New York: Fordham University Press.

Classen, Constance, ed. 2005. *The Book of Touch*. Oxford: Berg.

Classen, Constance, ed. 2014. *A Cultural History of the Senses in the Age of Empire*. London: Bloomsbury.

Colson, Robert L. 2011. "Arresting Time, Resisting Arrest: Narrative Time and the African Dictator in Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong'o's *Wizard of the Crow*." *Research in African Literatures* 42 (1): 133–53.

Comaroff, Jean, and John Comaroff. 1991. *Of Revelation and Revolution*. Vol. 1, *Christianity, Colonialism, and Consciousness in South Africa*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Comaroff, Jean, and John Comaroff. 1997. *Of Revelation and Revolution*. Vol. 2, *The Dialectics of Modernity on a South African Frontier*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Comaroff, Jean, and John Comaroff. 2012. *Theory from the South: Or, How Euro-America Is Evolving toward Africa*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.

Comaroff, Jean, and John Comaroff. 2013. "Writing Theory from the South: The Global Order from an African Perspective." *World Financial Review*, November 13, 17–20.

CONADEP. 1984. *Nunca Más. Informe de la Comisión Nacional sobre la Desaparición de Personas*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Universitaria de Buenos Aires.

Connell, Raewyn. 2007. *Southern Theory: The Global Dynamics of Knowledge in Social Science*. Cambridge: Polity.

Connell, Raewyn. 2014. "Using Southern Theory: Decolonizing Social Thought in Theory, Research and Application." *Planning Theory* 13 (2): 210–23. doi:10.1177/1473095213499216.

Cooper, Craig, ed. 2007. *Politics of Orality*. Leiden: Brill.

Csordas, Thomas J. 1990. "Embodiment as a Paradigm for Anthropology." *Ethos* 18 (1): 5–47.
Curti, Lidia. 2012. "Beyond White Walls." In *Cultural Memory, Migrating Modernities and Museum Practices*, edited by Beatrice Ferrara, 187–203. Milan: MELA.
Cusicanqui, Silvia Rivera. 1993. "La Raíz: Colonizadores y Colonizados." In *Violencias encubiertas en Bolivia*, edited by Silvia Cusicanqui and Raul Barrios, 25–139. La Paz: Centro de Investigación y Promoción del Campesinado (CIPCA).
Cusicanqui, Silvia Rivera. 2012. "Ch'ixinakax utxiwa: A Reflection on the Practices and Discourses of Decolonization." *South Atlantic Quarterly* 111 (1): 95–109. doi:10.1215/00382876-1472612.
Cusicanqui, Silvia Rivera, and René Arze. 1986. "Taller de historia oral andina: Proyecto de investigación sobre el espacio ideológico de las rebeliones andinas a través de la historia oral (1900–1950)." In *Estados y Naciones en los Andes*, edited by Jean-Paul Deler and Yves Saint-Geours, 83–99. Lima: Institut français d'études andines.
Dallmayr, Fred. 2002. *Dialogue among Civilizations: Some Exemplary Voices*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
Dalton, Dennis. 1993. *Mahatma Gandhi: Nonviolent Power in Action*. New York: Columbia University Press.
Dalton, Dennis, ed. 1996. *Mahatma Gandhi: Selected Political Writings*. Indianapolis: Hackett.
Danowsky, Déborah, and Eduardo Viveiros de Castro. 2017. *The Ends of the World*. Cambridge: Polity.
Dantwala, M. 1995. "Gandhi's and Ruskin's *Unto This Last*." *Economic and Political Weekly* 30 (44): 2793–95.
Darwin, C. 1872. *The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals*. London: John Murray.
Das, Veena. 2007. *Life and Words: Violence and the Descent into the Ordinary*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Das, Veena. 2015. *Affliction: Health, Disease, Poverty*. New York: Fordham University Press.
Davis, Angela Yvonne. 1974. *Angela Davis: An Autobiography.* New York: Random House.
Dawdy, Shannon. 2010. "Clockpunk Anthropology and the Ruins of Modernity." *Current Anthropology* 51 (6): 761–93.
Desai, Ashwin, and Goolam Vahed. 2016. *The South African Gandhi: Stretcher-Bearer of Empire.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
Despret, Vinciane. 2002. *Quand le loup habitera avec l'agneau*. Paris: Les Empêcheurs de penser en rond.
Dewey, John. 1922. *Human Nature and Conduct: An Introduction to Social Psychology*. New York: Henry Holt.
Dewey, John. 1928. "Body and Mind." *Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine* 4 (1): 3–19.
Dhaouadi, Mahmoud. 1996. *Toward Islamic Sociology of Cultural Symbols*. Kuala Lumpur: A.S. Noordeen.
Diagne, Souleymane. 2013. *L'encre des savants: Réflexions sur la philosophie en Afrique*. Paris: Editions Présence Africaine.
Di Bello, Patrizia, and Gabriel Koureas, eds. 2010. *Art, History and the Senses: 1830 to the Present.* Farnham, UK: Ashgate.
Dirik, Dilar, David Levi Strauss, Michael Taussig, and Peter Lamborn Wilson. 2016. *To Dare Imagining: Rojava Revolution.* New York: Autonomedia.

Draper, Jonathan, ed. 2003. *Orality, Literacy, and Colonialism in Southern Africa*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Draper, Jonathan, ed. 2004. *Orality, Literacy, and Colonialism in Antiquity.* Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Du Bois, William. 1943. "As the Crow Flies." *Amsterdam News* (January 9).

Duker, Sam. 1966. *Listening: Readings*. New York: Scarecrow.

Dussel, Enrique. 1995. *The Invention of the Americas: Eclipse of "the Other" and the Myth of Modernity.* New York: Continuum.

Dussel, Enrique. 2000. "Europe, Modernity and Eurocentrism." *Nepantla: Views from South* 1 (3): 465–78.

Dussel, Enrique. 2002. "World-System and 'Trans' Modernity." *Nepantla: Views from South* 2 (3): 221–45.

Dussel, Enrique. 2005. "Europa, modernidade e eurocentrismo." In *A colonialidade do saber: Eurocentrismo e ciências sociais: Perspectivas latino-americanas*, edited by Edgardo Lander, 24–32. Buenos Aires: CLACSO.

Dussel, Enrique. 2008. "Philosophy of Liberation, the Postmodern Debate, and Latin American Studies." In *Coloniality at Large: Latin America and the Postcolonial Debate*, edited by Mabel Moraña, Enrique Dussel, and Carlos Jauregui, 335–49. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Echevarria, Tessa, and Andrew Sernatinger. 2014. *The Making of Capitalist Patriarchy: Interview with Silvia Federici*. *The North Star*, February 24. http://www.thenorthstar.info/?p=11947.

Echeverría, Bolivar. 2011. *Critica da Modernidade Capitalista*. La Paz: Vicepresidencia del Estado

Elst, Koenraad. 2001. *Decolonizing the Hindu Mind: Ideological Development of Hindu Revivalism.* New Delhi: Rupa.

Escobar, Arturo. 2005. "Economics and the Space of Modernity." *Cultural Studies* 19 (2): 139–75. doi:10.1080/09502380500077714.

Escobar, Arturo. 2008. *Territories of Difference: Place, Movements, Life, Redes*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Escobar, Arturo. 2010. "Latin America at a Crossroads." *Cultural Studies* 24 (1): 1–65.

Escobar, Arturo. 2011. *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Esteva, Gustavo. 2006. *Celebración del Zapatismo*. Oaxaca: Ediciones ¡Basta!

Esteva, Gustavo. 2007a. "The Asamblea Popular de los Pueblos de Oaxaca." *Latin American Perspectives* 34 (1): 129–44. doi:10.1177/0094582x06297615.

Esteva, Gustavo. 2007b. "El camino de la democracia radical." *Bajo el volcán* 13.

Esteva, Gustavo. 2007c. "Oaxaca: The Path of Radical Democracy." *Socialism and Democracy* 21 (2): 74–96. doi:10.1080/08854300701388146.

Esteva, Gustavo, D. Stuchul, and M. Prakash. 2005. "From the Pedagogy for Liberation to Liberation from Pedagogy." In *Rethinking Freire: Globalization and Environmental Crisis*, edited by C. Bowers and F. Apffel-Marglin, 82–98. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Esteva, Gustavo, Rubén Valencia, and David Venegas. 2008. *Cuando Hasta las Piedras Se Levantan: Oaxaca, México, 2006*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Antropofagia.

Fals Borda, Orlando. 1970. *Ciencia Propia y Colonialismo Intelectual*. Mexico: Editorial Nuestro Tiempo.

Fals Borda, Orlando. 1986. *Conocimiento y poder popular: Lecciones con campesinos de Nicaragua, Mexico, Colombia*. Bogotá: Punta de Lanza.

Fals Borda, Orlando. 1988. *Knowledge and People's Power: Lessons with Peasants in Nicaragua, Mexico and Colombia*. New Delhi: Indian Social Institute.

Fals Borda, Orlando. 2009. *Una sociología sentipensante para América Latina*. Bogotá: Siglo del Hombre Editores and CLACSO.

Fals Borda, Orlando, and Luis Mora-Osejo. 2007. "Beyond Eurocentrism: Systematic Knowledge in a Tropical Context. A Manifesto." In *Cognitive Justice in a Global World: Prudent Knowledges for a Decent Life*, edited by Boaventura de Sousa Santos, 397–406. Lanham, MD: Lexington.

Fanon, Frantz. 1967a. *Black Skin, White Masks.* New York: Grove.

Fanon, Frantz. 1967b. *Toward the African Revolution*. New York: Grove.

Fanon, Frantz. 1968. *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Grove.

Federici, Silvia. 2004. *Caliban and the Witch: Women, the Body, and Primitive Accumulation.* New York: Autonomedia.

Fernández Retamar, Roberto. 2016. *Pensamiento anticolonial de nuestra América*. Buenos Aires: CLACSO.

Ferrara, Anita. 2015. *Assessing the Long-Term Impact of Truth Commissions*. London: Routledge.

Feyerabend, Paul K. 1975. *Against Method: Outline of Anarchistic Theory of Knowledge*. London: New Left.

Finnegan, Ruth. 2005. "Tactile Communication." In *The Book of Touch*, edited by Constance Classen, 18–25. Oxford: Berg.

Finnegan, Ruth. 2012. *Oral Literature in Africa*. Cambridge: Cambridge Open Book.

Foley, John. 2012. *Oral Tradition and the Internet Pathways of the Mind*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Forgacs, David, ed. 2000. *The Gramsci Reader: Selected Writings 1916–1935*. New York: New York University Press.

Foucault, Michel. 1969. *L'Archéologie du Savoir*. Paris: Gallimard.

Foucault, Michel. 1995. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage.

Fox, Richard. 1987. *Gandhian Utopia: Experiments with Culture*. Boston: Beacon.

Fox, Richard. 1997. "Passage from India." In *Between Resistance and Revolution: Cultural Politics and Social Protest*, edited by Richard Fox and Orin Starn, 65–82. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Fraleigh, Sondra. 1987. *Dance and the Lived Body*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Fraleigh, Sondra. 1994. "Good Intentions and Dancing Moments: Agency, Freedom, and Self-Knowledge in Dance." In *The Perceived Self Ecological and Interpersonal Sources of Self Knowledge*, edited by Ulric Neisser, 102–11. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Freire, Paulo. 1967. *Educação como Prática da Liberdade*. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.

Freire, Paulo. 1970. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

Freire, Paulo. 1985. *The Politics of Education: Culture Power and Liberation*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin and Garvey.

Fujimura, Joan. 2007. "Authorizing Knowledge in Science and Anthropology." In *Cognitive Justice in a Global World: Prudent Knowledge for a Decent Life*, edited by Boaventura de Sousa Santos, 105–28. Lanham, MD: Lexington.

Fuller, Steve W. 2003. "The Unended Quest for Legitimacy in Science." *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 33 (4): 472–78. doi:10.1177/0048393103258148.

Gade, Anna M. 2004. *Perfection Makes Practice: Learning, Emotion, and the Recited Qur'ān in Indonesia*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Galison, Peter, and David Stump, eds. 1996. *The Disunity of Science: Boundaries, Contexts, and Power*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Gandhi, Mahatma. 1942. "Village Swaraj." *Harijan*, July 26.

Gandhi, Mahatma. 1951. *Selected Writings of Mahatma Gandhi*. Boston: Beacon.

Gandhi, Mahatma. 1956. *The Gandhi Reader*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Gandhi, Mahatma. 1987. "Introduction." In *Mahatma Gandhi and Leo Tolstoy: Letters*, edited by Srinivasa Murthy, 41–43. Long Beach, CA: Long Beach Publications.

Gandhi, Mahatma. 1999a. "Accident?" In *The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi*, vol. 3, 209. New Delhi: Publications Division Government of India. http://www.gandhiashramsevagram.org/gandhi-literature/mahatma-gandhi-collected-works-volume-1.pdf.

Gandhi, Mahatma. 1999b. "Letter to 'The Natal Advertiser.'" In *The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi*, vol. 1, 206–7. New Delhi: Publications Division Government of India. http://www.gandhiashramsevagram.org/gandhi-literature/mahatma-gandhi-collected-works-volume-1.pdf.

Gandhi, Mahatma. 1999c. "Neither a Saint nor a Politician." In *The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi*, vol. 20, 303–7. New Delhi: Publications Division Government of India. http://www.gandhiashramsevagram.org/gandhi-literature/mahatma-gandhi-collected-works-volume-20.pdf.

Gandhi, Mahatma. 1999d. "A Note." In *The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi*, vol. 96, 311. New Delhi: Publications Division Government of India. http://www.gandhiashramsevagram.org/gandhi-literature/mahatma-gandhi-collected-works-volume-96.pdf.

Gandhi, Mahatma. 1999e. "Speech at Gandhi Seva Sangh." In *The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi*, vol. 65, 408–12. New Delhi: Publications Division Government of India. http://www.gandhiashramsevagram.org/gandhi-literature/mahatma-gandhi-collected-works-volume-65.pdf.

Gandhi, Mahatma. 1999f. "Speech at Opening of Tibbi College, Delhi." In *The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi*, vol. 22, 340–3. New Delhi: Publications Division Government of India. http://www.gandhiashramsevagram.org/gandhi-literature/mahatma-gandhi-collected-works-volume-22.pdf.

Gandhi, Mahatma. 2001. *Satyagraha in South Africa*. Ahmedabad: Navajivan.

Gandhi, Mahatma. 2009. *India of My Dreams*. Ahmedabad: Rajpal and Sons.

Gandhi, Mahatma. 2013. "What Has Hinduism Done for Us?" In *Hinduism According to Gandhi: Thoughts, Writings and Critical Interpretation*, 52–56. New Delhi: Orient.

Garrow, David. 1986. *Bearing the Cross: Martin Luther King, Jr., and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference.* New York: William Morrow.

Geertz, Clifford. 1989. "Anti Anti-relativism." In *Relativism: Interpretation and Confrontation*, edited by Michael Krausz, 12–34. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

Gellner, Ernest. 1979. *Spectacles and Predicaments.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Giarraca, Norma. 2008. "Notas metodológicas: 'Experiencia de investigación' desde lugares diferentes (Algunas reflexiones acerca del intelectual comprometido)." In *Cuando hasta las piedras se levantan: Oaxaca, México, 2006*, edited by Gustavo Esteva, Rubén Valencia, and David Venegas, 121–36. Buenos Aires: Antropofagia.

Gibson, Nigel, ed. 1999. *Rethinking Fanon: The Continuing Dialogue*. Amherst, NY: Humanity.

Gilroy, Paul. 1993. *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Giraldo, Omar. 2014. *Utopías en la era de la supervivencia: Una interpretación del buen vivir*. Mexico City: Editorial Ítaca, Universidad Autónoma de Chapingo.

Giroux, Henry. 1985. "Introduction." In *The Politics of Education: Culture, Power, and Liberation*, by Paulo Freire. New York: Bergin and Garvey.

Giroux, Henry. 1992. *Border Crossings: Cultural Workers and the Politics of Education*. New York: Routledge.

Gitlin, Todd. 2000. "Afterword." In *The Sociological Imagination*, by C. Wright Mills, 229–43. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Glissant, Édouard. 1989. *Caribbean Discourse: Selected Essays*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.

Glissant, Édouard. 2009. *Philosophie de la Relation*. Paris: Gallimard.

Glissant, Édouard. 2010. *Poetics of Relation*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Gluckman, Max. 1955. *The Judicial Process among the Barotse of Northern Rhodesia*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

González Casanova, Pablo. 1969. *Sociología de la explotación.* Mexico City: Siglo XXI.

González Casanova, Pablo, ed. 1984–85. *Historia Política de Los Campesinos Latinoamericanos*. 4 vols. Mexico City: Siglo XXI.

González Casanova, Pablo. 1996. "El colonialismo global y la democracia." In *La nueva organización capitalista mundial vista desde el sur*. Vol. 2, El Estado y la política en el sur del mundo, edited by Samir Amin and Pablo González Casanova, 11–144. Barcelona: Anthropos, Centro de Investigaciones Interdisciplinarias en Ciencias y Humanidades-Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.

González Casanova, Pablo. 2006. "Colonialismo Interno (una redefinición)." In *La Teoría Marxista Hoy: Problemas y perspectivas*, edited by A. Boron, J. Amadeo, and S. González, 409–34. Buenos Aires: CLACSO.

Goody, Jack. 1987. *The Interface between the Written and the Oral*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goody, Jack. 2000. *The Power of the Written Tradition*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Goonatilake, Susantha. 1995. *Toward a Global Science: Mining Civilizational Knowledge*. New Delhi: Vistaar.

Gordon, Jane. 2005. "The General Will as Political Legitimacy: Disenchantment and Double Consciousness in Modern Democratic Theory." PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania.

Gordon, Jane. 2014. *Creolizing Political Theory: Reading Rousseau Through Fanon*. New York: Fordham University Press.

Gordon, Jane, Lewis Gordon, Aaaron Kamugisha, and Neil Roberts, eds. 2016. *Journeys in Caribbean Thought: The Paget Henry Reader*. London: Rowman and Littlefield International.

Gordon, Lewis. 1995a. *Bad Faith and Antiblack Racism*. Amherst, NY: Humanity.

Gordon, Lewis. 1995b. *Fanon and the Crisis of European Man: An Essay on Philosophy and the Human Sciences*. New York: Routledge.

Gordon, Lewis, ed. 1997a. *Black Existential Philosophy*. New York: Routledge.

Gordon, Lewis. 1997b. *Her Majesty's Other Children.* Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Gordon, Lewis. 2000. *Existentia Africana: Understanding Africana Existential Thought.* New York: Routledge.

Gordon, Lewis. 2007. "Problematic People and Epistemic Decolonization: Toward the Postcolonial in Africana Political Thought." In *Postcolonialism and Political Theory*, edited by Nalini Persram, 121–42. Boulder, CO: Lexington.

Gordon, Lewis. 2015. *What Fanon Said: A Philosophical Introduction to His Life and Thought*. New York: Fordham University Press.

Gordon, Lewis. Forthcoming. *"No Longer Enslaved, Yet Not Quite Free": Essays on Freedom, Justice, and the Decolonization of Knowledge*. New York: Fordham University Press.

Gordon, Lewis, George Ciccariello-Maher, and Nelson Maldonado-Torres. 2013. "Frantz Fanon, Fifty Years On: A Memorial Roundtable." *Radical Philosophy Review* 16 (1): 307–24.

Gordon, Lewis, Denean Sharpley-Whiting, and Renée White, eds. 1996. *Fanon: A Critical Reader.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Gorman, Anthony. 2005. "Anarchists in Education: The Free Popular University in Egypt (1901)." *Middle Eastern Studies* 41 (3): 303–20.

Gould, Carol. 1983. *Beyond Domination: New Perspectives on Women and Philosophy*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Allanheld.

Gramsci, Antonio. 1971. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci.* New York: International.

Gready, Paul. 2011. *The Era of Transitional Justice: The Aftermath of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission in South Africa and Beyond*. Oxford: Routledge.

Grosfoguel, Ramón. 2014. "Breves notas acerca del Islam y los Feminismos Islámicos." *Tabula Rasa* 21: 11–29.

Grosfoguel, Ramón. 2016a. "Del extractivismo económico al extractivismo epistémico y ontológico." *Revista Internacional de Comunicación y Desarrollo* 1 (4): 33–45. doi:10.15304/ricd.1.4.3295.

Grosfoguel, Ramón. 2016b. "What Is Racism." *Journal of World-Systems Research* 22 (1): 9–15.

Gudynas, Eduardo. 2009. *El mandato ecológico: Derechos de la Naturaleza y políticas ambientales en la nueva Constitución*. Quito: Abya Yala.

Gudynas, Eduardo. 2011. "Buen Vivir: Today's Tomorrow." *Development* 54 (4): 441–47. doi:10.1057/dev.2011.86.

Guha, Ranajit. 1982. "On Some Aspects of the Historiography of Colonial India." In *Subaltern Studies: Writings on South Asian History and Society*, vol. 1. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Guha, Ranajit, ed. 1989. *Subaltern Studies VI: Writings on South Asian History and Society.* Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Gumbrecht, Hans. 2004. *Production of Presence: What Meaning Cannot Convey.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Gupta, Dipankar. 2009. "Gandhi before Habermas: The Democratic Consequences of Ahimsa." *Economic and Political Weekly* 44 (10): 27–33.

Guru, Gopal. 2009. "Introduction." In *Humiliation, Claims and Context*, edited by Gopal Guru, 1–19. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Guru, Gopal. 2012a. "Egalitarian and Social Sciences in India." In *The Cracked Mirror: An Indian Debate on Experience and Theory*, edited by Gopal Guru and Sundar Sarukkai, 9–28. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Guru, Gopal. 2012b. "Experience, Space and Justice." In *The Cracked Mirror: An Indian Debate on Experience and Theory*, edited by Gopal Guru and Sundar Sarukkai, 71–106. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Guru, Gopal, and Sundar Sarukkai. 2012. *The Cracked Mirror: An Indian Debate on Experience and Theory.* New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Gutiérrez, Gustavo. 1971. *Teologia de la Liberación: Perspectivas.* Lima: Editorial Universitaria CEP.

Habermas, Jürgen. 1981. *Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Habermas, Jürgen. 1984. *The Theory of Communicative Action*. Vol. 1, *Reason and the Rationalization of Society*. Boston: Beacon.

Habermas, Jürgen. 1985. "A Philosophico-Political Profile." *New Left Review* 1 (151): 75–105.

Haraway, Donna. 1991. *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. New York: Routledge.

Haraway, Donna. 2016. *Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Chthulucene*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Hardiman, David. 2003. *Gandhi in His Time and Ours.* New Delhi: Permanent Black.

Harris, James. 1992. *Against Relativism: A Philosophical Defense of Method*. La Salle, IL: Open Court.

Hart, Roger. 1999. "Beyond Science and Civilization: A Post-Needham Critique." *East Asian Science, Technology, and Medicine* 16: 88–114.

Hendrick, George. 1956. "The Influence of Thoreau's 'Civil Disobedience' on Gandhi's Satyagraha." *New England Quarterly* 29 (4): 462–71.

Henry, Paget. 1996. "Fanon, African and Afro-Caribbean Philosophy." In *Fanon: A Critical Reader*, edited by Lewis Gordon, Denean Sharpley-Whiting, and Renée White, 220–43. Oxford: Blackwell.

Henry, Paget. 2000. *Caliban's Reason: Introducing Afro-Caribbean Philosophy*. New York: Routledge.

Hidalgo-Capitán, Antonio, Alejandro Guillén García, and Nancy Deleg Guazha. 2014. "El indigenismo ecuatoriano y el Sumak Kawsay: Entre el buen salvaje y la paja del

páramo." In *Sumak Kawsay Yuyay: Antología del Pensamiento Indigenista Ecuatoriano sobre Sumak Kawsay*, edited by Antonio Hidalgo-Capitán, Alejandro García, and Nancy Guazha, 13–23. Huelva y Cuenca: FIUCUHU.

Hirsch, Steven, and Lucien van der Walt, eds. 2010. *Anarchism and Syndicalism in the Colonial and Postcolonial World, 1870–1940*. Leiden: Brill.

Hodkinson, Stuart, and Paul Chatterton. 2006. "Autonomy in the City? Reflections on the Social Centres Movement in the UK." *City: Analysis of Urban Trends, Culture, Theory, Policy, Action* 10 (3): 305–15.

Holbraad, Martin, Morten Pedersen, and Eduardo Viveiros de Castro. 2014. "The Politics of Ontology—Theorizing the Contemporary." *Cultural Anthropology*, January 13. https://culanth.org/fieldsights/461-the-politics-of-ontology.

Hollis, Ernest, and Steven Lukes, eds. 1982. *Rationality and Relativism*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Hooper-Greenhill, E. 1992. *Museums and the Shaping of Knowledge*. London: Routledge.

Hooper-Greenhill, E. 2000. *Museums and the Interpretation of Visual Culture*. London: Routledge.

Horkheimer, Max, and Theodor Adorno. 1972. *Dialectic of Enlightenment*. New York: Herder and Herder.

Horton, Robin, and Ruth Finnegan, eds. 1973. *Modes of Thought: Essays on Thinking in Western and Non-Western Societies*. London: Faber and Faber.

Hountondji, Paulin, ed. 1997. *Endogenous Knowledge: Research Trails*. Dakar: CODESRIA.

Hountondji, Paulin. 2002. *The Struggle for Meaning: Reflections on Philosophy, Culture and Democracy in Africa*. Athens: Ohio University Press.

Hountondji, Paulin, ed. 2007. *La Rationalité, une ou plurielle?* Dakar: CODESRIA.

Hountondji, Paulin. 2009. "Knowledge of Africa, Knowledge by Africans: Two Perspectives on African Studies." *RCCS Annual Review* (1): 1–11. doi:10.4000/rccsar.174.

Howe, Stephen. 2002. *Ireland and Empire: Colonial Legacies in Irish History and Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hui, Andrew. 2016. *The Poetics of Ruins in Renaissance Literature*. New York: Fordham University Press.

Husserl, Edmund. 1973. *Zur Phänomenologie der Intersubjektivität I*, Husserliana XIII. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Huxley, Aldous. 1933. "Economists, Scientists, and Humanists." In *Science in the Changing World*, edited by Mary Adams, 209–23. London: Allen and Unwin.

Huyssen, Andreas. 2006. "Nostalgia for Ruins." *Grey Room*, no. 23: 6–21.

Hymans, Jacques. 1971. *Leopold Sedar Senghor: An Intellectual Biography*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Jorasvsky, David. 1970. *Lysenko Affair*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Jordens, Joseph. 1998. *Gandhi's Religion: A Homespun Shawl*. London: Macmillan.

Jung, Carl. 1967. "Alchemical Studies." In *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung*, edited by Sir Herbert Read, Michael Fordham, and Gerard Adler, 6–7. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Jung, Carl. 1969. *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Kadri, Aïssa. 2007. "Histoire du système d'enseignement colonial en Algérie." In *La France et l'Algérie: Leçons d'histoire*, edited by Frédéric Abécassis, Gilles Boyer, Benoît Falaize, et al., 19–39. Lyon: Institut national de recherche pédagogique.

Kagame, Alexis. 1956. *La philosophie bantu-rwandaise de l'être*. Bruxelles: Académie Royale des Sciences Coloniales.

Kane, Cheikh Hamidou. 1963. *Ambiguous Adventure*. New York: Walker.

Kane, Ousmane. 2012. *Non-Europhone Intellectuals*. Dakar: CODESRIA.

Kasturi, Leela, and Vina Mazumdar, eds. 1994. *Women and Indian Nationalism*. New Delhi: Vikas.

Keats, John. 1958. *The Letters*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Keller, E. 2002. "Ethnic Federalism, Fiscal Reform, Development and Democracy in Ethiopia." *African Journal of Political Science* 7 (1): 21–50.

Khaldun, Ibn. 1958. *The Muqaddimah: An Introduction to History.* 3 vols. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Khodarkovsky, Michael. 2004. *Russia's Steppe Frontier: The Making of a Colonial Empire, 1500–1800*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Khoshoo, T. 1995. *Mahatma Gandhi, an Apostle of Applied Human Ecology*. New Delhi: Tata Energy Research Institute.

Kitchen, Helen. 1967. "A Conversation with Eduardo Mondlane." *Africa Report* 12 (8): 31–32, 49–51.

Klein, Naomi. 2013. "Dancing the World into Being: A Conversation with Idle No More's Leanne Simpson." *YES! Magazine*, March 3. http://www.yesmagazine.org/peace-justice/dancing-the-world-into-being-a-conversation-with-idle-no-more-leanne-simpson.

Kordig, Carl. 1978. "Discovery and Justification." *Philosophy of Science* 45: 110–17.

Kovach, Margaret. 2009. *Indigenous Methodologies: Characteristics, Conversation and Contexts*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Krausz, Michael, ed. 1989. *Relativism: Interpretation and Confrontation*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

Kusch, Rudolfo. 1998–2003. *Obras completas*. Rosário: Editorial Fundación Ross.

Lacey, Hugh. 2015. "Science, Emancipation and the Variety of Forms of Knowledge." *Metascience* 24: 159–62.

Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. 1999. *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and Its Challenge to Western Thought*. New York: Basic Books.

Lal, Vinay. 2009. "Gandhi's West, the West's Gandhi." *New Literary History* 40 (2): 281–313.

Latour, Bruno. 1987. *Science in Action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Latour, Bruno. 1999. *Pandora's Hope: Essays on the Reality of Science Studies*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Latour, Bruno. 2004. "How to Talk about the Body? The Normative Dimension of Science Studies." *Body and Society* 10 (2–3): 205–29.

León, Irene, ed. 2009. *Sumak Kawsay / Buen Vivir y cambios civilizatorios*. Quito: FEDAEPS.

Leopold, Aldo. (1933) 1986. *Game Management.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. Reprint, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Leopold, Aldo. 1949. *A Sand County Almanac and Sketches Here and There*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1973. *Tristes Tropiques*. London: Jonathan Cape.

Lloyd, Genevieve. 1984. *The Man of Reason: "Male" and "Female" in Western Philosophy.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Lugones, María. 2003. *Pilgrimages/Peregrinajes: Theorizing Coalitions against Multiple Oppressions.* Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Lugones, María. 2007. "Heterosexualism and the Colonial/Modern Gender System." *Hypatia* 22 (1): 186–209.

Lugones, María. 2010a. "The Coloniality of Gender." In *Globalization and the Decolonial Option*, edited by Walter Mignolo and Arturo Escobar, 369–90. London: Routledge.

Lugones, María. 2010b. "Toward a Decolonial Feminism." *Hypatia* 25 (4): 742–59. doi:10.1111/j.1527-2001.2010.01137.x.

Lukács, Georg. 1971. *History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics*. Translated by Rodney Livingstone. London: Merlin.

Lupien, Pascal. 2011. "The Incorporation of Indigenous Concepts of Plurinationality into the New Constitutions of Ecuador and Bolivia." *Democratization* 18 (3): 774–96. doi:10.1080/13510347.2011.563116.

Luthuli, Albert. 1982. "On the Rivonia Trial." In *The African Liberation Reader: Documents of the National Liberation Movements.* Vol. 2, *The National Liberation Movements*, edited by Aquino de Bragança and Immanuel Wallerstein, 41–42. London: Zed.

Luxemburg, Rosa. 2010. *Rosa Luxemburg: Socialism or Barbarism: Selected Writings*. Edited and with an introduction by Paul Le Blanc and Helen Scott. New York: Pluto.

Macdonald, Sharon, ed. 1998. *The Politics of Display: Museums, Science, Culture.* London: Routledge.

Macdonald, Sharon, and G. Fyfe. 1996. *Theorizing Museums.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Macedo, Donaldo. 2004. Foreword to *Pedagogy of Indignation*, by Paulo Freire, ix–xxv. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.

Maeso, Silvia. 2014. " 'Civilising' the Roma? The Depoliticisation of (Anti-)Racism within the Politics of Integration." *Identities* 22 (1): 53–70. doi:10.1080/1070289x.2014.931234.

Magubane, Zine. 2004. *Bringing the Empire Home: Race, Class and Gender in Britain and Colonial South Africa*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Maldonado-Torres, Nelson. 2007. "On the Coloniality of Being: Contributions to the Development of a Concept." *Cultural Studies* 21 (2–3): 240–70. doi:10.1080/09502380601162548.

Maldonado-Torres, Nelson. 2008. *Against War: Views from the Underside of Modernity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Maldonado-Torres, Nelson. 2011. "Thinking through the Decolonial Turn: Post-continental Interventions in Theory, Philosophy, and Critique—an Introduction." *Transmodernity: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World* 1 (2): 1–15.

Maldonado-Torres, Nelson. 2016. "The Crisis of the University in the Context of Neoapartheid: A View from Ethnic Studies." In *Decolonizing the Westernized University: Interventions in Philosophy of Education from Within and Without*, edited by Ramón

Grosfoguel, Roberto Hernández, and Ernesto Rosen Velásquez, 39–52. Lanham, MD: Lexington.

Mamdani, Mahmood. 1996. *Citizen and Subject: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Martínez, Miguel. 2007. "The Squatters' Movement: Urban Counter-Culture and Alter-Globalization Dynamics." *South European Society and Politics* 12 (3): 379–98.

Marx, Karl, and Frederick Engels. 1974. *The German Ideology*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Masolo, Dismas. 2003. "Philosophy and Indigenous Knowledge: An African Perspective." *Africa Today* 50 (2): 21–38. doi:10.1353/at.2004.0015.

Masolo, Dismas. 2016. "African Sage Philosophy." In *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/african-sage/.

Mayo, Peter. 1995. "The 'Turn to Gramsci' in Adult Education: A Review." *International Gramsci Society Newsletter* 4: 2–9.

Mazama, Ama, ed. 2003. *The Afrocentric Paradigm*. Trenton, NJ: Africa World.

Mbembe, Achille. 1992. "Provisional Notes on the Postcolony." *Africa* 62 (1): 3–37. doi:10.2307/1160062.

Mbembe, Achille. 2003. "Necropolitics." *Public Culture* 15 (1): 11–40. doi:10.1215/08992363-15-1-11.

Mbembe, Achille. 2016. "Decolonizing the University: New Directions in Arts and Humanities." *Higher Education* 15 (1): 29–45.

McKenna, Phil. 2017. "Standing Rock's Pipeline Fight Brought Hope, Then More Misery." *InsideClimateNews*, April. https://insideclimatenews.org/news/30032017/dakota-access-pipeline-standing-rock-protests-oil-obama-donald-trump.

McLellan, David, ed. 2000. *Karl Marx: Selected Writings*. New York: Oxford University Press.

McRuer, Robert. 2006. *Crip Theory: Cultural Signs of Queerness and Disability*. New York: New York University Press.

Mehta, Usha. 1962. "Gandhi and Thoreau." *Indian Journal of Political Science* 23 (1–4): 252–57.

Memmi, Albert. 1953. *La Statue de sel*. Paris: Ed. Corréa.

Mendes, José Manuel. 2019. "Carry Their Rights, Their Own Way: Dalit Struggle for Equality." In *Demodiversity: Towards New Democratic Possibilities*, edited by Boaventura de Sousa Santos and José Manuel Mendes. London: Routledge.

Meneses, Maria Paula. 2010. "O indígena africano e o colono europeu: A construção das diferenças por processos legais." *E-cadernos CES* 7: 68–93.

Meneses, Maria Paula. 2011. "Images outside the Mirror? Mozambique and Portugal in World History." *Human Architecture* 9: 121–37.

Meneses, Maria Paula. 2016. "Os sentidos da descolonização: Uma análise a partir de Moçambique." *OPSIS* 16 (1): 26–44.

Menon, Ritu. 2011. *Making a Difference: Memoirs from the Women's Movement in India*. Delhi: Women Unlimited.

Mercier, Lucien. 1986. *Les universités populaires 1899–1914*. Paris: Éditions ouvrières.

Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. 1962. *Phenomenology of Perception*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. 1963. *The Structure of Behavior.* Translated by Alden Fisher. Boston: Beacon.

Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. 1964a. "Eye and Mind." In *The Primacy of Perception*, edited by James E. Edie and translated by Carleton Dallery, 159–90. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. 1964b. *Le visible et l'invisible.* Paris: Gallimard.

Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. 1978. *L'union de l'âme et du corps chez Malebranche, Biran et Bergson*. Paris: J. Vrin.

Mies, Maria. 1986. *Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World Scale*. London: Zed.

Mignolo, Walter. 2013. "Geopolitics of Sensing and Knowing: On (De)Coloniality, Border Thinking, and Epistemic Disobedience." *Confero: Essays on Education Philosophy and Politics* 1 (1): 129–50. doi:10.3384/confero.2001-4562.13v1i1129.

Mills, C. Wright. 1948. *The New Men of Power: America's Labor Leaders*. New York: Harcourt Brace.

Mills, C. Wright. 1951. *White Collar: The American Middle Classes*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Mills, C. Wright. 1956. *The Power Elite*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Mills, C. Wright. 2000. *The Sociological Imagination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Minawi, Mostafa. 2016. *The Ottoman Scramble for Africa: Empire and Diplomacy in the Sahara and the Hijaz*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Miscevic, Nenad. 2000. *Rationality and Cognition: Against Relativism-Pragmatism*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Misirhiralall, Sabrina. 2013. "Dance as Portrayed in the Media." *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 47 (3): 72–95.

Mol, Annemarie. 1999. "Ontological Politics: A Word and Some Questions." In *Actor Network Theory and Beyond*, edited by John Law and John Hassard, 74–89. Oxford: Blackwell.

Mol, Annemarie. 2002. *The Body Multiple: Ontology in Medical Practice*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Mondlane, Eduardo. 1969. *The Struggle for Mozambique*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.

Montagu, Ashley. 1971. *Touching: The Human Significance of the Skin*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Morris, Erik. 2015. "Universidades populares e as epistemologias do sul." PhD diss., CES/FEUC, Universidade de Coimbra.

Moser, Stephanie. 2006. *Wondrous Curiosities: Ancient Egypt at the British Museum*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mudimbe, Valentin. 1988. *The Invention of Africa: Gnosis, Philosophy and the Order of Knowledge*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Mudimbe, Valentin. 1994. *The Idea of Africa*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Mudimbe, Valentin Y., and Boaventura de Sousa Santos. 2013. "Conversation of the World II—Valentin Y. Mudimbe and Boaventura de Sousa Santos." Alice, June 20. http://alice.ces.uc.pt/en/index.php/santos-work/conversation-of-the-world-ii-valentin-y-mudimbe-and-boaventura-de-sousa-santos/.

Mukherjee, Mithi. 2010. *India in the Shadows of Empire: A Legal and Political History, 1774–1950*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Mukherjee, Nirmalangshu. 2009. "Open Letter to Noam Chomsky." *KAFILA—10 Years of a Common Journey*, October 21. https://kafila.online/2009/10/21/open-letter-to-noam-chomsky-nirmalangshu-mukherjee/.

Myers, Ramon, and Mark Peattie, ed. 1984. *The Japanese Colonial Empire, 1895–1945*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Naess, Arne. 1973. "The Shallow and the Deep, Long-Range Ecology Movement: A Summary." *Inquiry* 16 (1): 95–100.

Naess, Arne. 1989. *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle: Outline of an Ecosophy*. Oslo: Universitetet i Oslo.

Naess, Arne. 2002. *Life's Philosophy: Reason and Feeling in a Deeper World*. Athens: Georgia University Press.

Nahón, Abraham. 2017. *Imágenes en Oaxaca: Arte, política y memoria*. Guadalajara: Ciesas.

Nanda, B. 2007. *In Search of Gandhi: Essays and Reflections*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Nandy, Ashis. 1987. *Traditions, Tyranny and Utopias: Essays in the Politics of Awareness.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nandy, Ashis. 1988. "The Politics of Secularism and the Recovery of Religious Tolerance." *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 13 (2): 177–94. doi:10.1177/030437548801300202.

Nandy, Ashis. 1995. *Alternative Sciences: Creativity and Authenticity in Two Indian Scientists*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Nasioka, Katerina. 2017. *Ciudades en Insurrécción: Oaxaca 2006 / Atenas 2008*. Guadalajara: Ciesas.

Ndlovu-Gatsheni, Sabelo. 2008. "Who Ruled by the Spear? Rethinking the Form of Governance in the Ndebele State." *African Studies Quarterly* 10 (2–3): 71–94.

Ndlovu-Gatsheni, Sabelo. 2013. *Coloniality of Power in Postcolonial Africa: Myths of Decolonization*. Dakar: CODESRIA.

Ndlovu-Gatsheni, Sabelo. 2016. *The Decolonial Mandela: Peace, Justice and the Politics of Life*. New York: Berghahn.

Needham, Joseph. 1954. *Science and Civilization in China*. 6 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Newmeyer, Frederick. 1986. *Linguistic Theory in America*. New York: Academic Press.

Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o. 1986. *Decolonizing the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*. London: Heinemann.

Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o. 2006. *Wizard of the Crow*. New York: Pantheon.

Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o. 2007. "Notes Towards a Performance Theory of Orature." *Performance Research* 12 (3): 4–7.

Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o. 2009. *Something Torn and New: An African Renaissance*. New York: Basic Civitas.

Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o. 2012. *Globalectics: Theory and the Politics of Knowing*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. 2016. *Thus Spake Zarathustra: A Book for All and None*. Translated by Thomas Common. Project Gutenberg. http://www.gutenberg.org/files/1998/1998-h/1998-h.htm#link2H_4_0004.

Niezen, Ronald. 2013. *Truth and Indignation: Canada's Truth and Reconciliation Commission on Indian Residential Schools*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Nkrumah, Kwame. 1965. *Neo-colonialism: The Last Stage of Imperialism*. New York: International.

Nkrumah, Kwame. 1970. *Consciencism: Philosophy and Ideology for De-colonization*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Nkrumah, Kwame. 1973. *Revolutionary Path*. New York: International.

Norris, Christopher. 1997. *Against Relativism: Philosophy of Science, Deconstruction and Critical Theory*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Ntuli, Pitika. 1988. "Orature: A Self Portrait." In *Storms of the Heart: an Anthology of Black Arts and Culture*, edited by Kwesi Owusu, 209–18. London: Camden.

Nussbaum, Martha. 2004. "Emotions as Judgments of Value and Importance." In *Thinking about Feeling: Contemporary Philosophers on Emotions*, edited by Robert Solomon, 183–99. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nyamnjoh, Francis. 2016. *#RhodesMustFall: Nibbling at Resilient Colonialism in South Africa*. Mankon: Langaa Research and Publishing.

Nyerere, Julius. 1967. *Freedom and Unity: A Selection from Writings and Speeches 1952–65*. London: Oxford University Press.

Nyerere, Julius. 1968. *Freedom and Socialism—Uhuru na Ujamaa*. Dar es Salaam: Oxford University Press.

Ong, Walter. 1982. *Orality and Literacy*. London: Routledge.

Ortega y Gasset, J. 1942. *Ideas y Creencias*. Madrid: Revista de Occidente.

Oruka, Odera, ed. 1990. *Sage Philosophy: Indigenous Thinkers and Modern Debate on African Philosophy*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Oruka, Odera. 1997. "Mahatma Gandhi and Humanism in Africa." In *Sagacious Reasoning: Henry Odera Oruka in Memoriam*, edited by A. Graness and K. Kresse, 133–38. Frankfurt: P. Lang.

Orwell, George. 1949. *1984: A Novel*. New York: New American Library.

Orwell, George. 1950. "Reflections on Gandhi." In *Shooting an Elephant, and Other Essays*, 93–103. New York: Harcourt Brace.

Oyewùmí, Oyéronké. 1997. *The Invention of Women: Making an African Sense of Western Gender Discourses*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Pantham, Thomas. 1988. "On Modernity, Rationality, and Morality: Habermas and Gandhi." *Indian Journal of Social Science* 2: 187–208.

Parekh, Bhikhu. 1997. *Gandhi: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Parel, Anthony, ed. 1997. *Gandhi: "Hind Swaraj" and Other Writings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Parel, Anthony. 2000. "Introduction: Gandhian Freedoms and Self-Rule." In *Gandhi, Freedom and Self-Rule*, edited by Anthony Parel, 9. Oxford: Lexington.

Parviainen, Jaana. 1998. *Bodies Moving and Moved: A Phenomenological Analysis of the Dancing Subject and the Cognitive and Ethical Values of Dance Art*. Tampere, Finland: Tampere Universit.

Parviainen, Jaana. 2002. "Bodily Knowledge: Epistemological Reflections on Dance." *Dance Research Journal* 34 (1): 11–26.

Patel, Sujata. 2014. "Gazing Backward or Looking Forward: Colonial Modernity and the Making of a Sociology of Modern India." In *Social Theory and Regional Studies*

in the Global Age, edited by S. Arjomand, 437–60. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Paterson, Mark. 2007. *The Senses of Touch: Haptics, Affects and Technologies*. Oxford: Berg.

Péju, Marcel. 1960. "To Die for De Gaulle?" *Temps Modernes*, no. 175–76, October–November: 43–45.

Podemos. 2016. *Un país para la gente: Bases políticas para un gobierno estable y con garantías*. https://podemos.info/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/un-pais-para-la-gente.pdf.

Poerksen, Bernhard. 2004. " 'Truth Is What Works': Francisco J. Varela on Cognitive Science, Buddhism, the Inseparability of Subject and Object, and the Exaggerations of Constructivism—a Conversation." In *The Certainty of Uncertainty: Dialogues Introducing Constructivism*, 85–108. Exeter, UK: Imprint Academic.

Polanska, Dominika, and Grzegorz Piotrowski. 2015. "The Transformative Power of Cooperation between Social Movements: Squatting and Tenants' Movements in Poland." *City: Analysis of Urban Trends, Culture, Theory, Policy, Action* 19 (2–3): 274–96.

Praeg, Leonhard. 2014. *A Report on Ubuntu*. Pietermaritzburg: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press.

Prasad, Amit. 2006. "Beyond Modern vs Alternative Science Debate Analysis of Magnetic Resonance Imaging Research." *Economic and Political Weekly* 21: 219–27.

Prasad, Shambhu. 2001. "Towards an Understanding of Gandhi's Views on Science." *Economic and Political Weekly* 36: 3721–32.

Prashad, Vijay. 2008. *The Darker Nations: A People's History of the Third World*. New York: New Press.

Prescott, John. 2012. *Taste Matters*. London: Reaktion.

Prigogine, Ilya. 1980. *From Being to Becoming*. San Francisco: Freeman.

Prigogine, Ilya. 1997. *The End of Certainty: Time, Chaos, and the New Laws of Nature*. New York: Free Press.

Puiggrós, Adriana. 1984. *Educación popular en América Latina: Origenes, polemicas y perspectivas*. Mexico: Editorial Nueva Imagen.

Quijano, Aníbal. 1991. "Colonialidad y modernidad/racionalidad." *Perú indígena* 29: 11–20.

Quijano, Aníbal. 2005. *Colonialidade do poder, Eurocentrismo e América Latina.* Buenos Aires: CLACSO, Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales.

Rabinow, Paul, and Gaymon Bennett. 2012. *Designing Human Practices: An Experiment with Synthetic Biology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ramose, Mogobe. 1992. "African Democratic Tradition: Oneness, Consensus and Openness: A Reply to Wamba-dia-Wamba." *Quest: An International African Journal of Philosophy* 6 (2): 63–83.

Ramose, Mogobe. 2001. "An African Perspective on Justice and Race." *Polylog: Forum for Intercultural Philosophizing* 2: 1–27.

Ramose, Mogobe B., and Boaventura de Sousa Santos. 2014. "Conversation of the World VI—Boaventura and Mogobe B. Ramose." Alice, March 5. http://alice.ces.uc.pt/en/index.php/democratising-democracy/conversation-of-the-world-vi-boaventura-and-mogobe-b-ramose/.

Ray, Mohit, ed. 2007. *The English Writings of Rabindranath Tagore.* 8 vols. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers and Distributors.

Reiss, Julian, and Jan Sprenger. 2017. "Scientific Objectivity." In *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, spring, edited by Edward Zalta. https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2017/entries/scientific-objectivity/.

Remedios, Francis. 2003. "Fuller and Rouse on the Legitimation of Scientific Knowledge." *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 33 (4): 444–63. doi:10.1177/0048393103257965.

Ribeiro, Darcy. 1996. *Mestiço é que é bom*. Rio de Janeiro: Revan.

Roberts, Neil. 2004. "Fanon, Sartre, Violence, and Freedom." *Sartre Studies International* 10 (2): 139–60.

Rodney, Walter. 1981. *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*. Washington, DC: Howard University Press.

Roht-Arriaza, Naomi, and Javier Mariezcurrena, eds. 2006. *Transitional Justice in the Twenty-First Century: Beyond Truth versus Justice.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Romão, José, and Adriana Loss. 2013. "A universidade popular no Brasil." In *Universidade popular: Teorias, práticas e perspectivas*, edited by Eduardo Santos, Jason Mafra, and José Romão, 81–124. Brasília: Liber Livro.

Rouse, Joseph. 2002. *How Scientific Practices Matter*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rouse, Joseph. 2003. "Remedios and Fuller on Normativity and Science." *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 33 (4): 464–71. doi:10.1177/0048393103257991.

Rouse, Joseph. 2007. "Social Practices and Normativity." *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 37 (1): 46–56. doi:10.1177/0048393106296542.

Rouse, Joseph. 2016. "The Conceptual and Ethical Normativity of Intra-active Phenomena." *Rhizomes: Cultural Studies in Emerging Knowledge*, no. 30. doi:10.20415/rhiz/030.e01.

Roy, Arundhati. 2014. "The NGO-ization of Resistance." *Toward Freedom*, September 8. http://towardfreedom.com/33-archives/globalism/3660-arundhati-roy-the-ngo-ization-of-resistance.

Rudolph, Lloyd. 1996. "Contesting Civilizations: Gandhi and the Counter-Culture." In *Facets of Mahatma Gandhi*, edited by Subrata Mukherjee and Sushila Ramswamy, 41–93. Ethics, Religion and Culture, vol. 4. New Delhi: Deep and Deep.

Ruskin, John. 1872. *Unto This Last*. New York: John Wiley.

Rustin, Bayard. 1971. *Down the Line: The Collected Writings of Bayard Rustin.* Chicago: Quadrangle.

Sadlier, Darlene. 1998. *An Introduction to Fernando Pessoa: Modernism and the Paradoxes of Authorship*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.

Santi, Marlón. 2008. "Entrevista a Marlon Santi, Presidente de la Confederación de Nacionalidades Indígenas del Ecuador (CONAIE): 'Apoyamos el sí a la constitución pero no las políticas del Gobierno nacional.'" Interview by Sergio de Castro, Mayka de Castro, and Marc Delcan. *Rojo y Negro*, September 24. http://www.rojoynegro.info/articulo/sections/entrevista-marlon-santi-presidente-la-confederacion-nacionalidades-indigenas-del-0/.

Santos, Boaventura de Sousa. 1987. "Law: A Map of Misreading. Toward a Post-modern Conception of Law." *Journal of Law and Society* 14 (3): 279–302.

Santos, Boaventura de Sousa. 1995. *Toward a New Common Sense: Law, Science and Politics in the Paradigmatic Transition*. New York: Routledge.

Santos, Boaventura de Sousa. 1998. "Participatory Budgeting in Porto Alegre: Toward a Redistributive Democracy." *Politics and Society* 26 (4): 461–510. doi:10.1177/0032329298026004003.
Santos, Boaventura de Sousa. 2002. *Toward a New Legal Common Sense: Law, Globalization, and Emancipation*. London: Butterworths.
Santos, Boaventura de Sousa, ed. 2005a. *Democratizing Democracy: Beyond the Liberal Democratic Canon*. London: Verso.
Santos, Boaventura de Sousa. 2005b. "Law, Politics, and the Subaltern in Counter-Hegemonic Globalization." In *Law and Globalization from Below: Towards a Cosmopolitan Legality*, edited by Boaventura de Sousa Santos and César Rodríguez-Garavito, 1–26. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Santos, Boaventura de Sousa, ed. 2006a. *Another Production Is Possible: Beyond the Capitalist Canon*. London: Verso.
Santos, Boaventura de Sousa. 2006b. "The Heterogeneous State and Legal Pluralism in Mozambique." *Law and Society Review* 40 (1): 39–76. doi:10.1111/j.1540-5893.2006.00258.x.
Santos, Boaventura de Sousa. 2006c. *The Rise of the Global Left: The World Social Forum and Beyond*. London: Zed.
Santos, Boaventura de Sousa, ed. 2007a. *Another Knowledge Is Possible: Beyond Northern Epistemologies.* London: Verso.
Santos, Boaventura de Sousa. 2007b. "Beyond Abyssal Thinking: From Global Lines to Ecologies of Knowledges." *Review* 30 (1): 45–89.
Santos, Boaventura de Sousa, ed. 2007c. *Cognitive Justice in a Global World: Prudent Knowledge for a Decent Life.* Lanham, MD: Lexington.
Santos, Boaventura de Sousa. 2007d. "Human Rights as an Emancipatory Script? Cultural and Political Conditions." In *Another Knowledge Is Possible: Beyond Northern Epistemologies*, edited by Boaventura de Sousa Santos, 3–40. London: Verso.
Santos, Boaventura de Sousa. 2008. "The World Social Forum and the Global Left." *Politics and Society* 36 (2): 247–70.
Santos, Boaventura de Sousa. 2010a. *Descolonizar el saber, reinventar el poder*. Montevideo: Ediciones Trilce.
Santos, Boaventura de Sousa. 2010b. *Refundación del Estado en América Latina: Perspectivas desde una epistemología del Sur*. Bogotá: Siglo del Hombre Editores.
Santos, Boaventura de Sousa, ed. 2010c. *Voices of the World*. London: Verso.
Santos, Boaventura de Sousa. 2014. *Epistemologies of the South: Justice against Epistemicide*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.
Santos, Boaventura de Sousa. 2015a. "Conhecimento científico e popular: Construindo a ecologia de saberes." In *Dossiê ABRASCO: Um alerta sobre os impactos dos agrotóxicos na saúde*, edited by Fernando Ferreira Carneiro, Raquel Maria Rigotto, Lia Giraldo da Silva Augusto, Karen Friedrich, and André Campos Búrigo, 196–410. Rio de Janeiro / São Paulo: Escola Politécnica de Saúde Joaquim Venâncio.
Santos, Boaventura de Sousa. 2015b. *Revueltas de indignación y otras conversas*. La Paz: OXFAM / CIDES-UMSA / Ministerio de Autonomías.
Santos, Boaventura de Sousa. 2015c. "Towards a Socio-Legal Theory of Indignation." In *Global and Theoretical Contexts: Essays in Honour of William Twining*, edited by Upendra

Baxi, Christopher McCrudden, and Abdul Paliwala, 115–42. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Santos, Boaventura de Sousa. 2017. *Decolonising the University: The Challenge of Deep Cognitive Justice.* Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars.

Santos, Boaventura de Sousa, and Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui. 2013. "Conversation of the World IV—Boaventura and Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui." Alice, October 16. http://alice.ces.uc.pt/en/index.php/santos-work/conversation-of-the-world-iv-boaventura-de-sousa-santos-and-silvia-rivera-cusicanqui-2/.

Santos, Boaventura de Sousa, Maria Paula Meneses, and João Arriscado Nunes. 2007. "Opening Up the Canon of Knowledge and Recognition of Difference." In *Another Knowledge Is Possible: Beyond Northern Epistemologies*, edited by Boaventura de Sousa Santos, xvix–lxii. London: Verso.

Santos, Eduardo, Jason Ferreira Mafra, and José Eustáquio Romão, eds. 2013. *Universidade popular: Teorias, práticas e perspectivas.* Brasília: Liber Livro.

Sardar, Ziauddin. 1988. *The Revenge of Athena: Science, Exploitation and the Third World.* New York: Mansell.

Sarukkai, Sundar. 2012a. "Experience and Theory: From Habermas to Gopal Guru." In *The Cracked Mirror: An Indian Debate on Experience and Theory*, edited by Gopal Guru and Sundar Sarukkai, 29–45. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Sarukkai, Sundar. 2012b. "Phenomenology of Untouchability." In *The Cracked Mirror: An Indian Debate on Experience and Theory*, edited by Gopal Guru and Sundar Sarukkai, 157–99. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Sauvy, Alfred. 1952. "Trois Mondes, Une Planète." *L'observateur* 118: 14.

Schavelzon, Salvador. 2015. *Plurinacionalidad y Vivir Bien / Buen Vivir: Dos conceptos leídos desde Bolivia y Ecuador post-constituyentes*. Quito: CLACSO and Abya-Yala.

Schickore, Jutta. 2014. "Scientific Discovery." In *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, spring, edited by Edward N. Zalta. https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2014/entries/scientific-discovery/.

Schickore, Jutta, and F. Steinle. 2006. *Revisiting Discovery and Justification: Historical and Philosophical Perspectives on the Context Distinction*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Schmidt, Elizabeth. 1991. "Patriarchy, Capitalism, and the Colonial State in Zimbabwe." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 16 (4): 732–56.

Schopenhauer, Arthur. 2010. *Parerga and Paralipomena: Short Philosophical Essays*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Schultz, Katherine. 2003. *Listening: A Framework for Teaching across Differences*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Scocuglia, Afonso Celso. 2009. "Paulo Freire e Boaventura de Sousa Santos: Pedagogia crítica e globalização contra-hegemônica." In *Globalização, educação e movimentos sociais: 40 anos da Pedagogia do Oprimido*, edited by Jason Mafra, Afonso Scocuglia, and Moacir Gadotti, 114–23. São Paulo: Editora e Livraria Instituto Paulo Freire.

Scott, James. 1985. *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Scott, James. 1990. *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Seamon, David, and Arthur Zajonc, eds. 1998. *Goethe's Way of Science: A Phenomenology of Nature*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Sekyi-Out, Ato. 1996. *Fanon's Dialectic of Experience.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Senghor, Léopold. 1961. *Nation et Voie Africaine du Socialisme*. Paris: Présence Africaine.

Senghor, Léopold. 1971. "Problématique de la Négritude." *Présence Africaine* 78 (2): 3–26.

Senier, Siobhan, ed. 2014a. *Dawnland Voices: An Anthology of Indigenous Writing from New England*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Senier, Siobhan. 2014b. "Decolonizing the Archive: Digitizing Native Literature with Students and Tribal Communities." *Resilience: A Journal of the Environmental Humanities* 1 (3). doi:10.5250/resilience.1.3.006.

SENPLADES. 2009. *República del Ecuador. Plan Nacional de Desarrollo. Plan Nacional para el Buen Vivir 2009–2013: Construyendo un Estado Plurinacional e Intercultural*. Quito: Secretaría Nacional de Planificación y Desarrollo.

Shariarti, Ali. 1979. *On the Sociology of Islam*. Berkeley: Mizan.

Shaw, Shaka. 2013. "The Difference between Rap and Hip-Hop." *Ebony*, September 19. http://www.ebony.com/entertainment-culture/the-difference-between-rap-hip-hop-798#axzz4bVRStHEg.

Sheets-Johnstone, Maxine. 1994. *The Roots of Power: Animate Form and Gendered Bodies.* Chicago: Open Court.

Sheets-Johnstone, Maxine. 1998. *Bodies Moving and Moved: A Phenomenological Analysis of the Dancing Subject and the Cognitive and Ethical Values of Dance Art*. Tampere: Tampere University Press.

Sheets-Johnstone, Maxine. 1999. *The Primacy of Movement*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Shor, Ira, and Paulo Freire. 1987. *A Pedagogy for Liberation: Dialogues on Transforming Education*. London: Bergin and Garvey.

Shridharani, Khrisnalal. 1939. *War without Violence: The Sociology of Gandhi's Satyagraha.* New York: Harcourt Brace.

Singh, Baldev, ed. 1988. *Jawaharlal Nehru on Science and Society: A Collection of His Writings and Speeches.* New Delhi: Nehru Memorial Museum and Library.

Skurnik, Walter. 1965. "Léopold Sedar Senghor and African Socialism." *Journal of Modern African Studies* 3 (3): 349–69.

Slate, Nico. 2012. *Colored Cosmopolitanism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Slater, David. 1992. "Theories of Development and Politics of the Post-modern—Exploring a Border Zone." *Development and Change* 233 (3): 283–319.

Smith, Linda. 2012. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples.* London: Zed.

Solano, Xochitl Leyva, et al., eds. 2014. *Prácticas Otras de Conocimiento(s): Entre crisis, entre guerras.* 3 vols. San Cristóbal de Las Casas: Chiapas Cooperativa Editorial RETOS.

Somjee, Sultan. 2000. "Oral Traditions and Material Culture: An East Africa Experience." *Research in African Literatures* 31 (4): 97–103.

Spelman, Elisabeth. 1988. *Inessential Woman: Problems of Exclusion in Feminist Theory*. Boston: Beacon.

Spinoza, Benedict de. 1888. *The Ethics.* New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

Spivak, Gayatri. 1988. “Can the Subaltern Speak?” In *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, edited by Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg, 271–314. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Standing, Guy. 2011. *The Precariat: The New Dangerous Class*. Bloomsbury: Bloomsbury Academic.

Stengers, Isabelle. 2013. *Une autre science est possible! Manifeste pour un ralentissement des sciences*. Paris: La Découverte / Les Empêcheurs de penser en rond.

Stephenson, Marcia. 2002. “Forging an Indigenous Counterpublic Sphere: The Taller de Historia Oral Andina in Bolivia.” *Latin American Research Review* 37 (2): 99–118.

Stoler, Ann Laura. 2009. *Along the Archival Grain: Epistemic Anxieties and Colonial Common Sense.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Subrahmanyam, Sanjay, ed. 1998. *Sinners and Saints: The Successors of Vasco da Gama*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Subrahmanyam, Sanjay. 2012. *The Portuguese Empire in Asia, 1500–1700*. London: Wiley.

Sukarno. 1955. “Speech at the Opening of the Bandung Conference, April 18 1955.” Modern History Sourcebook. http://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/1955sukarno-bandong.html.

Tagore, Rabindranath. 2007. *The English Writings of Rabindranath Tagore: Essays, Lectures, Addresses*. New Delhi: Atlantic.

Tagore, Rabindranath, and Uma Dasgupta. 2009. *The Oxford India Tagore: Selected Writings on Education and Nationalism.* Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Taussig, Michael. 1993. *Mimesis and Alterity: A Particular History of the Senses.* New York: Routledge.

Taussig, Michael. 2004. *My Cocaine Museum.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Taussig, Michael. 2012. “Excelente Zona Social.” *Cultural Anthropology* 27 (3): 498–517.

Thayer, Stephen. 1982. “Social Touching.” In *Tactual Perception: A Sourcebook*, edited by William Schiff and Emerson Foulkes, 263–304. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

THOA. 1988. *El indio Santos Marka T’ula: Cacique principal de los ayllus de Qallapa y apoderado general de las comunidades originarias de la república*. La Paz: Universidad Mayor de San Andrés.

THOA. 1995. *El Ayllu: Pasado y Futuro de los Pueblos Indígenas*. La Paz: Aruwiyiri.

Thoreau, Henry. 1849. “Resistance to Civil Government.” In *Aesthetic Papers*, edited by Elizabeth Peabody. New York: G. P. Putnam.

Thoreau, Henry. 1957. *Walden and Civil Disobedience*. Edited by Sherman Paul. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Tolstoy, Leo. 1987. “A Letter to a Hindu.” In *Mahatma Gandhi and Leo Tolstoy: Letters*, edited by B. Srinivasa Murthy, 44–60. Long Beach: Long Beach Publications.

Tolstoy, Leo. 2007. *The Kingdom of God Is within You*. New York: Cosimo Classics.

Tomatis, Alfred. 1991. *The Conscious Ear: My Life of Transformation through Listening*. Barrytown, NY: Station Hill.

Tomatis, Alfred. 2005. *The Ear and the Voice.* Lanham, MD: Scarecrow.

Torres, Carlos. 1990. *The Politics of Nonformal Education in Latin America*. New York: Praeger.

Torres, Carlos, ed. 1995. *Education and Social Change in Latin America*. Albert Park, Australia: James Nicholas.

Torres, Carlos, ed. 2001. *Paulo Freire e a agenda da educação latino-americana no século XXI*. Buenos Aires: CLACSO.

Tortosa, José. 2011. *Maldesarrollo y mal vivir: Pobreza y violencia a escala mundial.* Edited by Alberto Acosta and Esperança Martínez. Quito: Abya-Yala.

Tuana, Nancy. 1992. *Women and the History of Philosophy*. New York: Paragon House.

Tuana, Nancy, and Rosemarie Tong, eds. 1994. *Feminism and Philosophy: Essential Readings in Theory, Reinterpretation, and Application*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Turner, Victor. 1969. *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-structure.* Chicago: Aldine.

Tutton, Mark. 2012. "Young, Urban and Culturally Savvy, Meet the Afropolitans." CNN, February 17. http://edition.cnn.com/2012/02/17/world/africa/who-are-afropolitans/index.html.

Twining, William. 2000. *Globalization and Legal Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Uberoi, J. 1978. *Science and Culture*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Uberoi, J. 1984. *The Other Mind of Europe: Goethe as a Scientist*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Uberoi, J. 2002. *The European Modernity: Science, Truth and Method.* Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Unceta, Koldo. 2014. "Post crecimiento y desmercantilización: Propuestas para el Buen vivir." In *Post-Crecimiento y Buen Vivir: Propuestas globales para la construcción de sociedades equitativas y sustentables*, edited by Gustavo Endara, 59–92. Quito: Friedrich Ebert Stiftung (FES-ILDIS).

Valls, Andrew, ed. 2005. *Race and Racism in Modern Philosophy*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Vieira, Sérgio. 2010. *Participei, por isso testemunho*. Maputo: Ndjira.

Visvanathan, Shiv. 1997. *Carnival for Science: Essays on Science, Technology and Development*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Viveiros de Castro, Eduardo. 2014. *Cannibal Metaphysics*. Minneapolis: Univocal.

von Hayek, Friedrich August. 2011. *The Constitution of Liberty*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Waithe, Mary. 1987. *History of Women Philosophers*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.

Waldmüller, Johannes. 2014. "Buen Vivir, Sumak Kawsay, 'Good Living': An Introduction and Overview." *Alternautas: (Re)Searching Development: The Abya Yala Chapter*, June 4. http://www.alternautas.net/blog/2014/5/14/buen-vivir-sumak-kawsay-good-living-an-introduction-and-overview.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. 2006. *European Universalism: The Rhetoric of Power*. New York: New Press.

Walsh, Catherine. 2002. "The (Re)articulation of Political Subjectivities and Colonial Difference in Ecuador: Reflections on Capitalism and the Geopolitics of Knowledge." *Nepantla: Views from South* 3 (1): 61–97.

Walsh, Catherine. 2008. "(Post)coloniality in Ecuador: The Indigenous Movement's Practices and Politics of (Re)signification and Decolonization." In *Coloniality at Large:*

Latin America and the Postcolonial Debate, edited by Mabel Moraña, Enrique Dussel, and Carlos Jauregui, 506–18. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Walsh, Catherine. 2009. *Interculturalidad, Estado, Sociedad: Luchas (de)coloniales de nuestra época*. Quito: Ediciones Abya-Yala.

Walsh, Catherine. 2010. "Development as Buen Vivir: Institutional Arrangements and (De)colonial Entanglements." *Development* 53 (1): 15–21. doi:10.1057/dev.2009.93.

Wamba dia Wamba, Ernest. 1991. "Some Remarks on Culture, Development and Revolution in Africa." *Journal of Historical Sociology* 4 (3): 219–53. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6443.1991.tb00119.x.

Warren, Karen. 2009. *An Unconventional History of Western Philosophy: Conversations between Men and Women Philosophers*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Warren, Karen. 2015. "Feminist Environmental Philosophy." In *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, winter, edited by Edward N. Zalta. https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/feminism-environmental/.

Wilhelm, Richard, and C. G. Jung. 1999. *The Secret of the Golden Flower: A Chinese Book of Life*. London: Routledge.

Wilson, Waziyatawin Angela, and Michael Yellow Bird, eds. 2005. *For Indigenous Eyes Only: A Decolonization Handbook*. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.

Wiredu, Kwasi. 1996. *Cultural Universals and Particulars: An African Perspective*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Wiredu, Kwasi. 1998. "Toward Decolonizing African Philosophy and Religion." *African Studies Quarterly* 1 (4): 17–46.

Wolin, Sheldon. 1990. *Contemporary Authors: New Revision Series 28*. Detroit: Gale Research.

Wynter, Sylvia. 1989. "Beyond the Word of Man: Glissant and the New Discourse of the Antilles." *World Literature Today* 63 (4): 637–48.

Wynter, Sylvia. 2003. "Unsettling the Coloniality of Being/Power/Truth/Freedom: Towards the Human, after Man, Its Overrepresentation—an Argument." *CR: The New Centennial Review* 3 (3): 257–337. doi:10.1353/ncr.2004.0015.

Young, Ralph. 2015. *Dissent: The History of an American Idea*. New York: New York University Press.

Zack, Naomi, ed. 2000. *Women of Color and Philosophy: A Critical Reader*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Zucker, Paul. 1961. "Ruins: An Aesthetic Hybrid." *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 20 (2): 119–30.

This page intentionally left blank

Index

abyssal line, 20–24, 41–42, 110, 128, 213, 297; and Conversations of the world, 191, 325n10; and experiences of the senses, 166, 169; identification of, 220; and identity, 150; 158; and ideology of progress, 160; and Marx, 307n7; and modern archive, 198, 200; and pedagogies, 276; and struggles, 249–52
abyssal science, 129, 135–36, 154–57, 186, 192, 278
abyssal thinking, 3–8, 14–16, 41–42, 81–85, 108, 128; archives of, 200–201; decolonization and, 73–75, 94–95; logic of, 136; nonabyssal and, 8, 19–25, 35, 64–65, 249, 261; pedagogies of, 247; persistence of, 325n17. *See also* postabyssal thinking
Achebe, Chinua, 332n6
Acosta, Alberto, 318n29
Adivasi (tribal peoples of India), 82, 84, 237, 329n33, 330n38
Adorno, Theodor, 44, 322n2
African Americans, 22, 317n15; civil rights movements of, 216, 231–34, 245–46, 248, 329n32
African liberation struggles, 67–77. *See also* négritude
African National Congress (ANC), 74–75, 231
African philosophy, 10, 55, 112, 191, 324n8
Afrocentricity, 116
Afro-descendent people: of Brazil, 203, 291, 335n19; of Colombia, 101–2
agency, 51, 101–2, 116, 239
ahimsa. *See* nonviolence
AIDS/HIV, 62
Alatas, Syed, 47–48, 114
Algeria, 316n3, 332n4; independence of, 75–76, 211
Alice project—Strange Mirrors, Unsuspected Lessons, xi–xii, 187, 289–90, 303n3
Allende, Salvador, 333n10
alliances, 24–25, 35, 252; counterhegemonic, 210; human rights and, 77; postcolonial knowledges and, 279–80. *See also* boycotts
American Indians, 9, 214, 309n11; Dakota Access Pipeline and, 326n7; oral histories project of, 321n8
Amin, Shahid, 114
anarchists, 31, 49, 212, 282; Chomsky on, 223, 225–27; *Indignados* movement and, 31, 249, 291, 326n3, 328n23, 334n18
Anderson, Benedict, 212
Anderson, Kevin, 307n7
Andrade, Oswald de, 326n4
anekantavada (many-sidedness of truth), 216–18, 245
Angola, 76
An-Na'im, Abdullahi Ahmed, 44
anthropomorphic fallacy, 138
anthropophagic method, 212, 326n4
apartheid, 74, 190, 311n7; Truth and Reconciliation Commission of, 10, 62
Arboleda, Santiago, 101–2
archives, 197–204, 298; ambiguity of, 200; as epistemicide, 198; insurgent, 202–4; palimpsest, 200–204; of Popular University of Social Movements, 288; postabyssal, 202;

archives (continued)
problem of, 15; sociology of absences and, 203; sociology of emergences and, 162, 203. *See also* museums
Argentina, 214; *desaparecidos* of, 204, 285; popular universities of, 285, 288
Aristotle, 180, 312n10, 323n20
armed struggle, 67, 73, 75, 231, 253, 312n15
artisanal knowledges, 43, 132–33, 150; methodological question of, 140–42; scientific versus, 147–50, 261–62, 284
artisanship of practices, 16, 19, 34–35, 251–52, 280
Asante, Molefi, 116
Asociación Madres de Plaza de Mayo (Argentina), 285
Atalay, Sonya, 152
authoritarianism, 83, 109, 262, 270; anarchism versus, 326n3; factionalism and, 264; fascist, 266, 297, 299; González Casanova on, 310n15; of Mexican state, 144; vanguardism and, 160
authorship, 3, 83, 133, 162; cognitive, 192–93; demonumentalizing of, 15; problem of, 13, 53–55; question of, 53–55; reinvention of, 58; types of, 54. *See also* superauthors
autonomy, 31, 54, 147, 185, 267; of entrepreneurs, 99; Gandhi on, 226, 227, 237, 240–42; of nongovernmental organizations, 306n6; of popular universities, 290; of science, 43, 134–36, 151, 155, 185–88; of sociology of absences, 27

Bâ, Amadou Hampâté, 55
Bacon, Francis, 10, 318n26
Bandung Conference (1955), 69–70, 211
Baxi, Upendra, 330n35
Belgium, 236
Benjamin, Walter, 149
Bentham, Jeremy, 171
Berlin Conference (1884–85), 112
Berlin Wall, ix, 266, 300
Betances, Ramón, 212
Bhabha, Homi, 317n14
Bhambra, Gurminder, 118–19
bifurcation, 157, 278–79
Blanqui, Louis, 212
blindness, 226; aesthetic, 37; Eurocentric, 115, 221; ideological, 73
Bloch, Ernst, 28
Boal, Augusto, 253
bodily knowledge. *See* corporeality of knowledge
Bolivia, 59, 214; Constitution of, 10–12, 234, 237, 238, 304n10, 330n36
border thinking, 115, 118, 317n14
Bourdieu, Pierre, 27; habitus of, 64, 154, 281; on social distinctions, 323n19
Bourke, Joanna, 324n25
boycotts, 24–25, 67–68, 233, 311n7; during U.S. civil rights movement, 233. *See also* alliances
Bragança, Aquino de, 73, 76
Brazil, 194; peasant movements in, 58, 214; Quilombolas of, 203, 291, 335n19; as settler colony, 316n3; Workers Party of, 333n9
Buddhism, 218, 327n11
buen vivir. See *sumak kawsay/suma quamaña*
Buey, Francisco, 332n3
Burke, Kenneth, 127, 294, 318n27

Cabral, Amílcar, 55, 71–75
Canada, 236; indigenous peoples of, 130, 214, 321n4; popular universities of, 283; World Social Forum in, 326n2
capitalism, 1–11, 63–65; alternatives to, ix, 249–51, 266; collective unconscious of, 173; defamiliarization of, 220; ecologies of knowledges and, 15; epistemologies of the North and, 19–35; Habermas on, 221; as mode of domination, 23, 259; university, 272–79. *See also* neoliberalism
Caribbean Philosophical Association, 115
caste system (India), 61, 81–82, 313n24, 323n21. *See also* Dalits
Center of Studies and Solidary Actions (CEASM), 204–5
Césaire, Aimé, 76, 111, 312n11, 317n7
chachawarmi (gender equality), 9–10
Chagas, Mário, 203, 326n22
Chakrabarty, Dipesh, 69–70
Chambers, Iain, 201
chaos, 35, 41–42, 85, 199, 295
Chatterjee, Partha, 328n21
Chiapas, Mexico, 145, 162, 258, 285. *See also* Zapatistas
Chile, 214, 331n9, 333n10
China, 194, 300; Opium Wars of, 124–25; science of, 47, 136, 307n9; writing in, 61, 123

Chomsky, Noam, 244; Gandhi and, 216, 219–23, 225–27, 327n18; Habermas and, 220; Mukherjee on, 328n22; on Vietnam War, 221–23
Chrétien, Jean-Louis, 167, 232n2
Christianity, 58, 88, 92, 181, 242, 314n7; Gandhi on, 216–19, 225, 245; Islam and, 22–23, 71, 225; liberation theology of, 253, 331n2, 333n10; missionaries of, 62, 273
civil rights movement (U.S.), 216, 231–34, 245–46, 248, 329n32
climate change, 122, 267. *See also* ecological movements
cognitive justice, 16; and democracy, 262, 332n14; and epistemologies of the South, 77–78, 161; and social justice, 163, 244, 276, 296
Colombia, 194, 198, 253; indigenous peoples of, 214; peasant movements in, 214
colonialism, 1–11, 19–35, 63–65, 117, 213; "civilizing mission" of, 160; collective unconscious of, 173; counterhegemonic globalization against, 244, 245, 258; defamiliarization of, 220; definition of, 108; ecologies of knowledges and, 15; Fanon on, 25, 75–76, 111, 275; intellectual, 256–57; internal, 313n23; inverted, 271; neoliberalism and, 32; Nkrumah on, 213, 305n2; Sauvy on, 312n8; sociology of absences and, 25–26; university, 272–78. *See also* metropolitan/colonial sociability
"coloniality": Maldonado-Torres on, 20, 115, 316n2; Quijano on, 110, 115, 305n1
Comaroff, Jean, 62, 119–20
Comaroff, John, 62, 119–20
commodification, 99, 107; of bodies, 90, 159; of knowledge, 46–47, 278–79
common sense, 16, 120, 152, 189, 195, 324n7; Chomsky on, 222–23, 225; Gandhi on, 242; neoliberalism and, 245
communism, 69, 224, 230. *See also* Marxism
Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), 234
Connell, Raewyn, 119
"consciencism," 70–71
"conscientization," 102, 254, 261
constitution(s), 10–12, 122, 234–42, 300, 315n7, 330n35; Bolivian, 10–12, 234, 237, 238, 304n10, 330n36, 333n7; Ecuadoran, 10–12, 234, 238, 304n10, 320n36, 333n7; South African, 10; Spanish, 330n34
Conversations of the World project, 187–93, 324n5, 325n10
corazonar (warming up reason), 14, 99–102, 128; Gandhi and, 224; sense experiences and, 165; Ushiña on, 315n12
corporeality of knowledge, x, 13, 87–90, 93; Husserl on, 314n3; Parviainen on, 93; Schopenhauer on, 314n2; space-time and, 189–90; types of, 90–93. *See also* embodied knowledge
cosmopolitanism, 33, 180, 227, 259; African American studies and, 317n15; of Gandhi, 219; insurgent, 125, 275; nonimperial, 244; subaltern, 8, 232, 264
counterhegemonic appropriations, 92, 202, 215; definition of, 30–31; of university, 281
counterhegemonic globalization, 210, 244, 245, 258
critical theory, 9, 19, 221, 238, 306n15
Cuban Revolution, 253, 256, 257, 333n10
Curti, Lidia, 201
Cusicanqui, Silvia Rivera, 110–11, 190; on methodological extractivism, 130; Taller de Historia Oral Andina and, 59, 321n4, 321n8
"cyberture," 57

Dakota Access Pipeline, 326n7
Dalits, 81–84, 149, 150, 180, 313n23; Gandhi and, 329n33; social movement of, 214, 237
Dallmayr, Fred, 241
Dalton, Dennis, 241–42
Darwin, Charles: on sense of smell, 322n3; on sense of touch, 324n26
Das, Veena, 88
Dasgupta, Uma, 124–25
da Silva, Lula, 204
Davis, Angela, 118
decolonial thinking, 26, 110, 115–17, 314n5, 316n5, 317n13
decolonization, 14, 108–16; Cabral on, 71–73; Chakrabarty on, 69–70; definition of, 109–10; Fanon on, 25, 75–76, 111; literature of, 121, 328n19; methodologies of, 129–36; Ndlovu-Gatsheni on, 316nn4–5; of universities, 16, 270–77; Wiredu on, 112. *See also* postcolonial societies
deep ecology, 11, 304n12

defamiliarization, 215, 219–21, 224
democracy, 21, 70; cognitive, 332n14; communitarian, 237, 241; exportation, 301; participative, 145; social, 23–24, 70, 160, 266
demonumentalization of knowledge, 15, 26, 185–87, 192–93, 298
Derrida, Jacques, 119, 180
Desai, Ashwin, 327n9
desaparecidos (Argentina), 204, 285
Descartes, René, 10, 87, 89, 314n1, 318n26; common sense and, 222–23; Nkrumah on, 312n10; on sight, 165, 170–71
Dewey, John, 233, 314n1
Dhaouadi, Mahmoud, 308n19
Dharti Mata (Our Mother), 241
Diderot, Denis, 30
dignity, 11, 96, 243, 334n18
Diop, Cheik Anta, 76
Doke, Joseph, 329n29
Draper, Jonathan, 62
drones, 94–95
Du Bois, W. E. B., 232, 316n5, 329n31
Durkheim, Émile, 308n19
Dussel, Enrique, 38, 114, 115, 117

Echeverría, Bolivar, 311n6
ecological movements, 11, 304n12; alliances of, 210; alternative development plans of, 213; climate change and, 122, 267
ecologies of knowledges, 13, 32–34, 78–79, 118, 247–67; construction of, 137–38; contexts of, 138–40; corporeality and, 190; as decolonized curriculum, 275–77; dichotomies of, 251; hybridization of, 45, 127, 162, 264; objectives of, 170; oral versus written, 59–60; pedagogy of, 248, 249, 280, 284; pluriversity and, 281; science in, 45–47, 134, 261–62; subversity and, 284; trust criteria and, 43; types of, 43. *See also* knowledge(s)
Ecuador: Constitution of, 10–12, 234, 238, 320n36; indigenous peoples of, 100, 214, 315n12
Egypt, 191, 282
Einstein, Albert, 222
elites, 61, 76, 219, 254, 282, 323n17
embodied knowledge, 87–88, 90, 165, 313n1. *See also* corporeality of knowledge
Enlightenment, 30, 61, 230, 323n20
epistemicide, 9, 21, 38, 296; archive as, 198; definition of, 8; false universality of, 108; Fanon on, 111; in metropolitan societies, 41; pedagogy of absences and, 276
epistemological imagination, 125–29
epistemologies of the North, x, 13, 26–27; authorship in, 53–54; hegemony of, 26, 39, 121–23, 154; methodologies of, 136; objectivity in, 40–44; search for truth in, 159; sense experiences and, 165; universities and, 271
epistemologies of the South, x, 1–16, 19–35, 137–38, 247–67; anti-imperialistic, 120–25; authorship in, 53–54; defamiliarization of, 215, 219–20; diversity of, 39–40; institutional, 247–49; intercultural translation of, 209–16; pedagogy of oppressed and, 253–55, 257–67; pluriversity and, 278; premises of, 296; refamiliarization of, 215, 220; search for truth in, 159; situating of, 116–20
Escobar, Arturo, 114, 117
essentialism, 312n12; identitarian, 11–12, 84–85, 214, 232
Esteva, Gustavo, 143–45, 320n1
Eurocentrism, 115, 221, 272–73, 327n16; criticism of, viii, 26, 209, 248, 251–52, 298
extractivism, 129–30, 166, 193, 214; Acosta on, 318n29; epistemic, 130, 174

Fals Borda, Orlando, 100, 114, 316n15; on liberation sociology, 255–56, 261–62; Marxism and, 257, 266, 332n13; C. Wright Mills and, 126; on participatory action research, 253, 255–67, 332n15
Fanon, Frantz, 20, 95, 125, 318n24; on decolonization, 25, 75–77, 111, 275; Gandhi and, 75, 223; Péju and, 305n2; Sartre and, 94; Vieira and, 76–77
fascism, 266, 297, 299. *See also* authoritarianism
Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, 204
Fédération des étudiants d'Afrique noire en France (FEANF), 76
Federation of Indigenous Organization of Ecuador (CONAIE), 239
Federici, Silvia, 108–9
feeling-thinking (*sentipensar*), 100, 316n15
feeling-with, 181–82, 324n26
femicide, 21, 23, 299

feminism, 10, 191; epistemologies of, 4, 308n15, 319n31; existentialism and, 313n22; intercultural translation of, 218; Islamic, 31, 116, 318n17; LGBT movements and, 203, 288, 314n5; world movements of, 29, 210, 291. *See also* gender
Fénéon, Félix, 212
Finnegan, Ruth, 309n9, 323n23
First International Workingmen's Association, 211
Foley, John, 57
Foucault, Michel, 3–4, 37, 119, 171, 201, 306n11
Fox, Richard, 232, 328n21
Francis Ferdinand, Archduke of Austria, 298–99
Frankfurt School, 44
Freedom Riders (1961), 234
Freire, Paulo, 114, 176, 257–58; on "conscientization," 102, 254, 261; exile of, 257–58, 331nn2–3; liberation pedagogy of, 154, 193; Marxism of, 331n2, 332n13; *Pedagogy of Indignation* by, 331n2; *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* by, 193, 253–55, 257–67, 281–82, 331nn2–3
Freud, Sigmund, 121, 308n19, 322n14
fundamentalisms, 38–39, 299–301, 315n7

Gade, Anne, 59–60
Gaia hypothesis, 242
Galileo Galilei, 291, 318n26
Gandhi, Mohandas, 10, 48–52, 55, 194; African decolonization struggles and, 67–77; ashram of, 190; on autonomy, 226, 227, 237, 240–42; boycotts and, 311n7; Chomsky and, 216, 219–23, 225–27, 327n18; conception of science of, 48–52; early life of, 216–19; Fanon and, 75, 223; on freedoms, 243, 327n10; Habermas and, 216, 219–21, 224, 225; indigenous peoples movement and, 234–43; on individualism, 226, 241, 242, 329n28; intercultural translation by, xi, 33, 212–46; on Marxism, 224, 226, 327n10; Orwell on, 246; Ruskin and, 228, 327n10, 328n24, 329n28; search for new responses of, 215; in South Africa, 218, 228, 327n9; as superauthor, 309n2; on *swaraj*, 236–37, 241; Thoreau and, 226–28, 327n10, 328n24; Tolstoy and, 216, 227–30, 327n10, 329n29; on truth, 217, 224–25; U.S. civil rights movement and, 231–34; vegetarianism of, 228, 329n27
Garrow, David, 233, 329n32
gay rights movements, 203, 288, 314n5
Geertz, Clifford, 39
gender, 10, 22, 116, 210, 218; access to land and, 150; division of labor and, 108–9; femicide and, 23; income inequality based on, 23. *See also* feminism; patriarchy
genocide, 9, 30, 326n7
Ghana, 60, 69, 211
Giarraca, Norma, 144–45
Gil, Gilberto, 204
Gilroy, Paul, 328n19
Giroux, Henry, 317n14, 331n4
Gitlin, Todd, 148
Glissant, Édouard, 115
globalization, 243–44, 266; counterhegemonic, 210, 244, 245, 258. *See also* neoliberalism
Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von, 5
Goldberg, Dennis, 74
Goldman, Lucien, 331n12
González Casanova, Pablo, 114, 310n15
Goody, Jack, 60, 61, 309nn5–6
Gordon, Jane, 116
Gordon, Lewis, 76–77, 115–16, 313n19
Gouveia, Inês, 203
Gramsci, Antonio, 320n38; on hegemony, 179; on intellectuals, 33, 194, 325n15; Mariátegui and, 282; on popular education, 333n10, 334n11
Greece, 191
Grosfoguel, Ramón, 114, 116, 130
Grupo Modernidad/Colonialidad, 114
Guerrero Arias, Patricio, 99–100, 315n13
Guha, Ranajit, 114, 317n11
Guinea-Bissau, 74
Gulbenkian Foundation, xi–xii
Gumbrecht, Hans, 103
Gupta, Dipankar, 221
Guru, Gopal, 81–84, 180–81
Gutiérrez, Gustavo, 331n2

Habermas, Jürgen, 83, 244, 271; Chomsky and, 220; communicative rationality of, 220–21; Gandhi and, 216, 219–21, 224, 225
habitus, 64, 154, 281
Hart, Roger, 47
Hayek, Friedrich August, ix, 303n2
healing, 15, 100, 157–59, 173

hearing. *See* listening
Hegel, G. W. F., 305n5, 312n10, 320n41
Henry, Paget, 116
heterotopias, 31, 201, 306n11. *See also* utopianism
Hinduism, 313n24, 327n12; caste system of, 313n24, 323n21; Gandhi's conception of, 216, 218, 219, 225, 226, 327n11
Horkheimer, Max, 44
Hountondji, Paulin, 112–13
human dignity, 11, 96, 243, 334n18
humanism, 20, 88–89, 166, 256; African, 70–71, 317n15
human rights, 228, 242–43; alliances based on, 77; constitutionalism and, 31, 122; plurinationality and, 236; rights of nature and, 11; universal, 20–21; violations of, 144, 158
human suffering, 14, 90–97, 100
Husserl, Edmund, 314n3
Huxley, Aldous, 48
Huyssen, Andreas, 30
hybridity, 11, 147, 242, 248; of ecologies of knowledges, 45, 127, 162, 264; of intellectuals, 317n6; intercultural translation and, 261. *See also* mestizaje

identities: diatopical, 243, 250–52; essentialist, 11–12, 84–85, 214, 232; feminist, 29
ignorance, learned, 27, 40, 97, 285, 305n4, 334n13
Illimani, Mount, 190
imagination: end of, ix; epistemological, 125–29; sociological, 22, 114, 126, 148
imperialism, 328n19; of United States, 95, 253, 256. *See also* colonialism
India, 180, 194, 308n19; caste system of, 61, 81–82, 313n24, 323n21; literature of, 216, 311n17; Uberoi on, 48. *See also* Dalits
Indian Ocean, 117
indifference, 39, 44, 90–91, 93–95, 299
indigenous movements, 151–52, 244; of Canada, 130, 214, 321n4; Gandhi and, 234–43; of Latin America, 100, 214, 235–43, 248, 315n12; of New Zealand, 151–52, 236; United Nations declaration on, 236. *See also* American Indians
Indignados movement, 31, 249, 291, 326n3, 328n23, 334n18
individualism, 53–54; Gandhi on, 226, 241, 242, 329n28
Indonesia, 59–60, 69, 312n8
industrialization, 48; slave trade and, 112; of universities, 279
insiders. *See* outsiders/insiders
intellectuals, 186; colonialism of, 256–57; Gramsci on, 33, 194, 325n15; hybrid, 317n6; "organic," 266
intercultural translation, 16, 32–34, 251–52; of decolonized curriculum, 276; of feminism, 218; by Gandhi, xi, 33, 212–46; hybridization and, 261; need for, 209–16; NGOs and, 65; objectives of, 170; South–North, 34, 215, 219–27; South–South, 34, 215, 230–43; university reform and, 275–76, 280, 284, 290; Watson on, 244
interknowledge, 118, 210, 244, 286, 287
International Labour Organization (ILO), 236, 258
International Monetary Fund (IMF), 301
Internet, 57, 258
intimate sufficiencies, 97, 99, 101–2, 191
Islam, 22–23, 59–60, 71; feminism and, 31, 116, 318n17; Gandhi on, 216–18, 225, 245; social science and, 308n19

Jainism, 216, 218, 219, 245, 327n11
Jesuits, 323n22
Jordens, Joseph, 216–17
Jung, Carl, 123–24, 173, 307n9
justice: cognitive, 16, 77–78, 161, 163, 244, 262, 276, 296, 332n14; transitional, 10, 62, 158

Kadri, Aïssa, 332n4
Kane, Cheikh Hamidou, 112
Kane, Ousmane, 110
Kant, Immanuel, 4, 87, 312n10, 314n1
Kathrada, Ahmed, 74
Keats, John, 322n6
Kenya, 316n3
khadi movement, 48, 50–51
Khaldun, Ibn, 121
Khalifa, 299–300
Khoshoo, T. N., 241
King, Martin Luther, Jr., 194, 233–34
Kitu Kara people, 100, 214, 315n12
knowing-with, 15, 155–62, 168, 173–75, 177; feeling-with and, 181–82, 324n26; knowing-

about versus, 117–18, 128, 147–48, 161, 196, 297
knowledge(s), 2–5, 41–42, 156, 195; absent, 128; artisanal, 43, 132–33, 140–42, 146–47, 150, 261–62, 284; born in struggle, 1, 13, 37, 43, 58, 131–32, 275; commodification of, 46–47, 278–79; demonumentalization of, 15, 26, 56, 185–89, 192–93, 298; endogenous, 112–13; learned ignorance and, 285; market value of, 272, 278–80; popular, 43, 132, 247, 253–57, 261–62; prism, 54, 140–41, 252, 320n40; scientific, 38, 133–34, 146–47, 261–62, 284. *See also* corporeality of knowledge; ecologies of knowledges
knowledge extraction (data mining), 319n29
"knowledge society," 319n32
Köhler, Axel, 162
Krausz, Michael, 37
Kurdistan, 31
Kusch, Rudolfo, 114

labor movement, 23–24, 144, 236, 258, 291
Lacey, Hugh, 308n12
Lakoff, George, 314n2
land, 46, 287, 290, 294, 330n43; ancestral, 214, 299; communal, 29, 109, 304n12; conflicts over, 58, 82, 88, 102, 150, 253, 266; grabbing of, 149, 288, 320n39; non-exploitive use of, 130, 239; ownership of, 300
Las Casas, Bartolomé de, 110
Latin-American Subaltern Studies Group, 114
learned despair (*docta desperatio*), 98
learned hope (*docta spes*), 97–98
learned ignorance (*docta ignorantia*), 27, 40, 97, 285, 305n4, 334n13
Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm, 34
Leopold, Aldo, 11, 304n12
Lévi-Strauss, Claude, 61
LGBT movements, 203, 288, 314n5
liberated zones, 29, 31–32, 298
liberation theology, 253, 331n2, 333n10
listening, 56, 167–68, 176–79, 223, 322n14, 323n18
literacy, 56, 61–62, 192, 194, 258, 273; Freire on, 254; Goody on, 60, 61, 309nn5–6
Livy (Titus Livius), 311n20
Locke, John, 4
Lovelock, James, 242
Lugones, María, 114, 115
Lukács, György, 44
Lutuli, Albert, 74–75, 312n16
Luxemburg, Rosa, ix, 214

MacArthur Foundation, xi–xii, 193
Macedo, Donaldo, 331n2
Malatesta, Errico, 212
Maldonado-Torres, Nelson, 20, 114; on "coloniality," 115, 316n2; on "decolonial turn," 110; on Fanon, 94
Mamdani, Mahmood, 109
Mandela, Nelson, 74, 194
Maori people, 151–52, 236
Marcos, Subcomandante (Rafael Sebastián Guillén Vincente), 194
Maré favelas, 325n21, 326n22
Maré Museum, 204–5
Mariátegui, José Carlos, 282–83
market value, 46, 120, 272, 278–80
Martí, José, 55
Marx, Karl, vii; Federici on, 108–9; Gandhi on, 224, 226, 327n10; Nkrumah on, 312n10; as postabyssal thinker, 307n7; on primitive accumulation, 214
Marxism, 44, 63, 70, 279; Fals Borda and, 257, 266, 332n13; liberation theology and, 331n2; popular universities and, 282–83; "totalizing paradigm" of, 262
Mbeki, Govan, 74
Mbembe, Achille, 113
McCarthyism, 256
Mehta, Ravjibhai, 216
Memmi, Albert, 332n4
memoria passionis, 58
Menchú, Rigoberta, 194
Mendes, Chico, 194
Meneses, Maria Paula, 318n21
Merleau-Ponty, Maurice, 165, 180; on embodied knowledge, x, 313n1; on "perceptive faith," 136; on sense experiences, 171, 322n4
mestizaje, 8, 11, 261, 296; decolonized, 14, 107; narratives of, 147. *See also* hybridity
methodologies, 107–8, 287–88; decolonizing of, 129–36; extractivist, 130; indigenous, 151–52; nonextractivist, 14–15, 143–55; postabyssal, 136–38; postextractivist, 130, 136–38; primitivist, 255

metropolitan/colonial sociability, 6, 22–23, 73, 150; abyssal exclusion and, 108, 128, 135; archive and, 198; Fanon on, 20; sociology of absences and, 250
Mexico, 143–46, 214, 249, 320n1. *See also* Zapatistas
Mhlaba, Raymond, 74
Michel, Louise, 212
Mies, Maria, 109
Mignolo, Walter, 114–15, 118, 317n14
migrant workers, 42, 94, 297, 325n17
Mills, C. Wright, 126, 147
mingas, 146, 161; epistemic, 15, 129, 146–47, 156, 161–63, 252
mirror images, 5–8, 140, 320n40
Mlangeni, Andrew, 74
Mondlane, Eduardo, 312n15, 326n5
Montagu, Ashley, 180
Morales, Evo, 238
Mother Earth (*pachamama*), 10–12, 238, 240, 242
Motsoaledi, Elias, 74
Mozambique, 149, 193–94, 288, 312n15, 326n5; peasant movements in, 214; Popular University of Social Movements in, 320n39; as settler colony, 316n3
Mudimbe, Valentin, 84, 112, 191
Mukherjee, Mithi, 327n10
Mukherjee, Nirmalangshu, 328n22
museums, 198, 202–5. *See also* archives
Muslims. *See* Islam

Naess, Arne, 11, 305n12
Namibia, 316n3
Nandy, Ashis, 48–49; on Gandhi, 328n21; on tolerance, 328n19
Native Americans. *See* American Indians
nature, 240–42, 330n43; rights of, 10, 11, 238, 242, 308n17. See also *pachamama* (Mother Earth)
Ndlovu-Gatsheni, Sabelo, 13, 316nn4–5
"necropolitics," 113
Needham, Joseph, 47, 123
négritude, 71, 94, 111, 312nn11–12, 317n7
Nehru, Jawaharlal, 48
neoliberalism, 32, 42, 210, 243–44; alternative to, 249–51, 266; consolidation of, 213; social movements and, 211; universities and, 269, 271–72. *See also* capitalism; globalization
New Zealand, 151–52, 236
"NGO-ization," 65–66, 306n6
Ngugi wa Thiong'o, 56–58, 309n5; on colonial education, 274–75; on plurilingualism, 276–77; on slavery, 111–12
Nicholas of Cusa, 40
Nietzsche, Friedrich, 103, 127, 318n27; Nkrumah on, 312n10; Spengler and, 318n26
Nigeria, 236
Nkrumah, Kwame, 55, 70–71; on Afrocentricity, 116; on colonialism, 213, 305n2; on Senghor, 312n12; on Western philosophers, 312n10
Non-Aligned Movement (1955–61), 231, 300
noncooperation (*satyagraha*), 67–68, 223–25, 233–34, 311n7
nonviolence, 9, 10, 67–68, 223–27, 229; of U.S. civil rights movements, 232–34
"not yet," 28–30, 58, 93, 297
Ntuli, Pitika, 56
Nussbaum, Martha, 98
Nyerere, Julius, 55; on boycotts, 311n7; on colonial education, 273–74; as superauthor, 309n2; on *ujamaa*, 70, 312n9

Oaxaca (Mexico), 143–46, 249, 320n1. *See also* Zapatistas
Oaxacan Voices Building Autonomy and Freedom (VOCAL), 144
objectivity, 13, 40–44; Fals Borda on, 256; neutrality of, 44, 144–45, 261–62
Occupy movements (2011), 328n23
Ong, Walter, 311n20
oral cultures, 11, 13, 53–55; Ong on, 311n20; Schopenhauer on, 310n17; storytelling and, 56–58; transcription of, 310n13; Voices of the World, 196; writing and, 55–62
oral tradition, 55, 57, 62, 280, 309n8, 309n13
orature, 280, 309n11; Finnegan on, 309n9; Goody on, 60, 61, 309nn5–6
Oruka, Odera, 55, 192–93, 261, 320n40; on interview techniques, 325n12; on superauthors, 309nn2–3
Orwell, George, ix, 246
outsiders/insiders, 15, 83, 140, 150–52; feeling with, 181–82, 324n25; Gandhi and, 217–18; research by, 156–58, 161, 173, 260
Oyewùmí, Oyéronké, 109

pachamama (Mother Earth), 9–12, 30, 238, 240, 242
Panchayat (village council), 241
Pantham, Thomas, 221, 224–25
Parekh, Bhikhu, 240, 243
Parel, Anthony, 52, 243
Parks, Rosa, 194
participatory action research (PAR), 253, 255–67, 332n15
Parviainen, Jaana, 93
Pascal, Camila, 162
Patel, Sujata, 114
Paterson, Mark, 323n20
patriarchy, 1–11; collective unconscious of, 173; ecologies of knowledges and, 15; epistemologies of the North and, 19–35; Hindu, 218; as mode of domination, 23; neoliberalism and, 32; resistance against, 108–16, 210. *See also* gender
peasant movements, 58, 214, 291; Via Campesina and, 210, 288, 320n39, 335n19
pedagogy, 175, 317n14; epistemologies of the South and, 253–55, 257–67; liberation, 154, 254; of oppressed, 193, 253–55, 257–67, 331nn2–3; postabyssal, 173, 263–65
Péju, Marcel, 305n2
periphery, 69, 112, 228, 249, 253, 266
Peru, 214, 282–83
Pessoa, Fernando, 315n14
Plato, 312n10, 323n20
pluralism, 236; epistemological, 240; religious, 216–18; scientific, 46–47
plurilingualism, 279
plurinationality, 235–37, 330n34
pluriversality, 8, 12, 275
pluriverse, 39, 162, 216
pluriversity, 269, 277–81, 285, 291, 333n8. *See also* university
Podemos party (Spain), 330n34
Ponce, Mariano, 212
Popular Assembly of the Oaxaca Peoples (APPO), 143–44
popular education, 16, 253–57
popular universities, 16, 281–91, 334n11
Popular University of Social Movements (UPMS), xi, 33, 140, 187, 286–91, 320n39; organization of, 288–90; principles of, 287–88, 290; webpage of, 289; workshops of, 334n19
postabyssal researcher, 120, 128, 154–58, 167–79, 263, 324n26; methodologies, 148–49; and pedagogy, 182–83, 249, 264–65; and pluriversity, 278, 280; as a rearguard intellectual; 261, 263
postabyssal science, 139–42, 151, 247, 249, 265; artisanship and, 147–50; epistemic mingas and, 146–47, 161–63; university capitalism and, 278
postabyssal thinking, 107–10, 119–21, 128–30, 249–57; archives of, 201–3; logic of, 136–37; pedagogies of, 15–16, 173, 247, 263–65; postextractive methodologies and, 136–38; in social sciences, x–xi, 155–61, 220. *See also* abyssal thinking
postcolonial societies, 113, 119, 236, 328n19; archive of, 201; future of, 29–30, 276–79; oral culture of, 62. *See also* decolonization
postcolonial thinking, 110, 114, 117
Praeg, Leonhard, 304n9
Prasad, Shambhu, 48, 49
Prigogine, Ilya, 157
Princip, Gravilo, 299
prism knowledge, 54, 140–41, 252, 320n40

Quijano, Aníbal, 8, 38, 114; on "coloniality," 110, 115, 305n1; on conquest of New World, 117
Quilombolas (Afro-descendants), 203, 291, 335n19
Qur'an, 59–60, 225. *See also* Islam

race, 111, 115, 167, 181, 269, 307n7, 310n17, 324n9
racialized disciplines, 191
racism, 21, 29, 34–42, 70, 102, 116, 329n31. *See also* civil rights movement
Ramose, Mogobe, 190, 191, 304n9
rearguard intellectuals, ix, 81, 143, 153, 155, 186, 212, 232, 245–46, 261
Reclus, Elisée, 212
reformism, 266, 300–301
Reinventing Social Emancipation project, 193, 325n13
relativism, 13, 37–40, 218, 220–21, 304n4
resignation, 93–94, 131, 159, 294–96, 299, 315
Retamar, Roberto, 114
Ribeiro, Darcy, 114
Rivonia Trial (1964), 74–75

Rizal, José, 55, 212
Roberto, Holden, 76
Roma people, 116
Rouse, Joseph, 319n31
Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, 85, 154, 327n10
Rudolph, Lloyd, 219, 228, 230
Ruskin, John, 228, 327n10, 328n24, 329n28
Rustin, Bayard, 233–34, 329n32

sacrifice, 48, 50, 72, 94, 160, 232, 300
"sage-philosophers," 192–93, 195
Santos, Marcos Antônio A., 204
Sartre, Jean-Paul, 94
Sarukkai, Sundar, 80, 81, 83, 180–81
sarvodaya, 241–42, 329m28
Sassoulitch, Vera, 307n7
satyagraha (noncooperation), 67–68, 223–25, 233–34, 311n7
Sauvy, Alfred, 312n8
scapegoating, 294–95
Schopenhauer, Arthur, 310n17, 312n10, 314n2, 318n26, 320n41
Schultz, Katherine, 176–77
science, 13, 47–50, 107, 256; alternative, 308n19; autonomy of, 43, 134–36, 151, 155, 185–88; Chinese, 47, 136, 307n9; Freud and, 322n14; Gandhi's conception of, 48–52; philosophy of, 37, 324n6; pluralism of, 46–47; politics and, 223, 225; postabyssal, 247, 249, 265, 278
scientific knowledges, 38, 133–34; artisanal versus, 146–50, 261–62, 284
Scocuglia, Afonso, 259
Scott, James, 66, 311n4, 313n20
Secretaría Nacional de Planificación y Desarrollo (SENPLADES), 239
Secret of the Golden Flower, 123–24
seeing, 165, 170–75, 322nn9–10
self-determination. See *swaraj* (self-determination)
Senghor, Léopold, 71, 312n11, 312n12
Senier, Siobhan, 310n13, 321n8
sense experience, xi, 15, 156, 165–83; listening as, 176–79; seeing as, 170–75; smell as, 180–83, 323n3; taste as, 180–83, 323n19. *See also* touching
sentipensar (feeling-thinking), 100, 316n15
Shariarti, Ali, 114
Sheets-Johnstone, Maxine, 93
Sheth, D. L., 190
Shridharani, Khrisnalal, 232–33
silence, 177–79, 223
Silko, Leslie Marmon, 310n13
Simpson, Betasamosake, 130
Singapore, 273
Sisulu, Walter, 74
Slate, Nico, 234
slavery, 21, 42, 111, 297; Bhambra on, 118; Bourke on, 324n25; industrialization and, 112; Lévi-Strauss on, 61; Ngugi wa Thiong'o on, 112, 275; Taussig on, 198, 202
smell (olfaction), 180–83, 322n3
Smiley, Glenn, 233–34
Smith, Linda, 110, 151–52
social sciences, 15, 283; Chomsky on, 222; epistemological privilege of, 64; postabyssal, x–xi, 155–61, 220
sociological imagination, 22, 114, 126, 148
sociology of absences, 8, 15, 25–29, 250–51; defamiliarization of, 220; ecology of knowledges, 32; as epistemic minga, 146; Hegel and, 305n5; museology as, 203; pedagogy of, 276, 280, 297; silence and, 177
sociology of emergences, 15, 29–32, 159, 250–51; archive and, 162, 202; defamiliarization of, 220; ecology of knowledges, 32; Gandhi and, 215, 231; museology as, 203; pedagogy of, 276, 280, 297
Socrates, 310n17, 318n26
Solano, Xochitl Leyva, 162
South Africa, 193–94; apartheid in, 74, 190, 311n7; Constitution of, 10; Gandhi in, 218, 228, 327n9; official languages of, 333n7; Rivonia Trial in, 74–75; Truth and Reconciliation Commission of, 10, 62; universities of, 275
South Asian Subaltern Studies Group, 113–14
Southern Christian Leadership Council (SCLC), 234
space-time, 189–90, 308n13
Spain, 31, 326n3, 328n23, 330n34, 334n18
Spengler, Oswald, 318n26
Spinoza, Benedict de, 11, 88, 97, 217, 242, 293
spirituality, 100, 122, 315n13
Spivak, Gayatri, 178
Standing, Guy, 334n17

Stoler, Ann, 199
structuralism, 21, 25, 63–64, 159, 214, 280
Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), 234
Subaltern Studies, 114
subversities, 269, 277, 281–85, 291. *See also* university
sumak kawsay/suma quamaña, 9–12, 30, 161, 238, 242–43, 330n41
superauthors, 13, 54–55, 148; Oruka on, 309nn2–3; of "sage philosophy," 192–93. *See also* authorship
swadeshi (self-reliance), 49, 241
swaraj (self-determination), 9, 10, 213, 236–37, 241, 245, 246
Switzerland, 236
Syrian Kurdistan, 31

Tagore, Rabindranath, 92, 124–25
Taller de Historia Oral Andina (THOA), 59, 321n4, 321n8
Tanzania, 70, 274, 311n7
Tarrida del Mármol, Fernando, 212
taste, 180–83, 323n19, 324n26
Taussig, Michael, 88, 198, 202
terrorism, 211, 214
Thayer, Stephen, 181
theater of the oppressed, 253
Third World, 69, 115, 221, 300, 305n2, 328n19
Thoreau, Henry David, 226–28, 327n10, 328n24
time-space, 189–90, 308n13
Tolstoy, Leo, 48; Gandhi and, 216, 227–30, 327n10, 329n29
Tomatis, Alfred, 176
"totalizing paradigm," 262
touching, 93, 180–83; Aristotle on, 323n20; Darwin on, 324n26; Finnegan on, 323n23; Jesuits and, 323n22; physical abuse and, 324n25
translation. *See* intercultural translation
transmodernity, 115, 117, 317n13
Trump, Donald, 326n7
Tunisia, 332n4
Turin, Popular University of, 334n11

Uberoi, J., 7, 48, 50–52
ubuntu, 9–12, 30, 304n9
ujamaa (extended family), 70, 312n9
uncertainty, 141, 293–94, 322n6
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR), ix, 266, 300
universalism, 6, 35, 39; Césaire on, 317n7; of Habermas, 221; relativism and, 38
Universidad de la Tierra (UNITIERRA), 145, 285
Universidade Popular dos Movimentos Sociais (UPMS). *See* Popular University of Social Movements (UPMS)
Universidad Popular Gonzáles Prada, 282
Universidad Popular Madres de Plaza de Mayo (Argentina), 285
Universidad Trashumante de San Luis (Argentina), 285
university, xi, 277–85; capitalism and, 272–73, 275, 277–78; colonialism and, 272–73, 275, 277–78; curriculum of, 275–77; decolonizing of, 16, 270–75; elitism of, 269, 279; industrialization of, 279; polyphonic, 277–78, 280–81, 291; popular, 16, 281–91, 334n11. *See also* pluriversity
unlearning, 15, 40, 128, 154, 215, 296; pedagogical, 284, 334n12; processes of, 156, 263–65; self-, 141
Ushiña, Mauricio, 315n12
utopianism, 12, 26, 31; Dewey and, 233; ecologies of knowledges and, 190; Gandhi and, 68, 213; postabyssal science and, 137, 141. *See also* heterotopias

Vahed, Goolam, 327n9
Valencia, Rubén, 144, 145
vanguardism, 153–54, 160, 161, 265–67
Veblen, Thorstein, 127
vegetarianism, 228, 329n27
Venegas, David, 144, 145
Vergès, Paul, 76
Verhaeren, Emile, 212
Via Campesina, 210, 288, 320n39, 335n19
Vieira, António, 110
Vieira, Orosina, 326n22
Vieira, Sérgio, 76–77
Vietnam War, 221–23
virtual reality, 57
Visvanathan, Shiv, 49
Viveiros de Castro, Eduardo, 322n5
Voces Oaxaqueñas construyendo autonomía y libertad (VOCAL), 144

Voices of the World, 193–97
voluntarism, 157
von Hayek, Friedrich August, ix, 303n2

Wallerstein, Immanuel, 73
Walsh, Catherine, 114, 115
Warren, Karen, 303n2
Weffort, Francisco, 331n3
Westphalia, Treaty of (1648), 213
Wilhelm, Richard, 123–24
Willard, Steven, 326n7
Wiredu, Kwasi, 112
Wolin, Sheldon, 222
working class, 33, 44, 194, 266, 282–83, 305n2
World Bank, 150, 301
World Economic Forum, 258
World March of Women, 210, 320n39
World Social Forum (WSF), xi, 258, 259, 287, 320n39; of 2001, 210, 286, 331n9; of 2003, 286; of 2016, 210, 326n2
Writing of Indigenous New England project, 321n8
Wylie, Curzon, 229
Wynter, Sylvia, 115

Zapata, Emiliano, 194
Zapatistas, 31, 143–46, 249, 258, 320n1; popular university of, 145, 285
Zimbabwe, 288, 335n19
Zirimu, Pio, 56