From Temporal Redemption to Spatial Liberation: Omar Rivera's Delimitations of Latin American Philosophy

JULIAN RIOS ACUÑA
DePaul University, USA (jriosacu@depaul.edu)

Omar Rivera. *Delimitations of Latin American Philosophy. Beyond Redemption*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2019, pp. 222. $32.00 USD

Omar Rivera's Delimitations of Latin American Philosophy: Beyond Redemption *is an important contribution to the interpretation of central figures and questions of the Latin American philosophical tradition, particularly Peruvian Marxist José Carlos Mariátegui and questions of identity and liberation. Rivera establishes productive dialogues between foundational figures such as Simón Bolívar, José Martí, and Mariátegui and decolonial thinkers like María Lugones, Aníbal Quijano, and Gloria Anzaldúa to posit delimitations of Latin American philosophy that might allow it to move beyond redemptive logics that essentialize identities and reinscribe oppressions in narratives of liberation. This review explores the central arguments of the book and proposes a philosophical and a political issue that emerges from them.*

Key words: Latin American philosophy; aesthetics; politics; liberation; identity; temporalities; spatialities

Omar Rivera's *Delimitations of Latin American Philosophy: Beyond Redemption* is a journey through the philosophical and political possibilities of the writings of Peruvian Marxist José Carlos Mariátegui.[1] Rivera locates Mariátegui in the historical trajectory of a constellation of thinkers that shaped pressing questions of Latin American identity, decolonization, and liberation. *Delimitations* is an important contribution to Latin American philosophy in at least two ways. Firstly, in the context of a heavily hermeneutic tradition, Rivera offers original and insightful interpretations of three of its key figures—Simón Bolívar,[2] José Martí,[3] and Mariátegui—in close dialogue with a wide range of literature on or related to their work. Secondly, the book bridges what Santiago Castro-Gómez calls the two approaches of Latin American philosophy: historicism, with its questions on Latin American identity, and liberationism, with its questions on the political tasks and commitments of philosophy.[4] Rivera offers significant avenues to think through these historicist and liberationist questions in tandem while giving special attention to their decolonial possibilities and historical limitations.

The book is composed of an introduction, six chapters, and a conclusion. In the introduction, Rivera presents the stakes and structure of the book, proposing the notion of "delimitation" as a hermeneutical strategy in a twofold sense. On the one hand, he establishes the delimitations of Latin American philosophy as a philosophical field in itself along the lines of what Castro-Gómez calls the historicist tradition. On the other, in a liberationist gesture, Rivera establishes the delimitations of Latin American philosophy as the normative limits that could allow it to be truly liberatory. Rivera will

Journal of World Philosophies 6 (Winter 2021): 222–229
Copyright © 2021 Julian Rios Acuña.
e-ISSN: 2474-1795 • http://scholarworks.iu.edu/iupjournals/index.php/jwp • doi: jourworlphil.6.2.13

thus argue throughout the book that, to be truly liberatory, Latin American philosophy must forgo the tendency to conflate redemption and liberation that distinctly marks the history of the tradition.

Rivera explains that the conflation of liberation and redemption relies on essentializing identities and temporalities. This essentialization reinscribes logics of oppression that are contrary to liberatory goals. On the one hand, liberation understood as redemption presupposes a linear temporality that necessarily moves toward liberation in the future. Temporality is thus essentialized as a homogeneous progression whose present and future have been established a priori and relate hierarchically to each other because the present is justified only by the future. On the other, the identity of those who will attain liberation, the oppressed, is pre-defined by the futurity of their redemption. Their actions in the present are justified on the basis of a future that has been externally pre-determined for them. In this way, the identity of the oppressed appears as an essential continuity whose meaning in the present and past has been externally fixed from the future. This comes perilously close to colonial logics that construe oppressed identities as inferior in the present on the basis of a future redemption from inferiority through imposed assimilation into colonial modes of life. Rivera's hermeneutics of delimitations allows him to present a possible path to untangle liberation from redemption by showing that Latin American philosophy both has and should have a contextual, a transcultural, and an aesthetic delimitation.

In Rivera's argument, each delimitation builds on the previous one in the process of separating redemptive logics from liberation. He uses notions of space and spatiality developed through each delimitation to disrupt the linear and essentializing temporality of Latin American philosophy revealed by the previous delimitation. Space functions as an interpretative mechanism to trouble the linearity and homogeneity of redemptive time by localizing the struggle for liberation in the aesthetic sensibilities of oppressed people. These aesthetic sensibilities are liberatory beyond redemption because rather than deriving their validity from the future, they acquire meaning through the agency of the oppressed in the present. As an aesthetic *sensibility*, the agency of the oppressed (that resists oppression in the present) is embodied and localized, and therefore derives meaning from space rather than time. In this way, the aesthetic delimitation of Latin American philosophy allows it to restrict itself to the guidance of the aesthetic agency of the oppressed in the present, and therefore to renounce redemptive temporalities and aspirations. Although Rivera's hermeneutic strategy is successful in disarticulating liberation from redemption, as this review will conclude, it does so by establishing a relation of opposition between time and space that is not entirely developed philosophically and leads to the possibly problematic renunciation of any politics of the future.

Chapter one establishes the contextual delimitation of Latin American philosophy by following Linda Martín Alcoff's focus "on the ways Latin American liberatory philosophical thought intersects with and attempts to elucidate and influence processes of identity formation in the context of coloniality" (14). In colonial contexts, liberationist philosophies must be attentive to how identity is constructed. Philosophical resistance to colonialism in fact emerges by elucidating the identities of the oppressed, the contextual delimitation of Latin American philosophy. This delimitation, however, can lead liberationist philosophies to "become racist mechanisms" (16). Bolívar's construction of identity illustrates this. For Bolívar, American identity emerges as the excluded third of the colonial duality "Spanish/Indian." This identity, however, excludes indigenous perspectives by equating "the plight of Americans with that of the Indians during the conquest" (20). The historical analogy turns indigenous peoples into a past to be incorporated into the American[5] identity that has not yet fully emerged and is, therefore, determined by its futurity. In its redemption, American identity will attain a homogeneity brought about by European-style political enlightenment. By the end of his life, Bolívar himself, however, was skeptical about the actualization of such a possibility because the revolutionary period and the following years were marked by betrayals and calculations for the preservation of the

Journal of World Philosophies 6 (Winter 2021): 222–229
Copyright © 2021 Julian Rios Acuña.
e-ISSN: 2474-1795 • http://scholarworks.iu.edu/iupjournals/index.php/jwp • doi: jourworlphil.6.2.13

social hierarchies of the colony in the new republics. Thus, American identity finds its content in the rapture of a future whose actualization is suspended in the present. In this way, Rivera shows that Bolívar's American identity requires a futural redemptive temporality marked by the exclusion of indigenous peoples construed as belonging to the past. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the life of the Bolivarian theme of redemption in the works of Leopoldo Zea and Rebecca Earle.

In chapter two, Rivera develops the contextual delimitation through a spatial interpretation of Cuban thinker and revolutionary José Martí's most widely read essay, "Our America." He establishes an opposition between the space that José David Saldívar calls "transamericanity"[6] to reflect on the Americas as not separated by the US/Mexico border, a "transamerican" space that "Our America" opens, and a redemptive time inherited from Bolívar and still at work in the text. In its Bolivarian-redemptive strand, "Our America" inherits the concern for the fragmentation and unity of America. This unity, however, cannot derive from the spatiality of Martí's image of "the village" where the geopolitical determination of American identity is negated. Likewise, unity cannot come from the spatiality of the image of the "travelers" who represent the lettered class that governed Latin America in the nineteenth century. In response to these two spatialities, Rivera proposes an epistemological reading of Martí's image of the "natural man," a figure of American identity that "reverses the Eurocentric perspective that is still operative in Bolívar's thought" (45). The "natural man" posits the need to derive the sciences of government from the localized space of the governed rather than from European enlightenment. Despite this challenge to Bolivarian redemption, Rivera clarifies, Martí introduces a conception of Nature as the unifying principle of a harmonic and homogeneous American identity. The coexistence of disruptive heterogeneity and harmonizing homogeneity fractures the text into a fixed American identity with a continental spatiality and a fluid "transamerican" space of oppressed identities that speak from a multiplicity of locations and perspectives across the Mexico/US border. Rivera concludes the chapter by illustrating transamerican possibilities through Juan Flores'[7] approach to "Our America" from the standpoint of diasporic Latinx identities north of the border. Rivera contrasts Flores' approach to Boaventura de Souza Santos'[8] Bolivarian reading. In this way, the chapter concludes with an illustration of "Our America's" fracture in its reception.

Chapter three marks a transitional point in the book because it begins Rivera's sustained engagement with Mariátegui, whose work is the central protagonist of *Delimitations*. Here, Rivera shows that there is a colonial and an *indigenista* logic of redemption at work in Mariátegui's thought. To arrive at these logics, Rivera develops his spatial reading of Martí through Mariátegui's conception of the nation and the nonlinear temporality it presupposes. Mariátegui defines the nation through a concept of nationalism that "is derivative of internationalism" (Rivera 2019: 67). Internationalism refers to a large political field where multiple temporal projections (national histories) coexist and posit their difference from specific spatial locations. In internationalism, space disseminates temporal projections of nations into a spatial multiplicity. Disseminated temporalities proliferate through space, flattening "out […] time, especially progressive, developmental temporal projections" (67) like the colonial-capitalist ones. Through the contextualized spatialization of time that emerges from the spatial development of the contextual delimitation, Rivera interprets Mariátegui as taking distance from colonial-capitalist models and reclaims the concept of the nation for the Peruvian space. He turns to the indigenous roots of the Peruvian nation to offer an alternative paradigm to the politico-economic and temporal models of colonial-capitalism. Before the conquest, the indigenous-Peruvian nation's mode of production was a form of socialism. Far from being annihilated by colonialism, indigenous socialism survived as a possible future for Perú. Thus, Mariátegui uses the space of the nation to disseminate its temporal projection, bringing to the fore the indigenous identity excluded by the white nation founded after independence. The socialist future of the nation, however, points to the colonial

Journal of World Philosophies 6 (Winter 2021): 222–229
Copyright © 2021 Julian Rios Acuña.
e-ISSN: 2474-1795 • http://scholarworks.iu.edu/iupjournals/index.php/jwp • doi: jourworlphil.6.2.13

and *indigenista* redemptive logics at work in Mariátegui. For Rivera, Mariátegui inherits the "Indian problem" from Spanish academic Eugenio d'Ors,[9] who proposes two solutions: the Saxon one of extermination and the Spanish method of redemptive assimilation. Rivera calls this method of assimilation, where indigenous construed "sub-humanity" is redeemed in the assimilation of western values, the colonial logic of redemption. In Rivera's reading, Mariátegui comes close to dismantling this logic by rejecting non-economic treatments of the "Indian problem" that focused on "administrative, juridical, ethnic, moral, educational, ecclesiastic" (81) solutions. In fact, Mariátegui shows that all these non-economic solutions are undergirded by racist logics that conceive of indigenous people as incapable of development.

Even though Mariátegui is able to posit an economic analysis of the problem that recognizes indigenous peoples, his recognition relies on a revolutionary indigenous subject whose future redemption will be attained in the socialist revolution that reclaims the nation and abolishes colonial capitalism. Mariátegui identifies the indigenous socialist revolution through a concept of myth capable of mobilizing the indigenous masses toward a revolutionary redemptive future. Mariátegui, however, offers no account of this revolution besides the positing of myths' capacity to mobilize wills and identities toward future redemption. This is the *indigenista* logic, and it presupposes an indigenous identity continuously linking past and future. Rivera thus shows that Mariátegui relies on the essentialization of indigenous identity to provide a cohesive account of the indigenous socialist revolution. This reliance on essentialization leads Mariátegui to anti-black racist claims that posit black people as incapable of contributing to the nation and makes them responsible for their own subjection.[10] In this way, the *indigenista* redemption reinscribes colonial-racist logics. Throughout the argument, however, Rivera emphasizes that these logics of redemption are challenged by Mariátegui's recognition of indigenous people's capacity for developing, learning, and adapting in contact with other cultures. In fact, the nonlinear temporality of the spatial dissemination allows Mariátegui to see that indigenous peoples have constantly engaged in processes of transculturation through adaptation and resistance.

Mariátegui's attention to transculturation opens onto Rivera's transcultural delimitation of Latin American philosophy in chapter four through a reading of Ofelia Schutte,[11] who distinguishes between national and social liberation. While the former is directed toward the attainment of self-government, the latter "is the liberation of peoples oppressed on the basis of their social identities, and its targets are the structural and everyday social marginalizations that undermine their survival" (98). In Rivera's view, Schutte establishes a continuity between oppressed social or cultural identities and the political movements that contest social marginalization. This move, however, risks essentializations like the one at work in Mariátegui's *indigenista* logic of redemption. Rivera addresses this issue by bringing into play Walter Mignolo's notion of "colonial difference," the necessary adaptation of global designs in their encounter with local histories (102). Modes of liminal "border thinking" emerge from within the colonial difference and articulate practices of survival and resistance that exceed and often detach the oppressed from defined cultural identities. Despite Schutte's view of the relation between cultural identity and social liberation, Rivera interprets her approach to Latin American philosophy "as a hermeneutics that sustains a transcultural dialogic space" (106) insofar as it posits the particular humanity and rationality of Latin Americans in dialogue with other philosophies. Latin American philosophy thus contests the universalist pretensions of Eurocentered thought, opening up a field where particular cultural identities can establish horizontal transcultural dialogues on the condition that "liberatory praxis is allowed to guide philosophical thought" (109). The transcultural delimitation is present in Schutte's interpretation of Mariátegui's indigenous socialism as a cultural category that emerges from indigenous experience and praxis. Rivera understands this through what he calls Schutte's "Nietzschean matrix" of interpretation of Mariátegui. Since Mariátegui

Journal of World Philosophies 6 (Winter 2021): 222–229
Copyright © 2021 Julian Rios Acuña.
e-ISSN: 2474-1795 • http://scholarworks.iu.edu/iupjournals/index.php/jwp • doi: jourworlphil.6.2.13

makes socialism into the (Nietzschean) life-affirming force of indigenous cultural identity, he challenges the positivist rationality of western socialism. This, however, exposes Schutte to essentializing indigenous identities by overemphasizing the continuity of indigenous socialism as a life-force. Ultimately, Rivera argues that the tensions that Schutte's work reveals in Mariátegui's open the latter beyond redemption.

One of such tensions is between Mariátegui's understanding of Marxism as a methodological approach on the one hand, and as a revolutionary faith expressed through an aesthetics of myths on the other. In Rivera's view this aesthetic aspect of Mariátegui's thought opens it beyond redemption. Chapter five develops the aesthetic aspect of Mariátegui's thought and links it to María Lugones' concept of "invisibilities." Rivera develops Mariátegui's aesthetics of invisibilities from his relation to the literary movement of *indigenismo* from a twofold perspective. On the one hand, Rivera engages Jorge Coronado's[12] and Luis Alberto Sánchez's[13] critiques of Mariátegui's *indigenista* representations of indigenous peoples. On the other, Rivera offers an interpretation of Mariátegui's as a "transrepresentative approach" (124). Rivera reads Coronado's critiques of Mariátegui as an iteration of Sánchez's since both "see Mariátegui manipulating *indigenista* representations…for the sake of his socialist ideology" (123). On the contrary, Mariátegui does not manipulate the representations of indigenous peoples because what he seeks to represent is not indigenous peoples but the impossibility of their representation. His approach is thus transrepresentative. From Mariátegui's perspective, "*indigenismo* partakes in a movement of self-overcoming and belongs within a long lineage of resistance and aesthetics of invisibilities that can be traced back to the beginning of colonialism in the Andes" (132). Aesthetics of invisibilities, Rivera argues, articulates the type of sensibility that emerges from within oppression and resists it immanently. Lugones develops the notion of invisibility to show that, by virtue of ontological pluralism, oppressed people can act even when their agency is negated by oppression. Thus, even in acting according to oppressive imperatives, oppressed people can resist such imperatives by ontologically inhabiting a plurality of spaces, some of which are unhindered by oppressions. Liberation thus becomes detached from static identities. Often, resistive actions remain invisible from the perspective of the oppressor, but they are fundamental in the daily practices of resistance and survival of the oppressed. Mariátegui recognizes this invisibility, and the agency it presupposes, by recognizing *indigenista* aesthetic representations' limits and the transcultural practices of indigenous peoples. Through this aesthetics of invisibilities, Rivera argues, Mariátegui and Lugones are able to show that the agency of the oppressed is linked to spatial rather than to temporal determinations, especially redemptive ones. The chapter concludes by emphasizing the spatialization of time that delinks fixed identity from a liberation where aesthetic sensibilities and practices disrupt redemptive tendencies.

Rivera further develops Mariátegui's aesthetics in chapter five, where he establishes the role of myth in Mariátegui through Aníbal Quijano's[14] and Alberto Flores Galindo's[15] interpretations. According to Rivera, Quijano's reading of Mariátegui's heterodox Marxism as a rigorous method attempts to excise, or at least subordinate, the concept of myth. Rivera opposes this rejection of myth with the notion of "aesthetic discipline." In his interpretation, Mariátegui's notion of myth reveals an "affective component [that emerges] in view of sustaining a commitment to revolutionary praxis" (148). Myth in Mariátegui has the function of mobilizing the masses towards revolutionary action. Rivera understands this mobilization as an affective process that takes place at the level of the sensible, namely, through aesthetics. His reading is supported by an engagement with Flores Galindo and Fernanda Beigel's[16] interpretation of Mariátegui's relation to surrealism. According to them, surrealism for Mariátegui was a form of artistic discipline that sustained a will to formulate the world "otherwise." Alternatively, surrealism is the disciplined desiring and acting towards utopia. Even though Flores Galindo's reading of Mariátegui as a utopian thinker risks redemptive implications,[17] Rivera expands

Journal of World Philosophies 6 (Winter 2021): 222–229
Copyright © 2021 Julian Rios Acuña.
e-ISSN: 2474-1795 • http://scholarworks.iu.edu/iupjournals/index.php/jwp • doi: jourworlphil.6.2.13

his argument to show that utopia here is not a futural projection but is present in aesthetic expressions such as festivals interpreted as mythical, affective, and aesthetic disciplines that sustain revolutionary wills in situations of oppression. This type of utopian thinking is the aesthetic delimitation of Latin American philosophy, and it involves a liberationist ethos that rejects and resists oppressions as well as essentializing redemptions. Rivera concludes by showing that Quijano's later engagement with aesthetics brings him closer to the aesthetic discipline of Mariátegui's myth, a possible decolonial aesthetics of liberation as conceived by Alejandro Vallega.

In the conclusion, Rivera develops the aesthetic delimitation even further through Mariátegui's reading of José Vasconcelos in dialogue with Gloria Anzaldúa's[18] concepts of "auto-historia" and "border arte." In Mariátegui's reading of Vasconcelos, philosophy's role is to reconstruct or create utopian architectures "that appeal to one's whole being" (174) out of a multiplicity of fragments. These utopian architectures operate in disseminated and multiple times and spaces that manifest the singularity of philosophers, their "auto-historia."[19] The manifestation of singularities exposes them to each other, revealing that "utopian philosophy as community making is necessarily liberatory" (175). Liberation, however, is no longer understood in terms of a defined futural redemptive end, but rather as a hope grounded in liberatory praxes in the present. Praxes in the present can be liberatory insofar as, like "border arte," they locate themselves in complex and fluid identities produced at the border of the colonial difference and they build communities through artwork and an ethos of resistance.

Despite Rivera's significant contributions to the interpretation of key figures and themes of the Latin American tradition, as well as to questions of aesthetics and decoloniality, his argument raises a philosophical issue that leads to a political one. Although the conclusion seems to point to a relation between space and time,[20] this relation is never fully developed. This is a limitation of Rivera's argument because, throughout the book, the dislodging of redemption from liberation relies on a separation of time and space that at times seems to set them in opposition to each other. Indeed, Rivera's readings of Mariátegui and Martí operate through disseminations of space that neutralize the temporal structures of their arguments where explicitly liberatory (and redemptive) themes come to light. Space could then be read as Rivera's conceptual operator to dislodge time from liberation. It is as if space could somehow abolish time to prevent redemptive logics in liberationist politics/philosophies. Politically, since space abolishes time, liberation appears as a matter exclusively of localized presents. This opens questions about the liberatory status of different praxes. Are all praxes, or at least all aesthetic praxes, in the present of the oppressed liberatory? How to decide which are and which are not? The assertion of liberation in the praxes of the present can lead to a kind of "politics" of everyday resistance where the political becomes so indeterminate that it becomes impossible to conceive of the transformation of society beyond unqualified individual attitudes or communal localized practices. While Rivera's attention to the resistive and political praxes of people's present and everyday lives is very important, one is left wondering how these praxes might become articulated to larger struggles for social transformation like the ones Mariátegui envisioned. How does one articulate multiple struggles without a vision of the future to help build solidarity across social movements towards broader political and material transformations? In a world where neoliberal capital-colonialism forecloses possibilities for the future in multiple ways, the political implications of the rejection of the future must be thoroughly considered. Although Rivera's answer is not a definitive rejection of the future, it comes perilously close.

Julian Rios Acuña, BA in Liberal Arts from St. John's College–Santa Fe, MA in Philosophy from DePaul University, and currently PhD candidate in philosophy at the same university. His work focuses on the intersection between decolonial and postcolonial theory and social, political, and legal philosophy.

Journal of World Philosophies 6 (Winter 2021): 222–229
Copyright © 2021 Julian Rios Acuña.
e-ISSN: 2474-1795 • http://scholarworks.iu.edu/iupjournals/index.php/jwp • doi: jourworlphil.6.2.13

1 José Carlos Mariátegui (1894–1930): Peruvian journalist, literary critic, and political theorist and activist whose most famous contribution to Latin American thought is his original use of Marxist analysis to understand the postcolonial situation of the Peruvian Republic, in particular the situation of indigenous peoples. See José Carlos Mariátegui, *Seven Interpretative Essays on Peruvian Reality*, trans. Marjory Urquidi (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1971).

2 Simón Bolívar (1783–1830): Venezuelan general, politician, and political thinker. Commander of the revolutionary armies that defeated the Spanish forces in the northern region of South America in the independence revolutions of the beginning of the nineteenth century. Considered the founding father of the modern nation-states of Venezuela, Colombia, Panamá, Ecuador, Perú, and Bolivia (named after him). His thought has served as in inspiration for social and political movements throughout Latin America. See Simón Bolívar, *El Libertador: Writings of Simón Bolívar*, trans. Frederick Fornoff, ed. David Bushnell (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003).

3 José Martí (1853–1895): Cuban poet, journalist, intellectual, and political activist. He is most recognized for his contributions to Latin American letters as a poet and essayist and to the process of formation of national Cuban identity because of his leading role in the organizing of the insurrection that ended Spanish rule in Cuba after the intervention of the Unites States at the end of the nineteenth century. See José Martí, *Selected Writings*, ed. and trans. Esther Allen (New York: Penguin Books, 2002).

4 Santiago Castro-Gómez, *Crítica de la Razón Latinoamericana* (Bogotá: Pontificia Universidad Javeriana, 2011), 13.

5 "America" and "American" identities here refer to the Americas colonized by Spain.

6 See José David Saldívar, *Trans-Americanity: Subaltern Modernities, Global Coloniality, and the Cultures of the Greater Mexico* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2011).

7 Juan Flores (1943–2014): Puerto Rican cultural theorist and professor of cultural studies at New York University. He was a pioneer of ethnic and cultural studies and analysis in the context of New York Puerto Rican and Dominican communities. See Juan Flores, *From Bomba to Hip-Hop: Puerto Rican Culture and Latino Identity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000).

8 Boaventura de Sousa Santos (1940): Portuguese sociologist and legal theorist whose work on *epistemologies of the south* marked a turn in the critical studies of colonialism as well as political anti-colonial movements. See Boaventura de Sousa Santos, *Epistemologies of the South: Justice Against Epistemicide* (New York: Routledge–Taylor & Francis, 2016).

9 Eugenio d'Ors (1881–1954): Spanish intellectual and art critic. His contributions are most notable in the "Novecentista" literary and intellectual movement that marked Spanish cultural life at the turn of the twentieth century, a historical moment of great political and spiritual turmoil in Spain. Mariátegui's reference to d'Ors is to an unspecified letter on the occasion of the hundredth anniversary of Bolivian independence ostensibly published in the Costa Rica based journal *Repertorio Americano*. It was impossible to find the specific reference.

10 See José Carlos Mariátegui, "El problema de las razas en América Latina" in *Textos Básicos* (México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1995). "The contribution of the negro that arrived as a slave seems less valuable and negative [in comparison to that of indigenous people] … [The negro] is not in conditions to contribute to any culture, but rather threatens to obstruct culture through the crude and living influence of his barbarism."

11 Ofelia Schutte (1945): Cuban philosopher, professor emerita of philosophy at University of South Florida. Her work in Latin American philosophy opened a space for the tradition in the English-speaking academy. Besides Latin American philosophy, her work focuses on feminism and decolonial feminism, nineteenth-century German philosophy, and other fields. See Ofelia Schutte, *Cultural Identity and Social Liberation in Latin American Thought and Culture* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1993).

12 Jorge Coronado: professor of Latin American and Andean literature at Northwestern University. His work focuses on processes of cultural formation, production, and representation in the Andean literary tradition as

Journal of World Philosophies 6 (Winter 2021): 222–229
Copyright © 2021 Julian Rios Acuña.
e-ISSN: 2474-1795 • http://scholarworks.iu.edu/iupjournals/index.php/jwp • doi: jourworlphil.6.2.13

well as other cultural expressions such as music, film, and photography. See Jorge Coronado, *The Andes Imagined: Indigenismo, Society, and Modernity* (Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg Press, 2009).

13 Luis Alberto Sánchez (1900–1994): Peruvian writer, historian, and lawyer member of the anti-imperialist leftist movement Alianza Popular Revolucionaria Americana (APRA–Popular Revolutionary American Alliance). He was an important intellectual and political interlocutor of Mariategui's. See Luis Alberto Sánchez, *Indianismo e indigenismo en la literatura peruana* (Lima: Mosca Azul, 1981).

14 Aníbal Quijano (1930–2018): Peruvian sociologist and political theorist. His most notable contribution is the formulation and development of the concept of "coloniality of power" that has served as fundamental category of analysis for thinkers in what has come to be denominated the "decolonial turn." See Aníbal Quijano, *Reencuentro y debate: una introducción a Mariátegui* (Lima: Mosca Azul, 1979), ed. Aníbal Quijano and Danilo Assis, *Cuestiones y Horizontes*, Buenos Aires: Consejo Americano de Ciencias Sociales, 2014, and Aníbal Quijano, "Coloniality of Power, Eurocentrism, and Latin America," in *Coloniality at Large: Latin America and the Postcolonial Debate,* ed. Mabel Moraña, Enrique Dussel, and Carlos A. Jauregui (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 2008), 181–224.

15 Alberto Flores Galindo (1949–1990): Leftist Peruvian historian and activist intellectual. His writings focused on questions of Peruvian identity and a sustained engagement with Mariátegui's writings. See Alberto Flores Galindo, *In Search of an Inca: Identity and Utopia in the Andes* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010)

16 Fernanda Beigel (1970): Argentinean sociologist and political theorist. Her most recent work focuses on questions of the production of scientific knowledge in Latin America. See Fernanda Beigel (ed.), *The Politics of Academic Autonomy in Latin America* (New York: Routledge, 2013) and Fernanda Beigel, *El itinerario y la brújula: el vanguardismo estético-político de José Carlos Mariátegui* (Buenos Aires: Biblos, 2003).

17 Rivera recognizes that any utopian narrative risks falling into redemption. His reading of Flores Galindo allows him to address this.

18 Gloria Anzaldúa (1942–2004): Chicana intellectual, scholar, poet, and activist whose contributions to cultural, feminist, and queer theory have decisively shaped these fields. Most recently, her work has become very relevant in discussions of decolonial critical theory. See Gloria Anzaldúa, *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza* (San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books, 1987) and Gloria Anzaldúa, *Light in the Dark/Luz en los oscuro: Rewriting Identity, Spirituality, Reality* (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 2015).

19 Although Anzaldúa is careful not to translate these terms, "auto-historia" can be understood as a "self-history" that includes biographical aspects but also social, political, and cultural ones.

20 In multiple places in the conclusion Rivera remarks that philosophy "is a site of simultaneous temporalities where alternative spatialities break through" (176). Philosophy is thus presented as a locus of articulation of disseminated and multiple temporalities and spatialities. Moreover, the present in which liberatory hope is grounded appears as "the spatio-temporal condition for philosophical liberatory utopias" (178).

Journal of World Philosophies 6 (Winter 2021): 222–229
Copyright © 2021 Julian Rios Acuña.
e-ISSN: 2474-1795 • http://scholarworks.iu.edu/iupjournals/index.php/jwp • doi: jourworlphil.6.2.13