

THE HISTORICAL ONTOLOGY AS A HORIZON FOR EDUCATION

La ontología histórica como horizonte para la educación

SAMUEL GUERRA BRAVO*

Independent researcher, Quito/Ecuador

samuelguerrabravo@gmail.com

Orcid code: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8019-4578>

Abstract

Education was always linked to philosophy, to the question of 'ser', to metaphysics. What should we think after the end of philosophy as metaphysics' proclaimed by Europe? The hypothesis of this work is that philosophy in Latin America can not benefit from its European' final because the question of 'ser' and 'entes' has had specific determinations coming from metaphysics not only as 'theory of being but as a justifying horizon of domination imposed on our region. It becomes necessary then a decolonial vision that critiques this function of metaphysics and thinks of the conditions of a historical ontology that brings to light the possibilities of a reconstitution of 'ser' and logos (language, reason). Historical ontology then appears as a new horizon for one's existence and for corresponding education.

Keywords

Metaphysics, ontology, being, historicity, modernity.

Resumen

La educación siempre estuvo ligada a la filosofía, a la cuestión del 'ser', a la metafísica. ¿Qué debemos pensar después del 'fin de la filosofía como metafísica' proclamado por Europa? La hipótesis de este trabajo es que la filosofía en América Latina no puede acogerse a su 'final' europeo, porque la cuestión del 'ser' y los 'entes' ha tenido determinaciones específicas que provenían de la metafísica no solo como 'teoría del ser' sino como horizonte justificador del dominio impuesto sobre nuestra región. Se hace necesaria entonces una visión decolonial que critique esa función de la metafísica y piense las condiciones de una ontología histórica que saque a luz las posibilidades de una reconstitución del 'ser' y el logos (lenguaje, razón). La ontología histórica aparece entonces como nuevo horizonte para la propia existencia y para la educación correspondiente.

Palabras clave

Metafísica, ontología, ser, historicidad, modernidad.

Suggested form of citing: Guerra Bravo, Samuel (2019). La ontología histórica como horizonte para la educación. *Sophia, colección de Filosofía de la Educación*, 27, pp. 51-76.

* Independent researcher. He was a professor at the School of Philosophy of the Pontifical Catholic University of Ecuador (PUCE) and author of several books. Regular contributor to journals in his area and Editor of the Logos Magazine of the Faculty of Philosophical-Theological Sciences of PUCE.

Introduction

The subjects of Metaphysics and Ontology invites us to move to the Greek re-start of philosophy and brings us back to the present and the philosophical situations that afflict the human being. Education is one -the main, perhaps- of these situations that compromise the existence of the individual and his knowledge, action, learning, work and being human.

Metaphysics was the 'science of being in general' or 'science of entity'. The concepts of 'being' and 'entity' were used interchangeably to deal with issues that had to do with 'what is.' Even when the term 'Ontology' came into circulation with Christian Wolf (1679-1754), the two 'sciences' continued to be understood as equivalents. Heidegger (1978) introduced in the twentieth century the so-called 'ontological difference' to distinguish between 'being' and 'entity', a distinction that made possible the understanding of man as 'being-there', as a privileged manifestation of 'being'. The history of philosophy then appeared as the history of Metaphysics that reached its culmination (final) when the experimental sciences separated and became independent of their philosophical matrix (XIX / XX centuries). After the "end of philosophy as metaphysics" (p.134), Heidegger postulated an "other beginning" that he called "Thinking": an activity of reason that is neither metaphysical nor science and that thinks the essence or sense of being. 'Being' had been 'forgotten' as a result of Plato and later philosophy dealing with 'being' and not 'being as being'. Heidegger's phenomenological ontology once again addressed the 'question of being' through an analytic of 'being-there' and its events (historical manifestations, events of 'being').

Has this trajectory of 'being' in Europe taken place in Latin America? Some will say "indeed", that Latin America was incorporated into European universalism in the sixteenth century and that it is still under the effects of colonialism and coloniality.¹ Others, those who think from a de-colonial horizon, find in that question an accumulation of difficulties that have to do precisely with the colonial vicissitudes of 'being' in the Latin American subcontinent. The 'end of philosophy as metaphysics', postulated by Heidegger, did not think the reality of the areas subject to colonialism/coloniality, in which Americans (indigenous, blacks, mestizos) were degraded from 'being' to 'non-being'; that is to say, the condition of objects, instruments, quasi-human beings, barbarians without soul, without reason, without spirituality..., which had to be violently incorporated into civilization and Christianity. The Latin American history of the last five centuries has been that of this 'being' diminished,



depredated and depowered, a 'being-there' undermined, dehumanized by the gaze of the conqueror and the imposed imperial system.

The consequence of all this is that philosophy in Latin America cannot benefit from its Eurocentric 'end', but has to be re-defined as a discipline of thought that thinks the conditions of possibility of the re-constitution of the depredated 'being' and the re-habilitation of the *logos* (reason, rationality, knowledge, discourse) typical of the Latin American people. This re-constitution of 'being' and *logos*, as an imperative of the present, leads us to situate ourselves within a 'historical Ontology' that points to another 'way to being' and leads, unlike Europe, 'more here' and not 'more there' in the ontological horizon. It will help in this task a clear distinction between 'Metaphysics' (as 'science' that ideologically manipulated 'being' and 'non-being'/ Parmenides / in their wars of expansion and colonialism) and 'Historical Ontology' (as a system of categories that reflects on the re-constitution and deployment of the 'being-there' and the *logos*).

What comes next is, therefore, a brief exposition and critique of the role played by 'metaphysics' in our history of the last five centuries, and an initial systematization of a 'historical ontology' that enables the re-constitution/re -habilitation/ iberation of Latin American 'being'. These guidelines will show Ontology as the historical horizon necessary for understanding both our existence and our education, since this has to do, ultimately, with the 'being-there' that 'we are' and with the *logos* that let us think and think-us.



Philosophy as “metaphysics”

To have a philosophy, it always took a fundamental disposition and a founding event: the 'amazement' that things are instead of not-being, among the Greeks; the 'madness' of faith in a Supreme Creator of all that exists,² in the case of the medieval thinkers; the power of reason and knowledge, in the case of European modernity. These events opened possibilities for philosophical thinking to gradually develop systems of concepts and categories that expressed the way of understanding the world of those peoples and cultures: metaphysics, in the case of the Greeks; Scholasticism, in the case of the medieval people; science and technology, in the case of modern-Europeans.

The Greek metaphysics, which later expanded to Rome and Europe and was re-formulated and re-oriented by Christianity, was the one that arrived in America in the sixteenth century and which has been cultivated in Latin American academic centers. This philosophy responded to the de-

mands and needs of the Greco-European context and developed specific universalized characteristics. This philosophy included the Latin American people in their vision of the world as homunculi, animals, objects, things at hand, “less than dung from the town squares” in the condemnation of Bartolomé de las Casas (2011, p.17); that is to say, as a degradation of ‘being’ (foundation), of ‘being-there’ (man) and of *logos* (reason).³

The ‘being’ that the Greeks discovered as their foundation had evolved from pure substantiality to self-consciousness and that is why it was manifested before them as a way of being Greek, as *logos*, as *philosophy* and as culture. As ‘way of being’, it reflected the defining characteristics of the Greek people; as *logos* and *philosophy*. That is to say, as rationality and theory, it allowed them to ‘see’, understand and expose the existing as a totality; as ‘Greek culture’, it understood everything in relation to the perfect, immutable, eternal, necessary, absolute, divine (as the supreme manifestation of the human being). In this same tradition, ‘being’ will manifest itself in European modernity as I, as self-consciousness-for-oneself, as Spirit, as Reason, as Idea, as Freedom, as democracy, and will seek to expand their culture and civilization throughout the known world.

That philosophy, for us, has been and continues to be a ‘science of being’ (Metaphysics), not so much from Heidegger who updated the question of ‘being’ in the 20th century, but from our historical experience. What does this mean? From a descriptive point of view, it means that the philosophy that prevailed in America has been the theory of being and non-being (Parmenides), of the ‘being’ (the ontological) and the ‘entities’ (the ontic)⁴, of the totality of what is, of the principles of non-contradiction and identity as supreme principle, of the system of concepts about essence and existence, about matter and form, about act and power, about predicaments or supreme genres of the existing (the substance and the accidents that affect the substance: quantity, quality, relation, place, time, manner, habit, action, passion), on the transcendental properties of being or ‘entity’ (unity, truth, goodness, beauty), about identity and difference, about the ultimate causes (material, formal, efficient, final), etc.

The vision of the world sustained in this system of categories was called ‘metaphysics’ because it was located on the plane of the purely conceptualized, categorized, for the reason that thinks and abstracts, ‘beyond’ (*meta*) of the sensitive domain or experimental (*physis*). It has also been understood as a science/theory about the ‘being of the entities’, which means that everything that exists is an entity (this tree, this



dog, this man, that mountain, etc.), that, in fact, there is a multiplicity and diversity of entities, although metaphysics is only interested in what makes them entities: their essence (tree, dog, man, mountain, etc.), and, what unifies them: their being, their existence. The 'being' is the most universal and radical of the concepts, it is indefinable and evident in/by itself⁵. All entities 'are', 'exist'; 'be', however, is not an entity, nor a thing, but that which is given or manifested in the entities. Every being is, therefore, 'to be in action'. 'Being' as a foundation is one, but manifests itself in a different way in, for example, the stones, the plants, the animals, the man, the angels, God. Scholasticism will speak of levels in the dignity of 'being', from the lowest (which would correspond to inanimate beings) to the highest and perfect (which would correspond to God, as absolute Being, Creator and Person). In the Greek version, however, the 'being' is not a person, but a universal and abstract metaphysical principle, which was defined as the prime motor/God (Aristotle), converting metaphysics into onto-theo-logy.

Given the factual presence of this philosophy understood as metaphysics, as rational, first and universal theory about 'being' (what is/exists) and the *logos* (language/discourse that reveals 'being'), the most radical question we can ask, in relation to us, is: 'Who are we today and what is our relationship with the *logos*?' With this question we allude to the fundamentals that sustain us: the being (existence, action) and the *logos* (reason, rationality, language, discourse) that reveals the 'being'. Man ('being-there'/Dasein: Heidegger), is the only one for whom the question about being is meaningful, because in it he (gains) his own 'being', his own existence. No entity, nor God, escapes the question of 'being' (because you can ask who He is and whether or not He exists), only that He is the original identity of Being and *Logos*, of essence and existence⁶. We, mere mortals, those of us who are still under colonial systems, are forced to re-think the questions of 'being' as a foundation, of 'being-there' and of *logos* because those are precisely the fundamental dimensions that have been concealed and distorted by the Eurocentric philosophy/metaphysics/onto-theo-logical.

The imposition and deployment of this philosophy/metaphysics in America allowed it to operate as an absolute parameter of what is and is not, as a propaedeutic of theology in the academies and of religion in the consciences, as the backbone of philosophy careers and social sciences, as a vision of the world in the minds of people, as a norm of morality and ethics in human acts, as a culture in ordinary life and in customs... This philosophy/metaphysics ordered and hierarchized everything, and



continues to do so, even if we do not realize it or it seems incredible. Its presence among us is all-inclusive (although we ignore everything about it or we do not notice its presence), it has to do with everything that 'is' and, therefore, with our existence (yours, mine, each one's), with our reason and thought, with our present, with our actions, with the direction and meaning of our life, with our language, emotions and feelings.⁷

This Metaphysics/Scholastics modeled the new generations of creoles and mestizos in ways of being and thinking based on horizons of transcendence, eternity, absoluteness, necessity, totality, immateriality, spirituality, generating attitudes and behaviors that, in a general way, we could define as contemplative, idealistic, passive, resigned, hopeful, mystical, of recollection, of renunciation of this world, of distancing from the sensible, material, corporal, etc. In this metaphysical culture one can find the origins of certain characteristics that, as a general tendency, Latin American peoples present in ordinary life: universalists, idealists, deductivists, transcendentalists, absolutists, spiritualists, theoreticians, essentialists, hierarchizers, perfectionists, intolerant, traditionalists, conservative, rigorists, jealous, racist, sexist, gossipers, exclusivists, ostentatious, formalistic, overbearing, bureaucratic, foreignizing...

56



Philosophy as 'metaphysics of domination'

In the preceding lines we have spoken of 'philosophy as metaphysics', and it has been understood as a system of concepts that thinks 'being' as a foundation: a 'being' (originally centered on the Greek, and, later, on the Roman, the Hispanic, the European, the North American) that through a process of abstraction was installed as a universal theoretical principle. This meta-physical 'being' could only be accessed by reason, rationality, *logos*, speech, language, discourse: the heritage of 'rational' human beings (white-Europeans) who had/have the *logos*, unlike others (indigenous, black, mestizo) who do not have it (because they are 'irrational' or 'bestly', as Columbus called the Native Americans), or borrow it (like conquered and colonized peoples), or exercise their reason -according to the conquerors- in an elementary and routine way (they are like 'children' who must be guided and one must 'think for them').

This philosophy/theory/vision about the 'being' of existence came to America as the mental and cultural horizon of the Spanish conquerors (even if they were illiterate) and as a system of thought and understanding of reality in the head and in the books brought for the religious who

accompanied the invaders. Philosophy used that Greco-European categorical system to theoretically justify and legitimize the invasion, conquest, colonization and acculturation of America. In that task the very essence of the Spanish/European culture re-conceptually formulated and was established as 'civilization', and, in doing so, or with that same series of events, modernity was inaugurated and turned Europe into a visible 'center' of the world, which left the original, ancestral and specific American indigenous cultures in the shadow, concealed, subjected, devalued or destroyed, seen and defined as 'barbarism'.

Philosophy thus assumed an ideological function as a means and instrument of justification and legitimization of the Spanish invasion, of the subsequent indigenous genocide, of the destruction of religions, temples and knowledge that the aboriginal cultures had developed. Converted into a political and ideological weapon, it legitimized what happened with its word and discourse⁸. In the American sixteenth century, there was therefore a 'meeting' or a 'dialogue' of cultures, there was the imposition of one (the Hispanic) on the others (the indigenous), there was invasion, domination, subjugation, violent and destroyer military subjection of the indigenous civilizations.

The reason, rationality, the *logos*, became (along with religion and other elements of culture) in qualifying parameters that served to divide human beings into 'rational' and 'barbarian', into Christians and infidels, into modern and primitives, in enlightened and uneducated, in 'lords' and 'natives', in whites and people of color. The former think with their own reason and for themselves, the latter think (if they do) the thought of the 'rational'; the former are civilized, organized in institutions (political, social, economic, cultural), the latter live as scattered 'beasts', lack institutions⁹, confused with nature; the former are free men, owners of themselves, citizens (they live in the *polis*), the latter are slaves, they are not masters of themselves (they belong to the master) and they exist as mere instruments, objects or animals in the service of the master; the first have 'love for wisdom' (philosophy) and are capable of forming abstract concepts, the second ones are pure sensible experience not 'elevated' to concepts; the first are moral, ethical (*ethos*), the second are immoral, full of vices and are dominated by passions (*pathos*); the first govern the republic, the second work for the republic's subsistence; the former have been chosen to spread throughout the world the civilization and the religion of the empire (Christianity), the latter must become cultured and accept the God of their rulers; the first ones are luminous, transparent and untouched, the second ones are dark, opaque and stained....¹⁰



According to Maldonado-Torres (2007), in such a world, “ontology collapses in a Manichaeism” (p.149), in an exclusive dualism. The world worked on the basis of these opposing elements (which are opposed to each other) and contradictory (which exclude each other), one of which dominated by their ways of ‘being’, their *logos*, their culture, the ‘other’ marginalized (dominated, subjugated, subdued, colonized) and de-powered in their ‘being’, their thinking, their living and dying. This way of understanding and assuming the world legalized the existence of conquerors and colonizers who wielded a supposed ‘right’ over the conquered and colonized. The ‘being’ brought out its dark, colonial side, and the American went from ‘being-there’ to ‘being-there-colonized’. In this way, philosophy as ‘metaphysics’, as onto-theo-logy, culminated, since its arrival in America, in philosophy as ‘metaphysics of domination’ and has provided, over time, categories (those of being, not-being, act, power, substance, accident, matter, form, etc.) that have sustained ‘from behind’ (as a legitimating theoretical framework) colonialism, neocolonialism and coloniality.

Some characters warned and criticized this ideological function of philosophy very early on. The famous debate of Valladolid (1550-1551) between Bartolomé de las Casas and Ginés de Sepúlveda, about the legitimacy of the conquest and subjugation of the natives, exemplifies this contrast between the critical and questioning vision of de las Casas and the legitimizing vision of Sepúlveda.¹¹ However, the debate that took place in the sixteenth century did not stop the institutionalization of this philosophy, which was imposed as a study curriculum in schools (colleges and universities, which were gradually founded) and as a mental horizon of ordinary culture, not only of the natives, but also of the new generations that appeared with the miscegenation. Some religious conscious, inspired by an authentic vision of the Gospel, raised to the Spanish authorities reports or allegations denouncing the cruelty of the conquest and defending the indigenous cultures. These materials now allow the re-construction of a philosophical-critical line of thought, which emerged in what was called ‘America’¹², which continued and was redefined at decisive moments in our political and cultural history, such as the so-called ‘independence’ nineteenth century or the liberal and socialist revolutions of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

In this way, the soul, the thought, the culture, the organization of society, politics, government, and, in general, all the manifestations of the system in which our ancestors lived have been linked, and still are, for good and for bad, to the Greco-Roman-Hispanic-European-North



American West. This phenomenon had and has, not only cultural connotations, but also racist and exclusivist connotations to privilege the white-European vein of the new social groups that were formed in America, while hiding, discrediting or excluding the indigenous American vein, the black one (acclimated already in America, after its import from Africa), the mestiza. These other veins of our roots have had to resist in the darkness and silence for four centuries, from the second half of the twentieth century, re-constituted as ethnic groups, cultures or social groups and carry out a gradual de-concealment, study and re-valorization, both of its 'popular' wisdom and its more organic or systematic manifestations.¹³

Philosophy/metaphysics continues to be updated in the current mechanisms of power, especially the academic and communicational powers, with which it maintains its presence in all the intricacies of existence (such as being totalized over itself, as a stratified society, as life that is lived in relation to ulterior or transcendent referents), of thought (as Western-Christian reason and rationality), and of the culture of Latin American being (as a horizon of dematerialized, de-idealized and idealistic understanding¹⁴). What to do in front of this 'metaphysics of domination'? Re-think the 'being', the 'being-there' and the 'logos' from the 'amazement' (strangeness, scandal, outrage) before the annihilation and degradation of those our fundamental constituents. That is the answer that will also allow us to 'legitimize' the presence of philosophy in our reality, since 'illegitimately' (by imposed and ideological) has been present from the very moment that America was 'discovered'. What is it that we should ask, analyze and criticize to avoid that 'philosophy as metaphysics of domination' continues to run over us in the pulpits, in the families, in the curricula and in the culture of the street, in the media and in the private enclosures of ordinary life without us realizing it?



Critique of philosophy as 'domination metaphysics'

The 'end' of philosophy as a metaphysics of domination and its 're-start' as a knowledge of decolonization and subjectification

Expressions of ordinary life such as: 'yes or no', 'never again', 'heaven or hell', 'be perfect', 'forever and ever', 'must be', 'principles first and foremost', 'do it well or not at all', 'all or nothing', 'you only live once', 'now or never', 'success or failure', 'with you or without you '...', they show that the system of metaphysical categories has penetrated and organized

the vision of the world and manifests itself every day in the comprehensions of life, culture, religion, customs. Faced with these mental and cultural structures, philosophy can/must assume its critical role and 'legitimize' its need and presence in the region by means of a deconstruction (disarticulation, deconfiguration) of the imposed system of categories, which allows the unveiling of the thousand and one open and hidden ways of hiding our belonging to the 'being', our condition of 'being-there', and our disposition of the *logos*: 'Coloniality of being' which - as we already know - manifests itself among us as dehumanization, devaluation, disempowerment, invisibility, marginalization, exploitation, exclusion, ethnocentrism, violation (sexual and of human rights)... A permanent questioning ('asking') of the meaning, orientation and purpose of the individual and collective existence will help to open ways from the philosophical theory for a re-constitution of our 'being', a mental decolonization, and a gradual address the conditions of living, thinking, working, loving, relating, dying...

60



It should not be forgotten that philosophy is not only a theoretical knowledge but also an objective situation of an educational and institutional nature that, from the classrooms or from the pulpits, from the media or from public bodies, has promoted and promote (many sometimes without proposing it expressly) the reification (invisibilization, dehumanization) on the horizon of 'being'. Taking into account these antecedents, the 'legitimation' of philosophy, to be radical, should mean its deconstruction and end. A sustained and critical reflection on philosophy/metaphysics and its function in our context should lead to its consummation, sunset and end! But we must specify: the one that is driven to its end is Eurocentric philosophy/metaphysics/ideological, imposed as a mechanism that produces/justifies coloniality, not philosophy as a rational discourse that, correctly addressed, can/should be a logical instrument (*logos*) of subjectification, decolonization, affirmation and truth for those who emerge from the nothingness of being.¹⁵

Heidegger has spoken of 'The end of philosophy and the task of thinking'.¹⁶ In what sense has philosophy/metaphysics come to its 'end' in the old continent? In the sense that, after the reversal of metaphysics by Marx (the real foundation is real and concrete matter and not the abstract Being or the Absolute Spirit), philosophy exhausted its possibilities and dissolved (it was consumed, it came to its exhaustion) in the multiple special and specialized sciences (psychology, sociology, anthropology, logistics, semantics, cybernetics, etc.) that were born within the horizon that philosophy opened since ancient times and that later became inde-

pendent from it. The task that still remains reserved to think at the end of philosophy as metaphysics is a thinking that is no longer metaphysics or science. What comes after this 'end' is a thinking that thinks 'events of being' that are historically configured. One of these, according to the Italian philosopher Gianni Vattimo (2009), corresponds to us, it is the event of the Being in the stage of democracy that according to him lives the world, and in which the Being manifests itself as collective, concrete and historical experience (instead of its metaphysical manifestation as one, unique, universal, timeless, etc.).¹⁷

In Latin America and other areas marked by coloniality, the 'end' of philosophy as metaphysics has also another meaning. Since it has been used as a system of concepts designed to hide and devalue our belonging to 'being' and our condition of 'being-there', it is about freeing philosophy as such from those dominant structures and roles to turn it into a *logos*/reason/language/discourse that makes it possible to re-constitute our 'being' and value ourselves as beings in the world. It is in this sense that the 'end' of philosophy is postulated as Eurocentric metaphysics (System of concepts about 'being' as the ideal, essential, substantial, one and only, eternal, absolute, necessary, universal and hegemonic foundation) and its 're-start' as historical ontology of the present (System of concepts about 'being' that has manifested and manifests itself historically in the multiple and distinct 'events of being' that have taken place and take place in different contexts, peoples, cultures, individuals and philosophical situations).

What *logos* allows us to think and formulate in concepts this emergence/liberation of our historical 'being', this historical ontology of ourselves and our present, this decolonization of the coloniality of 'being'? Not the Greek *logos*, nor the Christian-medieval *logos*, nor the modern-European *logos*, based on the abstract (meta-physical) being as the universal foundation, one and only, but a decolonial, pluriversal and transmodern *logos* that makes it possible to think about ontological, epistemic, ethical and political decolonizations. It is a thought that represents a critical position with respect to the Eurocentric philosophy and that gradually organizes, from the margins of the given system, the concepts/categories corresponding to the historical being that is liberated and the achieved liberation. It is in this intellectual and deconstructive task where/when 'philosophy', 'philosophers' and 'philosophizing' justify their need, their presence and their theoretical/liberating work in Latin America and the South in general.



Our background in the task of disposing of the logos

Two centuries ago, more or less, the American intellectuals began to postulate the need to have a *logos* and to have a philosophy that was adjusted to the needs of the nascent American nations: it was the way of thinking about the transformation of the received philosophy. In the last century, thanks to the reflections of thinkers of our America such as Salazar Bondy or Leopoldo Zea, progress was made in this way and the existence of a philosophy of our America was debated. Today, we can already talk about various philosophical manifestations developed in the last half century: *Filosofía de la historia americana* of Leopoldo Zea (1978); la *Filosofía de la liberación* of Enrique Dussel (1996); la *Teoría y crítica del pensamiento latinoamericano* by Arturo Roig (2004); el *Filosofar desde nuestra América* by Horacio Cerutti (2000); the *baroque Ethos* of Bolívar Echeverría (2004); la *Filosofía andina* of Josef Estermann (1998); la *Filosofía intercultural* of Fornet-Betancourt (2009); *Giro decolonial* of Castro-Gómez and Grosfoguel (2007), the decolonial; etc.

In this 'learned' field, which is the most systematized, post-metaphysical, postcolonial, anti-imperialist, decolonial, trans-modern liberationist strategies that seek to break the circularity of hegemonic thinking with 'weapons' (alternative categories of thought) as the 'exteriority', the 'alterity', the 'heterarchical thought', the 'a priori anthropological', the 'thought of the margins', the 'epistemologies of the south', etc.. are in full development. In particular, decolonial thinking criticizes European modernity and the Eurocentrism of philosophy imposed and exercised as a disciplinary and coercive power (without often realizing it) in the minds and consciences of the colonized. The 'educated' contributions, however, are not the only ones, there is also a rich history of confrontations and social resistances, whose discursive genealogy has just begun to be studied. You can already visualize (as in an x-ray) the vertebrations of the history of our critical thinking that, although at times seems to be limited to complying with the parameters of European philosophy, brings out its immeasurable elements, allowing it to be valued as what it was and is: the register of 'other' thoughts that openly or subtly have questioned and question the colonial, neocolonial status and the current coloniality of being, knowledge and power.

Do these evidences mean that we are already 'more here' of philosophy as metaphysics of domination? Does it mean that we already have the *logos* instead of borrowing it? The answer is not so easy or immediate, especially if you bear in mind that our philosophical production, made in the bosom of colonialism and coloniality, has coincided with our histori-



cal struggles to validate, not only a certain type of knowledge, but also are the very condition of subjects animated by a rational soul (as it was said in the time of the conquest of America), or capable of thinking for ourselves and having a discourse about who we are today (as we can say in this stage of globalization and exclusion). We are by definition animals that have *logos* (*ratio, intellectus, nous, verstand*), but the colonial vicissitudes have hidden our disposition of it, disqualifying and devaluing our being, knowing, believing, doing, waiting and being human.

A different 'place of enunciation' (locus enuntiationis) for an 'other' philosophy

The 'end' of philosophy as a metaphysics of domination opens up the possibility of thinking of an 'other' philosophy. The expression 'other' refers to a philosophy thought from a *locus enuntiationis* ('place of enunciation': historical subject from which one speaks or philosophizes) different from the subject-imperial-modern-European-North American, constituted by historical subjects, empirical, collective, of the Global South, which are currently struggling for their subjectification, decolonization, affirmation and historical realization and which, to the extent that they do, break the Eurocentric uni-versality from pluri-versal, de-colonial and trans-modern horizons. In the case of Latin America, this 'other' and 'new' philosophy has the historical function of clarifying, through academic and extra-academic practice, the categories and concepts necessary to un-veil the degradation of our 'being', to make ourselves visible, to position ourselves as subjects, to construct ourselves (objectify ourselves) historically, to value ourselves and to really become (in everyday practice) a 'new' philosophical *locus*.

We are not alone in this task: decisive characters of our history made contributions of great usefulness/relevance. Such are the cases of: Bolivar, the Liberator, who explicitly asked who we are at the beginning of the XIXth century;¹⁸ of Juan Bautista Alberdi who proposed in 1842 the program of a philosophy that would think about the interests of the new nations that had been formed after the wars of independence;¹⁹ of Augusto Salazar Bondy who asked himself in 1968 if there is a philosophy of our America; and, of the multiple contributions of the critical philosophical thought in the last half century (mentioned above). The multiplicity and diversity of these proposals pays, from different angles, to the processes of contextualization, subjectification, knowledge and valuation of a thought that seeks to account for our reality and for ourselves.²⁰



The pedagogy of liberation (by Paulo Freire), the theology of liberation (Gustavo Gutiérrez and others) and the literature of magical realism (Gabriel García Márquez and others), have also undermined the cultural determinations of philosophy/metaphysics from their horizons of understanding. Certainly there is still a long way to go in order to transform philosophy, from a 'universal' and 'totalized' theory about itself into a 'pluriversal' and 'open' theory, but at least there has been progress in perception and consciousness of the needs and theoretical demands of the areas that, like Latin America, still fight against the geo-political-cultural coloniality.²¹ The term 'Latin America' refers, of course, to the geo-historical space known as 'Latin America' (basically Central America and South America) but, above all, refers to Latin Americans as an object and subject of thought, as a philosophical locus of enunciation and as living agents of decolonization.²²

64



The path we open while walking (because there is not a path previously opened, nor is there a pre-defined project, but only criteria that guide walking and moving forward) is defined from the pluri-versal horizon (a world in which many 'worlds'²³: a pluriverse), and not from the universal (a single world: the European), as in the case of traditional/metaphysical philosophy. This does not mean the establishment of some particularism that, converted into a new 'center', reproduces the fallacies of Eurocentrism; it means that all regions of the world are 'centers' or that there is simply no 'center', thus contributing with objective conditions for this world to become, one day, an integrated set of regions, human beings and cultures.

A horizon of pluri-versal, de-colonial and trans-modern understanding

Is the thought we propose, is it post-modern, post-metaphysical, post-philosophical? These denominations are still Eurocentric and that referentiality or European-North American centrality that makes us de-estimate our own processes is what we need to overcome. Although not ignore. Some Latin American philosophers now propose to visualize the 'epistemic otherness' (which, located at the intersection between the traditional and the modern, produces interstitial, 'hybrid' knowledge forms, in the sense of 'subversive complicity' with the system and of 'semiotic resistance' capable of re-signifying the hegemonic forms of knowledge) from the point of view of a post-Eurocentric and trans-modern rationality.²⁴

It is about thinking, thinking about our reality, thinking about our history, thinking about ourselves, and criticizing epistemic coloniality from us; think de-colonial, liberating thinking that assumes the challenges of our re-positioning on the horizon of 'being' and '*logos*' and that, to the extent that it does, constitutes a re-start of philosophy. It is about thinking as a reflective-technical activity from/on our historical-social reality and not as a frozen set of categories, theses, doctrines, principles, impositions, imported and repeated (taught, commented) naively from a situation of coloniality. Such decolonization in/by discourse, such liberating *logos*, calls for the overcoming of philosophy/metaphysics as knowledge of domination: in this sense it has been spoken of 'death/sunset/end' of that philosophy.

The classic re-starts of Greco-European philosophy (with Christianity, with Descartes, Kant, Hegel, Marx, Nietzsche, Heidegger, etc.) that 'surpassed' the systems of concepts of their predecessors, are not involved here; in areas of coloniality it is a re-start in the genealogical sense, whose deconstructive moment of Eurocentric philosophy is, at the same time, a moment of rational construction of a thought that thinks the fundamentals of Latin American reality and being within it. It is, literally, a re-start in the sense of overcoming the metaphysics-of-domination with a historical ontology that re-founds the belonging of the Latin American people to 'being', to 'being there' and to the *logos*.

That is why the question 'who are we today and what is our relationship with the *logos*' so that it does not allude to the totalized, colonial "being", and alludes, instead, to our ontological re-positioning that de-veils our belonging to 'being' and '*logos*' as subjects and not as objects. It is about opening our space-time for an event of 'being' and of the *logos*, overcoming the degradation and devaluation of our existence. 'Being' and the *logos* as an event constitute the fundamental (not the only) that, in historical situations of coloniality, must be thought and expressed through philosophical discourse.

The *logos* that de-veils our historical being brings to light new parameters for our own philosophy and re-define it as a 'critical' knowledge (that problematizes the received/imposed philosophy), 'pluri-versal' (there is no 'world' -Europe- that universalizes itself by totalizing itself and privatizing the *logos*, but multiple historical 'worlds' that open the *logos* and multiply it with 'other' visions/epistemes), 'de-colonial' (which criticizes the system of categories with which coloniality has been justified and justified, here or anywhere), and 'trans-modern' (which goes 'beyond' modernity, as a stage of organized humanity based on 'domina-



tion' over the nature and of some men over others). All this supposes an 'ontological turn' that de-constructs the 'metaphysics of domination' and opens the way to a 'historical ontology' of our present.

Philosophy as "historical ontology of the present"

The historical (s) 'ontology (s)' as a re-constitution of the 'being' and 'disposition' of the logos

It has been seen that asking about 'philosophy', 'philosophizing' and 'philosophers' demands a direct confrontation with this Greco-European manifestation in order to make it transparent and purge it of the equivocal (ideological) representation that it acquired from the moment of its imposition in America by the conqueror who assumed the role of dispenser of the *logos*, while the Americans borrowed it (because the *logos* of the indigenous cultures was systematically destroyed). Such confrontation seeks: a) to make viable in the plane of the concepts the fundamental concern of 'who we are today and what is our relationship with the *logos*'; b) bring out the theoretical strategies to identify our resistance to colonial inheritance; and, c) globally assess the advances that have taken place at various moments in the historical struggle for the ontological, epistemological, ethical-political, social, economic and cultural re-constitution of the Latin American people.

If 'philosophy as metaphysics of domination' was constituted in the horizon of justification of the 'coloniality of being', the task that corresponds is to think about the conditions of an ontological decolonization, which makes possible the re-constitution of the colonized as subjects²⁵ as an affirmation of themselves, as animals defined by the *logos*. The problem has been that we have only been able to think and philosophize with the same language and the same system of categories that we received from the conquerors and that served to hide, dehumanize, dehistoricize and devalue the Latin American people. How to open the way to a true and genuine philosophizing, that thinks the theoretical conditions of decolonization from the same existing coloniality and from the received language and philosophy? This is the fundamental question.

The questioning of the colonized about its 'being' and its relation to the *logos* before the 'amazement' of its degraded and dehumanized 'being' constitutes in itself a radical, ontological re-positioning formulated in the same language the dominator has used to degrade it and subsume



it as 'dispensable' in its exclusion. This ontological re-positioning is symbolized, in the case of Latin America, by the myth of Caliban²⁶ by Shakespeare (1953): the 'cannibal' that arose from metaphysical death, from nothing-of-being, to cursing his master in/with the same language that he had been taught and with which he had been denied as a man, making him a slave. It must be remembered that until the mid-twentieth century the slave/indigenous was not the owner of himself but was owned by the master/landowner, and by being part of the hacienda he/she could be sold with it. Not being his own master, he could be converted into a pack animal (remember the four thousand Indians who carried the baggage in the expedition of Orellana to the Amazon) or in a labor force without a soul (used until his exhaustion and death in domestic service, in the mines, in the *obrajes*, in the fulling mills).

The radical response to the question that has to do with the possibilities of generating philosophical thinking in situations of marginality and exclusion, is found symbolized in this 'ontological turn' by Caliban, who is able to say: "You taught me to speak, and my only benefit/is that I know how to curse. The radical response to the question that has to do with the possibilities of generating philosophical thinking in situations of marginality and exclusion, is found symbolized in this 'ontological turn' by Caliban, who is able to say: "You taught me language, and my only profit/is that I know how to curse. The red plague rid you / for teaching me your language!" (Shakespeare, 1953, p. 138), using in this way the same language learned from Prospero, his master, to 'curse' him: original pathos (attitude) with which he overcomes slavery and re-constitutes himself as a human being, affirms and valorizes himself as a subject of his own knowledge, his relations of power and the morality of his actions.

By learning and redirecting the language of the master (European philosophy), Caliban 'rises' from 'non-being', from the pure substantiality of a slave to uncovering his belonging to 'being'. This ontological equalization allows him to 'talk' (before Prospero taught him his language, he did not speak), 'curse' and wish that his 'red plague' fell on his master: primary manifestations of a 'being' that emerges as pathos, as desire, and which, however, open a horizon of possibilities to an evolution in the line of reason, which philosophy must account for. This 'evolution' of our 'being' was set in motion simultaneously with the same conquest and colonization and has not necessarily advanced along the lines of the self-sufficient, individualistic and closed (solipsistic) self that Europe developed, but in the line of an open being, multiple, relational, friendly, communitarian and supportive.





But, beware, this ‘curse’ is not something irrational or mere revenge: it is something more complex that involves a determining relationship between the master (Prospero) and the slave (Caliban), and that requires to be correctly understood. The original relationship has been colonial, of the mastery of the master over the slave; the ‘curse’ of Caliban does simply invert that relationship? No. The attitude of Caliban establishes an ontological relationship that frees Prospero from his domain as ‘being’ and Caliban from his submission as ‘non-being’, equating them in the ontological range of ‘being’ and establishing conditions for a horizontal relationship of similarity-difference that makes the hegemony of one over another illegitimate.. It is this attitude of Caliban regarding the language learned from the master and the understanding of things, which serves as an example of subjects in a situation, like Latin Americans, can problematize and legitimize philosophy as an activity of reason that seeks to be constructed and re-constructed, not from the hegemony of one or the slavery of another, but from their equalization in the ontological scale. Therefore, it is not correct to problematize and legitimize the philosophy received and imposed from a supposedly valuable historical-geographical-cultural peculiarity (Latin America, for example), but by a rational exercise that reveals our belonging to the universal species of the animals that have *logos* and dispose of it instead of borrowing it.

‘To curse’ Prospero’s philosophy from the standpoint of Caliban means to decipher it, de-ideologize it, de-construct it and redirect it to the historical ends of the colonized in the process of decolonization and self-affirmation. How to do that? De-saying, criticizing, disarticulating, bringing to light the negative and dark (ideological) background that that Greco-European-North American philosophy acquired in America, instead of repeating it. De-say that philosophy, to curse it, means to discuss the colonial side of ‘being’ that such a philosophy holds, and then re-signify it, re-conceptualize it and re-direct it towards the re-constitution of the colonized as historical ‘being’ (ontological re-constitution), as man (anthropological re-constitution), as an end in itself, (ethical re-constitution), as valuable for itself (axiological re-constitution), as free and sovereign (political re-constitution). In this way the *logos*/discourse is opened to a pluriversal language that legitimizes the access of the colonized to ‘philosophy’ and ‘philosophizing’. To think the conditions of possibility of this liberating process of the mental colonization of our region or of any part, is to philosophize and those who do it can be called ‘philosophers’. We present in this way a ‘philosopher’, a ‘philosophy’ and a condition of ‘philosophers’ that, when confronting intellectually the fun-

damental question of ‘who we are today and what is our relationship with the *logos*’, they open immediately (we open ourselves) to a ‘pluriverse’ (a world in which many ‘worlds’ fit) of new subjects, new *loci* of enunciation, new horizons of understanding and ‘new’ philosophies. Sometimes, by performing as professors of philosophy and philosophizing about already made philosophies, the illusion of making true and genuine philosophy is fabricated. But that philosophical modality does not position us as protagonists of thinking and, therefore, does not cause ruptures, dislocations, or incommensurability, or radical choices in thinking, or distancing from the hegemonic power (internal and external), but illusory (theoretical) problematizations that move under a common parameter with the imposed or the usual, reproducing it. Caliban ‘teaches’ to position ourselves as protagonists of thought, a position from which one can assume, repeat, gloss any philosophy based on our own unappealable decision to do so, if we see its need, without being seduced or dragged by the imposed, the traditional, the ideological, the supposedly ‘new’ or ‘latest’ in/of Europe or North America.

In this way, access to philosophical-critical rationality is constituted in a historical re-constitutive conquest of ourselves, which converts philosophizing and the activity of critical philosophers, not only into a modality and an exercise of thought, but in an experience of de-concealment and re-constitution of subjectivity. This problematizing the Eurocentric philosophy allows for Caliban’s horizon:

a) Be aware of the ‘place of enunciation’ of the fundamental question (‘who are we today and what is our relationship with the *logos*’): the colonized and not the colonizers; the ‘margins’ (ontological, not geographical²⁷) and not the ‘center’.

b) Place the question in the arc of time that, for the philosophy of our America, comes from Antonio de Montesinos and Bartolomé de las Casas (sixteenth century) to the current colonial philosophers.

c) Make visible the ‘philosophical situations’ that in our historical trajectory have given rise to manifestations of ‘philosophical thought’ and have fulfilled, critically, the parameters of all philosophy: link with extreme situations of a loving, political, scientific or artistic nature; rationality; abstraction; vision of totality; systematicity; radical choice; criticality; problematization; generation of concepts (Deleuze); universal singularity (Kant); incommensurability; distance between thought and power; dislocation of the usual, the given, the admitted; value of the exception, the strangeness, the rupture, the event; affirmation; transcendental (in the sense of the ‘inhuman’ or the ‘infinite’)..



d) Legitimize and ‘read as a philosophical production’, that is to say as rationality that expresses its vision of the world not only through univocal concepts, but also through ‘narratives’ and expressive own and specific resources to the multiple and diverse cultures: traditions, symbols, images, festivals, iconographies, etc. Artists, writers, and even leaders (political, social, cultural) can enter the philosophical horizon if they manage to capture in their works and discourses the ‘colonial difference’, which allows them to de-colonize the ‘being’ and uncover new subjects.

The ontological re-positioning of Caliban reverts his situation of slavery and generates an ontological relationship of equality in which master and slave ‘are’. As original pathos, it generates possibilities for an ‘other’ philosophy that assumes us as subjects and not as objects. The re-constitution of the colonized, their return from the ‘nothingness of being’ to the ‘being’ that is expressed in the ‘cursing’ (that is, in speaking, asking, thinking, knowing what is denied or devalued by the language of the dominator), constitutes in itself an ontological decolonization and a re-signification of *logos* and philosophy; that is, a concrete and historical liberation of ‘being’ and the *logos*.

Connections and derivations of the ontological question of the “new” philosophy

The ‘ontological turn’ exemplified by Caliban allows us to re-constitute our belonging to ‘being’ and position ourselves as ‘being-there’. But not everything is sewing and singing: our historicity (condition of historical subjects) is still hidden by the coloniality that ‘locates’ us in the current geo-political division as exploitable nature, as mere futurity (Hegel), or, as pure substantiality (underdeveloped regions/countries), which prevents or hinders our self-consciousness and self-construction. If we start from a different locus of enunciation, the ‘new’ philosophy finds that Caliban’s positioning represents a new ontological event, which puts in the hands of the individual/people/community the task of being historically constructed and defined from a *logos* that allows make it visible and value it. This is called ‘historical ontology of ourselves’ because it has to do with the ‘being’ that we become, with the *logos* with which we understand and express our ‘being’, and, with the history that allows us to see ourselves and project ourselves as beings temporary, multiple, empirical, mundane.

Philosophy thus becomes a ‘field’ of decolonizing struggle by/through discourse and in a ‘workshop’ of dismantling the domination metaphysical category system, which uses the acquired ‘toolbox’: the



new concepts, categories and attitudes with which the Calibans think. Philosophy must get its hands dirty in the hard work of the ontological re-constitution and thereby create possibilities for epistemological, ethical, political, economic and cultural decolonizations. This will take time and perhaps several generations of thinkers/activists, but the path that will be opened will have its immediate gratification: such decolonizations will be the “new” modes of subjectivation/objectification, that is to say, of historical realization of those that emerge from coloniality, since it is not the *a priori* conditions of thinking that determine our philosophizing but our ontological, anthropological, ethical and political re-constitution assumed as *a priori*.

Conclusion

Education, as a determined/determining philosophical situation that has to do with the self-possession of the ‘being-there’ and its spatial-temporal realization, that is, with the existence, life, thinking, acting, relating, of human beings that learn, know, project and become, requires to be proposed; in its fundamental core, within the horizon of a historical ontology that claims, as the original moment, our condition as subjects, that is our full belonging to the ‘being’ and our full disposition of the *logos*.

71



Notes

- 1 Colonialism and coloniality require a distinction: ‘colonialism’ refers to the military subjugation, territorial occupation and legal administration of a people by a foreign imperial power; ‘coloniality’ refers to the inheritances that colonialism leaves in the symbolic, affective and cognitive order of that people, even after the territorial occupation and the legal administration have ended.
- 2 Paul of Tarsus, First Letter to the Corinthians: 4, 10.
- 3 When in allusion to the conquered and colonized the expressions of ‘not-being’ or ‘nothing-of-being’ are used, it does not mean that they are ‘nothing’ (nullity of nothingness) or that they do not exist, it means -according to the modern/European philosophers- that their ‘being’ is still immersed and dispersed in pure substantiality (in their essence of ‘such’ entity) and has not evolved enough to become Spirit, Self-consciousness, Reason, *Logos* that ex-press their own evolution.
- 4 Scholasticism did not make a sharp distinction between ‘being’ and ‘entity’ and the indiscriminate use of these concepts generated ambiguity in many cases. Heidegger introduced in the twentieth century the so-called ‘ontological difference’ that allowed him, on the one hand, to clarify and specify the meaning of those concepts and, on the other hand, to identify that from Plato the ‘being’ ceased to be thought of as ‘be’ to be thought of as ‘entity’, thus producing a ‘forgetting of being’. This work

does not seek to validate one or another position, but instrumentalizes them in the direction of our decolonial theorizations.

- 5 The characterization of 'being' as 'what it is', which the *Metaphysical Manuals* bring, is a description, not a definition.
- 6 "In the beginning was the Word (*Logos*, Word)... And the Word was God", Gospel of John, 1.1: Latin American Bible, Pauline Editions/Divine Word, Madrid, 1972
- 7 This Greek metaphysics, re-semanticized by Christianity, was irradiated in America under the educational action of Scholasticism in its three aspects: that of Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274), under the action of the Dominicans; that of Juan Duns Scotto (1266-1308), under the action of the Franciscans; and, that of Francisco Suárez (1548-1617), under the action of the Jesuits.
- 8 It can be seen how the great philosophers of European modernity spew their opinions on America in Antonnello Gerbi (1960).
- 9 This way of thinking was wrong because human beings, however primitive, have never lacked institutions that allowed them to organize and advance, as contemporary anthropology demonstrates. And not only human beings, but even bees and higher apes have institutions (that of the 'bee-queen' or the 'dominant male', for example).
- 10 Currently there is a tendency to see an unsatisfactory explanation in the dialectical dichotomies. We believe that we must distinguish: one thing is the use of these dichotomies as categories of analysis or interpretation and another, very different, is to put them as 'ways of being' that arise from the objective data of the reality (epoch, system socio-historical, structure) investigated. In the first case, it is about the researcher's impositions about the investigated reality; in the second, it is about determinate/determinant exteriorizations, epochal syntheses or defining structures of the investigated reality. The correct attitude of the researcher in front of the dialectical dichotomies is to investigate their 'genesis' and their 'function' within the investigated reality and not only remain at the explanatory level. All reality is complex and does not end in the dialectical dichotomies, but these, when they emerge as defining characteristics of the same reality, can offer a vision of totality that captures the essence of reality and time investigated. Hermeneutics knows that capturing the investigated object as a whole is the culminating moment that allows validating if the analytical assumptions with which it has been operated have been able to capture the fundamental, that is, the essence of what has been investigated.
- 11 In 1552 an edition of this controversy was made in Seville, in the house of Sebastián Trujillo, printer of books. The consequences of this debate up to today keep their relevance and resonance. See also Lewis Hanke (1974).
- 12 The 'America' of the colonial centuries will be called 'Latin America' from the 19th century to the present day. At the end of that same century, José Martí, the Cuban hero, called it simply 'Our America'.
- 13 Many have called the philosophy and vision of the world of the Indians or black "philosophy" and perhaps they are right if those social groups advanced from the rationality based on experience to the rationality based on abstract concepts; but it is certainly not philosophy in a Greco-European sense. Because it is the one that still dominates our culture and our vision of things, it is this we refer to in this work, without this meaning that the thinking of indigenous or black cultures should not be studied: the study of these cultures and their thinking, which began decades ago, is still open as an urgent and significant task for indigenous or black peoples, for Latin Americans in general, and, for all those who want to approach them, if in reality we want to include ourselves all in one full understanding of what we are



- today and our relationship with the *logos*. The author of this article made a study of the historical structuring of our 'metaphysical mind' and of the need to re-educate it and transform it successively into 'historical mind', 'strategic mind' and 'master mind'. Cf. Guerra Bravo (2004).
- 14 The author of this article made a study of the historical structuring of our 'metaphysical mind' and of the need to re-educate it and transform it successively into 'historical mind', 'strategic mind' and 'master mind'. Cf. Guerra Bravo (2004).
 - 15 Philosophy was not always cultivated as an end in itself, but as an 'instrument-for'. Suffice two examples: Scholasticism made it the 'slave of theology' (*ancilla theologiae*), Averroism also instrumentalized it for its theological speculative purposes. In this perspective, it would be useful to ask: why areas that experience situations of coloniality cannot instrumentalize it for their decolonial ends?
 - 16 Cf. Heidegger (1978).
 - 17 Cf. "The end of philosophy in the age of democracy", in Carlos Muñoz Gutiérrez et al., (2009, pp. 255-262).
 - 18 Cf. Letter from Jamaica, National Autonomous University of Mexico, Mexico, 1978.
 - 19 Cf. Alberdi (1981).
 - 20 Enrique Dussel, Eduardo Mendieta and Carmen Bohórquez (2009) published as editors a thick volume entitled *Latin American, Caribbean and "Latino" philosophical thought (1300-2000)*, which reflects the philosophical thinking of the Latin American and Caribbean cultural continent, from the seventh century to the twentieth century, including the 'Latinos' of the United States,
 - 21 We must not forget, however, that the dominant philosophy has been reproduced and continues to be reproduced in the Academies and outside of them and that the history of Latin American philosophy also has a vein of important philosophers and intellectuals, in general, who have not broken with the Eurocentric horizon of understanding and have re-produced coloniality, without wanting it or without knowing it, even when they have dealt with systems of critical thought (such as Marxism, for example). See, as examples, Francisco Miró Quesada (1981); José Luis Romero (1967).
 - 22 It is also legitimate to speak of "South Philosophies" in which the word "South" refers not only to the southern hemisphere but also to the geo/historical/political areas of production of critical, pluriversal, decolonial and transmodern thought: Cf. E. Dussel (2015).
 - 23 The expression "a world in which many worlds fit" comes from Zapatism and the Colombian anthropologist Arturo Escobar (2013) has categorized it as 'pluriverse', in the social sciences.
 - 24 Walter D. Mignolo (2001, 2006, 2018), one of the members of the decolonial group, finds for example the first manifestations of this 'decolonial turn' in the Hispanic viceroalties, in the Anahuac and Tawantinsuyu in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, but also in the English colonies and in the metropolis during the eighteenth century; that is why he studies, from the decolonial perspective, the *New Coronel and Good Government (1616)* of Guaman Poma de Ayala and *Thoughts and Sentiments on the Evil of Slavery*/Thoughts and feelings on the evil of slavery (1787) of Otabbah Cugoana, as original manifestations that opened the doors to another thought from the experience and memory of the Tawantinsuyu, the one, and the experience and memory of the brutal black slavery of the Atlantic, the other. Cf. Castro-Gómez and Ramón Grosfoguel (2007, p.20).
 - 25 Here the concept of the subject is not mentioned in Cartesian terms, as the unconditional foundation of all thought, but in historical terms, as the 'hard work' of the



colonized to re-constitute their subjectivity degraded, disqualified and devalued by the system colonial.

- 26 Philosophy, which is a rational, logical knowledge, has always used myths to exemplify or make its arguments more accessible. It would suffice to recall Plato's mention of the philosopher as the creator of myths. Myths do not constitute the fundamental argumentation around a question, they are mere exemplifications so that the arguments are easily understood. Myths are 'narrations', not 'discourses'. Myths can be used perfectly without abandoning the *Logos*, as demonstrated by Gadamer (1997). From this perspective, it seems legitimate to appeal to a myth of American roots, although the literary source is Shakespeare, so that the students of the First Level of the Philosophy Career can better assimilate the rational explanations of the text they have in hand. I refer to the myth of Caliban, which has been widely discussed in the field of Latin American literature and which we want to re-interpret now in the field of philosophy.
- 27 In a geographical sense, the current globalization is more interested in blurring the 'margins' and homogenizing the world, because, according to various specialists, globalization is only the contemporary name for the world hegemony of the Northern empire.

74



Bibliography

ALBERDI, Juan Bautista

- 1981 Ideas para un curso de filosofía contemporánea. En *¿Qué es eso de filosofía latinoamericana? Introducción al filosofar*. Bogotá: Editorial El Búho.

BIBLIA LATINOAMERICANA

- 1972 *Evangelio de Juan, 1,1; Primera Carta a los Corintios: 4, 10*. Madrid: Ediciones Paulinas/Verbo Divino.

GUERRA BRAVO SAMUEL

- 2004 *Bases para la competitividad. Cómo re-educar la mente en contextos emergentes*. Quito: Editorial Abya-Yala.

CASTRO-GÓMEZ, Santiago & GROSGOUEL, Ramón

- 2007 *El giro decolonial. Reflexiones para una diversidad epistémica más allá del capitalismo global*, Siglo del Hombre Editores, Universidad Central, Instituto de Estudios Sociales contemporáneos y Pontificia Universidad Javeriana, Instituto Pensar, Bogotá.

CERUTTI GULDBERG, Horacio

- 2000 *Filosofar desde nuestra América. Ensayo problematizador de su modus operandi*. México: UNAM/Editorial Porrúa.

DE LAS CASAS, Bartolomé

- 2011 *Brevísima relación de la destrucción de las Indias*. Medellín: Editorial de la Universidad de Antioquia.

DUSSEL, Enrique

- 1996 *Filosofía de la liberación*. Bogotá: Editorial Nueva América.

- 2015 *Filosofías del Sur. Descolonización y Transmodernidad*. México: Ediciones Akal.

DUSSEL, Enrique, MENDIETA, Eduardo & BOHÓRQUEZ, Carmen

- 2009 *El pensamiento filosófico latinoamericano, del Caribe y "Latino" (1300-2000)*. México: Siglo XXI Editores.

- ECHEVERRÍA, Bolívar
2004 El ethos barroco y los indios. *Revista de Filosofía Sophia*. Quito: UPS.
- ESCOBAR, Arturo
2013 *Tejiendo el pluriverso: la ontología política de las luchas territoriales en América Latina/Abya Yala*. Seminario Internacional Pensamiento Contemporáneo, Universidad del Cauca.
- ESTERMAN, Josef
1998 *La filosofía Andina*. Quito: Abya-Yala.
- FERNÁNDEZ RETAMAR, Roberto
2005 *Todo Calibán*. Bogotá: Ediciones Antropos.
- FORNET-BETANCOURT, Raúl
2009 La filosofía intercultural. En Enrique Dussel, Eduardo Mendieta, y Carmen Bohórquez (Eds.), *El pensamiento filosófico latinoamericano, del Caribe y "latino" (1300-2000)*. *Historia, corrientes, temas, filósofos* (pp. 639-646). México: CREA/Siglo XXI.
- GADAMER, Hans Georg
1997 *Mito y Razón*. Barcelona: Ediciones Paidós.
- GERBI, Antonello
1960 *La disputa del nuevo mundo: historia de una polémica, 1750-1900*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- GUERRA BRAVO, SAMUEL
2004 *Bases para la competitividad. Cómo re-educar la mente en contextos emergentes*, Quito: Editorial Abya-Yala.
- HANKE, Lewis
1974 *El prejuicio racial en el Nuevo Mundo. Aristóteles y los indios de Hispanoamérica*. México: SEP/SETENTAS.
- HEIDEGGER, Martín
1978 *¿Qué es filosofía?* Madrid: Narcea S. A. de Ediciones.
- MALDONADO-TORRES, Nelson
2007 Sobre la colonialidad del ser: contribuciones al desarrollo de un concepto. En Santiago Castro-Gómez y Ramón Grosfoguel (Coords.), *El giro decolonial: reflexiones para una diversidad epistémica más allá del capitalismo global*. Bogotá: Siglo del Hombre Editores; Universidad Central, Instituto de Estudios Sociales Contemporáneos, Pontificia Universidad Javeriana, Instituto Pensar.
- MIGNOLO, Walter
2001 *Capitalismo y geopolítica del conocimiento. El eurocentrismo y la filosofía de la liberación en el debate intelectual contemporáneo*, Buenos Aires: Ediciones del Signo.
2006 *Descolonialidad del ser y del saber*. Buenos Aires: Editorial del Signo.
- MIGNOLO, Walter & CARVALLO, Francisco
2014 *Una concepción descolonial del mundo. Conversaciones de Francisco Carvallo con Walter Mignolo*. Buenos Aires: Editorial del Signo.
- MIRÓ QUESADA, Francisco
1981 *Proyecto y realización del filosofar latinoamericano*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica,
- PARUZZO, Daniela Pilar & ENGERT, Valeria
2010 Diferencia colonial: lugar de encuentro. *Revista Borradores, X/XI*. Universidad Nacional de Río Cuarto.



ROIG, Arturo Andrés

2004 *Teoría y crítica del pensamiento latinoamericano*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

ROMERO, José Luis

1967 *Latinoamérica: situaciones e ideologías*. Buenos Aires: Ediciones del Candil.

SALAZAR BONDY, Augusto

1998 *¿Existe una filosofía de nuestra América?* México: Siglo XXI Editores.

SHAKESPEARE, William

1953 *La tempestad*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Sopena.

VATTIMO, Gianni

2009 El final de la filosofía en la edad de la democracia. En Carlos Muñoz Gutiérrez *et al.*, *Ontología del declinar. Diálogos con la hermenéutica nihilista de Gianni Vattimo*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Biblos.

ZEA, Leopoldo

1978 *Filosofía de la Historia Americana*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

76



Document reception date: December 15, 2018

Document review date: February 20, 2019

Document approval date: April 25, 2019

Document approval date: July 15, 2019