### Decoloniality Affirmative

**Welcome to the Darker Side of Modernity, where shit isnt perfect, where lives are being destroyed, and people are kicked out their barrio. We are the hidden, the ignored, the forgotten, the dead.. From birth we are taught to believe that Modernity is a beautiful place unlike any other that treats everyone as equal. We are here to re-write history. America and Latin America are not real. They are inventions of European man, of Amerigo Vespucci, that fell out the sky and landed on the backs of slaves, and drenched in the blood of the indigenous.** **We are the rotting corpses that European Man walks on in this open field of Coloniality, of genocide, and of slavery. We are the Global South.**

**Mignolo** (Professor of Romance Languages at Duke University) **5**

(Walter, “The Idea of Latin America,” pg 5) //DDI13

How do these two entangled concepts, **modernity and coloniality, work together as two sides of the same reality to shape the idea of “America” in the sixteenth century and of “Latin” America in the nineteenth?** Modernity has been a term in use for the past thirty or forty years. In spite of differences in opinions and deﬁnitions, **there are some basic agreements about its meaning. From the European perspective, modernity refers to a period in world history that has been traced back either to the European Renaissance and the “discovery” of America** (this view is common among scholars from the South of Europe, Italy, Spain, and Portugal), or to the European Enlightenment (this view is held by scholars and intel-lectuals and assumed by the media in Anglo-Saxon countries – England, Germany, and Holland – and one Latin country, France). **On the other side of the colonial difference, scholars and intellectu-als in the ex-Spanish and ex-Portuguese colonies in South America have been advancing the idea that the achievements of modernity go hand in hand with the violence of coloniality**. **The difference, to reiterate, lies in which side of each local history is told**. O’Gorman’s “invention of America” theory was a turning point that put on the table a perspective that was absent and not recognized from the existing European and imperial narratives. Let’s agree that O’Gorman made visible a dimension of history that was occluded by the partial “discovery” narratives, and let’s also agree that it is an example of how things may look from the varied experiences of coloniality. **America, as a concept, goes hand in hand with that of modernity, and both are the self-representation of imperial projects and global designs that originated in and were implemented by European actors and institutions.** **The invention of America was one of the nodal points that contributed to create the conditions for imperial European expansion and a lifestyle, in Europe, that served as a model for the achievements of humanity**. Thus, **the “discovery and conquest of America”** is not just one more event in some long and linear historical chain from the creation of the world to the present, leaving behind all those who were not attentive enough to jump onto the bandwagon of modernity. Rather, it was a key turning point in world history: It **was the moment in which the demands of modernity as the ﬁnal horizon of salvation began to require the imposition of a speciﬁc set of values that relied on the logic of coloniality for their implementation**. **The “invention of America” thesis offers, instead, a perspective from coloniality and, in consequence, reveals that the advances of modernity outside of Europe rely on a colonial matrix of power that includes the renaming of the lands appropriated and of the people inhabiting them**, insofar as the diverse ethnic groups and civilizations in Tawantinsuyu and Anáhuac, as well as those from Africa, were reduced to “Indians” and “Blacks.” **The idea of “America” and of “Latin” America could, of course, be accounted for within the philosophical framework of European modernity,** even if that account is offered by Creoles of European descent dwelling in the colonies and embracing the Spanish or Portuguese view of events. What counts, however, is that the need for telling the part of the story that was not told requires a shift in the geography of reason and of understanding. **“Coloniality,” therefore, points toward and intends to unveil an embedded logic that enforces control, domina-tion, and exploitation disguised in the language of salvation, progress, modernization, and being good for every one.** The double register of modernity/coloniality has, perhaps, never been as clear as it has been recently under the administration of US president George W. Bush. Pedagogically, **it is important for my argument to conceptualize “modernity/coloniality” as two sides of the same coin and not as two separate frames of mind: you cannot be modern without being** colonial; **and if you are on the colonial side of the spectrum you have to transact with modernity – you cannot ignore it**. **The very idea of America cannot be separated from coloniality**: the entire continent emerged as such in the European consciousness as a massive extent of land to be appropriated and of people to be converted to Christianity, and whose labor could be exploited. Coloniality, as a term, is much less frequently heard than “moder-nity” and many people tend to confuse it with “colonialism.” The two words are related, of course. While “colonialism” refers to spe-ciﬁc historical periods and places of imperial domination (e.g., Spanish, Dutch, British, the US since the beginning of the twentieth century), “**coloniality” refers to the logical structure of colonial domination underlying the Spanish, Dutch, British, and US control of the Atlantic economy and politics, and from there the control and management of almost the entire plane**t**. In each of the particu-lar imperial periods of colonialism** – whether led by Spain (mainly in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries) or by England (from the nineteenth century to World War II) or by the US (from the early twentieth century until now) – **the same logic was maintained; only power changed hands**.

**We have come to accept the normalization of coloniality and accept its racialized model of humanity in which the European subject controls all. This is the epistemology of ignorance that governs our lives. We must delink ourselves from Modern rational thinking as a form of epistemic disobedience in which we can gain various set of decolonial optins.**

**Mignolo** (Professor of Literature in Duke University, Joint Appointments in Cultural Anthropology and Romance Studies) **2009**

Walter, “Epistemic Disobedience, Independent Thought and Decolonial Freedom,” Theory, Culture, & Society, 161-163, NDW //DDI13

**ONCE UPON a time scholars assumed** that **the knowing subject in the disciplines is transparent, disincorporated from the known** **and untouched by the geo-political configuration of the world in which people are racially ranked and regions are racially configured**. From a detached and neutral point of observation (that Colombian philosopher Santiago Castro-Gómez (2007) describes as the hubris of the zero point), **the knowing subject maps the world and its problems, classifies people and projects into what is good for them**. Today **that assumption is no longer tenable**, although there are still many believers. **At stake is indeed the question of racism and epistemology** (Chukwudi Eze, 1997; Mignolo, forthcoming). And once upon a time scholars assumed that if you ‘come’ from Latin America you have to ‘talk about’ Latin America; that in such a case you have to be a token of your culture. Such expectation will not arise if the author ‘comes’ from Germany, France, England or the US. In such cases it is not assumed that you have to be talking about your culture but can function as a theoretically minded person. As we know: the first world has knowledge, the third world has culture; Native Americans have wisdom, Anglo Americans have science. **The need for political and epistemic delinking here comes to the fore, as well as decolonializing and decolonial knowledges, necessary steps for imagining and building democratic, just, and non-imperial/colonial societies. Geo-politics of knowledge goes hand in hand with geo-politics of knowing**. **Who and when, why and where is knowledge generated** (rather than produced, like cars or cell phones**)? Asking these questions means to shift the attention from the enunciated to the enunciation**. And by so doing, turning Descartes’s dictum inside out: rather than assuming that thinking comes before being, one assumes instead that it is **a racially marked body in a geo-historical marked space that feels the urge** or get the call **to speak**, to articulate, in whatever semiotic system, the urge that makes of living organisms ‘human’ beings. By setting the scenario in terms of geo- and body-politics I am starting and departing from already familiar notions of ‘situated knowledges’. Sure, all knowledges are situated and every knowledge is constructed. But that is just the beginning. The question is: **who, when, why is constructing knowledges** (Mignolo, 1999, 2005 [1995])? **Why did eurocentered epistemology conceal its own geo-historical and bio-graphical locations and succeed in creating the idea of universal knowledge as if the knowing subjects were also universal?** This illusion is pervasive today in the social sciences, the humanities, the natural sciences and the professional schools. **Epistemic disobedience means to delink from the illusion of the zero point epistemology**. The shift I am indicating is the anchor (constructed of course, located of course, not just anchored by nature or by God) of the argument that follows. It is the beginning of any epistemic decolonial de-linking with all its historical, political and ethical consequences. Why? Because **geo-historical and bio-graphic loci of enunciation have been located by and through the making and transformation of the colonial matrix of power: a racial system of social classification that invented Occidentalism** (e.g. Indias Occidentales), **that created the conditions for Orientalism; distinguished the South of Europe from its center** (Hegel) **and**, on that long history, **remapped the world as first, second and third during the Cold War. Places of nonthought** (**of** myth, **non-western** religions, folklore, underdevelopment involving **regions and people**) **today have been waking up from the long process of westernization**. The anthropos inhabiting non-European places discovered that s/he had been invented, as anthropos, by a locus of enunciations self-defined as humanitas. Now, there are currently two kinds or directions advanced by the former anthropos who are no longer claiming recognition by or inclusion in the humanitas, but engaging in epistemic disobedience and de-linking from the magic of the Western idea of modernity, ideals of humanity and promises of economic growth and financial prosperity (Wall Street dixit). One direction unfolds within the globalization of a type of economy that in both liberal and Marxist vocabulary is defined as ‘capitalism’. One of the strongest advocates of this is the Singaporean scholar, intellectual and politician Kishore Mahbubani, to which I will return later. One of his earlier book titles carries the unmistakable and irreverent message: Can Asians Think?: Understanding the Divide between East and West (2001). Following Mahbubani’s own terminology, this direction could be identified as de-westernization. Dewesternization means, within a capitalist economy, that the rules of the game and the shots are no longer called by Western players and institutions. The seventh Doha round is a signal example of de-westernizing options. The second direction is being advanced by what I describe as the decolonial option. **The decolonial option is the singular connector of a diversity of decolonials**. The **decolonial paths have one thing in common: the colonial wound**, **the fact that regions and people around the world have been classified as underdeveloped economically and mentally**. Racism not only affects people but also regions or, better yet, the conjunction of natural resources needed by humanitas in places inhabited by anthropos. **De - colonial options have** one aspect in common with de-westernizing arguments: the **definitive rejection of ‘being told’ from the epistemic privileges of the zero point what ‘we’ are, what our ranking is in relation to the ideal of humanitas and what we have to do to be recognized as such.** However, decolonial and de-westernizing options diverge in one crucial and in - disputable point: while the latter do not question the ‘civilization of death’ hidden under the rhetoric of modernization and prosperity, of the improvement of modern institutions (e.g. liberal democracy and an economy propelled by the principle of growth and prosperity),decolonial options start from the principle that the regeneration of life shall prevail over primacy of the production and reproduction of goods at the cost of life (life in general and of humanitas and anthropos alike!). I illustrate this direction, below, commenting on Partha Chatterjee’s re-orienting ‘eurocentered modernity’ toward the future in which ‘our modernity’ (in India, in Central Asia and the Caucasus, in South America, briefly, in all regions of the world upon which eurocentered modernity was either imposed or ‘adopted’ by local actors assimilating to local histories inventing and enacting global designs) becomes the statement of interconnected dispersal in which decolonial futures are being played out. Last but not least, my argument doesn’t claim originality (‘originality’ is one of the basic expectations of modern control of subjectivity) but aims to make a contribution to growing processes of decoloniality around the world. My humble claim is that **geo- and body-politics of knowledge has been hidden from the self-serving interests of Western epistemology** and that **a task of decolonial thinking is the unveiling of epistemic silences of Western epistemology and affirming the epistemic rights of the racially devalued, and decolonial options to allow the silences to build arguments to confront those who take ‘originality’ as the ultimate criterion for the final judgment**.

**Acts of epistemic disobedience wherein we disengage from the normative forms of domination imposed by western discourse is key to the scraping off what western modernity has gilded, uncovering the DARKER side of modernity de-linking is a epistemological necessity and ends with the death of the European man not his assistance**

**Mignolo** (Professor of Literature in Duke University, Joint Appointments in Cultural Anthropology and Romance Studies) **2012**

Walter, “Epistemic Disobedience and the Decolonial Option: A Manifesto,” Transmodernity: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World, 45-46, NDW //DDI13

But the basic formulation of decolonial delinking (e.g., desprendimiento) was advanced by Aníbal Quijano in his ground-breaking article “Colonialidad y modernidad/racionalidad” (1991) [Coloniality and modernity/rationality]. The argument was that, on the one hand, **an analytic of the limits of Eurocentrism** (as a hegemonic structure of knowledge and beliefs) **is needed**. But that analytic was considered necessary rather than sufficient**. It was necessary**, Quijano asserted, “desprenderse de las vinculaciones de la racionalidad-modernidad con la colonialidad, en primer término, y en definitiva con todo poder no constituido en la decisión libre de gentes libres” [“**It is** **necessary to extricate oneself from the linkages between rationality/modernity and coloniality**, first of all, **and** definitely **from all power which is not constituted by free decisions made by free people**”].4 “Desprenderse” means epistemic de-linking or, in other words, epistemic disobedience. **Epistemic disobedience leads us to decolonial options as a set of projects that have in common the effects experienced by all the inhabitants of the globe that were at the receiving end of global designs to colonize the economy** (appropriation of land and natural resources), **authority** (management by the Monarch, the State, or the Church), **and police and military enforcement** (coloniality of power), **to colonize knowledges** (languages, categories of thoughts, belief systems, etc.) **and beings** (subjectivity). “**Delinking” is** then **necessary because there is no way out of the coloniality of power from within Western** (Greek and Latin) categories of **thought**. Consequently, **de-linking implies epistemic disobedience** rather than the constant search for “newness” (e.g., as if Michel Foucault’s concept of racism and power were “better” or more “appropriate” because they are “newer”—that is, post-modern—within the chronological history or archaeology of European ideas). **Epistemic disobedience takes us to a** different place, to a **different “beginning**” (not in Greece, but in the responses to the “conquest and colonization” of America and the massive trade of enslaved Africans), **to spatial sites of struggles and building** rather than to a new temporality **within the same space** (from Greece, to Rome, to Paris, to London, to Washington DC). I will explore the opening up of these spaces—the spatial paradigmatic breaks of epistemic disobedience—in Waman Puma de Ayala and Ottabah Cugoano. The basic argument (almost a syllogism) that I will develop here is the following**: if coloniality is constitutive of modernity** since the salvationist rhetoric of modernity presupposes the oppressive and condemnatory logic of coloniality (from there come the damnés of Fanon), **then this oppressive logic produces an energy of discontent, of distrust, of release within those who react against imperial violence.** **This energy is translated into decolonial projects** that, as a last resort, are also constitutive of modernity. **Modernity is a three-headed hydra**, **even though it only reveals one head:** **the** **rhetoric of** **salvation and progress**. **Coloniality**, **one of whose facets is poverty** and the propagation of AIDS in Africa, **does not appear in the rhetoric of modernity** **as its necessary counterpart, but rather as something that emanates from it.** **For example**, **the Millennium Plan** of the United Nations headed by Kofi Anan, **and the Earth Institute** at Columbia University headed by Jeffrey Sachs, **work in collaboration to end poverty** (as the title of Sach’s book announces).5 But, while **they question the unfortunate consequences of modernity**, **never for a moment is the ideology of modernity or the black pits that hide its rhetoric ever questioned**: the consequences of the very nature of the capitalist economy—by which such ideology is supported—in its various facets since the mercantilism of the sixteenth century, free trade of the following centuries, the Industrial Revolution of the nineteenth century, and the technological revolution of the twentieth century. On the other hand, despite all the debate in the media about the war against terrorism, on one side, and all types of uprisings, of protests and social movements, **it is** never suggested that **the logic of** **coloniality** that **hides beneath the rhetoric of modernity necessarily generates the irreducible energy of humiliated, vilified, forgotten, or marginalized human beings.** **Decoloniality is** therefore **the energy that does not allow the operation of the logic of coloniality** **nor believes the fairy tales of the rhetoric of modernity**. Therefore, **decoloniality has a varied range of manifestations**—some undesirable, such as those that Washington today describes as “terrorists”—**and decolonial thinking is,** then, **thinking that de-links and opens** (de-linking and opening in the title come from here) **to the possibilities hidden** (colonized and discredited, such as the traditional, barbarian, primitive, mystic, etc.) **by the modern rationality** that is mounted and **enclosed by categories of** Greek, Latin, and the six modern **imperial European languages.**

Coloniality generates a permanent state of exception that is the root cause of the death ethics of war and underwrites a hellish existence where death, murder, war, rape, and racism are ordinary. In short, the Global South is open to rapeability and kilability

Nelson Maldonado-Torres, associate professor of comparative literature at Rutgers, ‘8 [Against War: Views from the Underside of Modernity, p. 217-21] //DDI13

Dussel, Quijano, and Wynter lead us to the understanding that what happened in the Americas was a transformation and naturalization of the non-ethics of war—which represented a sort of exception to the ethics that regulate normal conduct in Christian countries—into a more stable and long-standing reality of damnation, and that this epistemic and material shift occurred in the colony. Damnation, life in hell, is colonialism: a reality characterized by the naturalization of war by means of the naturalization of slavery, now justified in relation to the very constitution of people and no longer solely or principally to their faith or belief. That human beings become slaves when they are vanquished in a war translates in the Americas into the suspicion that the conq uered people, and then non-European peoples in general, are constitutively inferior and that therefore they should assume a position of slavery and serfdom. Later on, this idea would be solidified with respect to the slavery of African peoples, achieving stability up to the present with the tragic reality of different forms of racism. Through this process, what looked like a "state of exception" in the colonies became the rule in the modern world. However, deviating from Giorgio Agarnben's diagnosis, one must say that the colony--long before the concentration camp and the Nazi politics of extermination--served as the testing ground for the limits and possibilities of modernity, thereby revealing its darkest secrets." It is race, the coloniality of power, and its concomitant Eurocentrism (and not only national socialisms or forms of fascism) that allow the "state of exception" to continue to define ordinary relations in this, our so-called postmodern world. Race emerges within a permanent state of exception where forms of behavior that are legitimate in war become a natural part of the ordinary way of life. In that world, an otherwise extraordinary affair becomes the norm and living in it requires extraordinary effort." In the racial/ colonial world, the "hell" of war becomes a condition that defines the reality of racialized selves, which Fanon referred to as the damnes de la terre (condemned of the earth). The damne (condemned) is a subject who exists in a permanent "hell," and as such, this figure serves as the main referent or liminal other that guarantees the continued affirmation of modernity as a paradigm of war. The hell of the condemned is not defined by the alienation of colonized productive forces, but rather signals the dispensability of racialized subjects, that is, the idea that the world would be fundamentally better without them. The racialized subject is ultimately a dispensable source of value, and exploitation is conceived in this context as due torture, and not solely as the extraction of surplus value. Moreover, it is this very same conception that gives rise to the particular erotic dynamics that characterize the relation between the master and its slaves or racialized workers. The condemned, in short, inhabit a context in which the confrontation with death and murder is ordinary. Their "hell" is not simply "other people," as Sartre would have put it-at least at one point - but rather racist perceptions that are responsible for the suspension of ethical behavior toward peoples at the bottom of the color line. Through racial conceptions that became central to the modern self, modernity and coloniality produced a permanent state of war that racialized and colonized subjects cannot evade or escape. The modern function of race and the coloniality of power, I am suggesting here, can be understood as a radicalization and naturalization of the non-ethics of war in colonialism." This non-ethics included the practices of eliminating and enslaving certain subjects-for example, indigenous and black-as part of the enterprise of colonization. From here one could as well refer to them as the death ethics of war. War, however, is not only about killing or enslaving; it also includes a particular treatment of sexuality and femininity: rape. Coloniality is an order of things that places people of color within the murderous and rapist view of a vigilant ego, and the primary targets of this rape are women. But men of color are also seen through these lenses and feminized, to become fundamentally penetrable subjects for the ego conquiro. Racial- ization functions through gender and sex, and the ego conquiro is thereby constitutively a phallic ego as well." Dussel. who presents this thesis of the phallic character of the ego cogito, also makes links, albeit indirectly, with the reality of war. And thus, in the beginning of modernity, before Descartes discovered ... a terrifying anthropological dualism in Europe, the Spanish conquistadors arrived in America. The phallic conception of the European-medieval world is now added to the forms of submission of the vanquished Indians. "Males," Bartolome de las Casas writes, are reduced through "the hardest, most horrible, and harshest serfdom"; but this only occurs with those who have remained alive, because many of them have died; however, "in war typically they only leave alive young men (mozos) and women.""5 The indigenous people who survive the massacre or are left alive have to contend with a world that considers them to be dispensable. And since their bodies have been conceived of as inherently inferior or violent, they must be constantly subdued or civilized, which requires renewed acts of conquest and colonization. The survivors continue to live in a world defined by war, and this situation is peculiar in the case of women. AsT. Denean Sharpley-Whiting and Renee T, White put it in the preface to their anthology Spoils oJ War: Women oJ Color, Cultures, and Revolutions: A sexist and/or racist patriarchal culture and order posts and attempts to maintain, through violent acts of force if necessary, the subjugation and inferiority of women of color. As Joy James notes, "its explicit, general premise constructs a conceptual framework of male [and/or white] as normative in order to enforce a politicaljracial, economic, cultural. sexual] and intellectual mandate of male [and/or white] as superior." The warfront has always been a "feminized" and "colored" space for women of color. Their experiences and perceptions of war, conA ict, resistance, and struggle emerge from their specific racial-ethnic and gendered locations ... Inter arma silent leges: in time of war the law is silent," Walzer notes. Thus, this volume operates from the premise that war has been and is presently in our midst.” The links between war, conquest, and the exploitation of women's bodies are hardly accidental. In his study of war and gender, Joshua Goldstein argues that conquest usually proceeds through an extension of the rape and exploitation of women in wartime." He argues that to understand conquest, one needs to examine: I) male sexuality as a cause of aggression; 2) the feminization of enemies as symbolic domination; and 3) dependence on the exploitation of women's labor-including reproduction." My argument is, first, that these three elements came together in a powerful way in the idea of race that began to emerge in the conquest and colonization of the Americas. My second point is that through the idea of race, these elements exceed the activity of conquest and come to define what from that point on passes as the idea of a "normal" world. As a result, the phenomenology of a racial context resembles, if it is not fundamentally identical to, the phenomenology of war and conquest. Racism posits its targets as racialized and sexualized subjects that, once vanquished, are said to be inherently servile and whose bodies come to form part of an economy of sexual abuse, exploitation, and control. The coloniality of power cannot be fully understood without reference to the transformation and naturalization of war and conquest in modern times.

Hellish existence in the colonial world carries with it both the racial and the gendered aspects of the naturalization of the non-ethics of war. "Killability" and "rapeability" are inscribed into the images of colonial bodies and deeply mark their ordinary existence. Lacking real authority, colonized men are permanently feminized and simultaneously represent a constant threat for whom any amount of authority, any visible trace of the phallus is multiplied in a symbolic hysteria that knows no lirnits.?" Mythical depiction of the black man's penis is a case in point: the black man is depicted as an aggressive sexual beast who desires to rape women, particularly white women. The black woman, in turn, is seen as always already sexually available to the rapist gaze of the white, and as fundamentally promiscuous. In short, the black woman is seen as a highly erotic being whose primary function is fulfilling sexual desire and reproduction. To be sure, any amount of "penis" in either one represents a threat, but in his most familiar and typical forms the black man represents the act of rape- "raping" -while the black woman is seen as the most legitimate victim of rape- "being raped." In an antiblack world black women appear as subjects who deserve to be raped and to suffer the consequences-in terms of a lack of protection from the legal system, sexual abuse, and lack of financial assistance to sustain themselves and their families-just as black men deserve to be penalized for raping, even without having committed the act. Both "raping" and "being raped" are attached to blackness as if they form part of the essence of black folk, who are seen as a dispensable population. Black bodies are seen as excessively violent and erotic, as well as being the legitimate recipients of excessive violence, erotic and otherwise." "Killability" and "rapeability" are part of their essence, understood in a phenomenological way. The "essence" of blackness in a colonial anti-black world is part of a larger context of meaning in which the death ethics of war gradually becomes a constitutive part of an allegedly normal world. In its modern racial and colonial connotations and uses, blackness is the invention and the projection of a social body oriented by the death ethics of war." This murderous and raping social body projects the features that define it onto sub-Others in order to be able to legitimate the same behavior that is allegedly descriptive of them. The same ideas that inspire perverted acts in war--particularly slavery, murder, and rape--are legitimized in modernity through the idea of race and gradually come to be seen as more or less normal thanks to the alleged obviousness and non-problematic character of black slavery and anti-black racism. To be sure, those who suffer the consequences of such a system are primarily blacks and indigenous peoples, but it also deeply affects all of those who appear as colored or close to darkness. In short, this system of symbolic representations, the material conditions that in part produce and continue to legitimate it, and the existential dynamics that occur therein (which are also at the same time derivative and constitutive of such a context) are part of a process that naturalizes the non-ethics or death ethics of war. Sub-ontological difference is the result of such naturalization and is legitimized through the idea of race. In such a world, ontology collapses into a Manicheanism, as Fanon suggested."

**And, there is no possibility for salvation –the notion of an Captain America is not benefitial for the global south because the state has no ethical legitimacy even leftist Americanism and Eurocentrism is bad—offers a false, venomous gift that holds humanity back—only the decolonial attitude shatters imperial identity—we must engage in radical suspension of privilege and enact an ethics of risk and generosity**

**Maldonado-Torres ‘5** (Nelson, associate professor of comparative literature at Rutgers “Decolonization and the New Identitarian Logics after September 11,” *Radical Philosophy Review* 8, n. 1 (2005): 35-67) //DDI13

Both Fanon and Anzaldúa, colonized subjects of the French and “*estadounidense*" empires, help define decolonization as a project and further strengthen what Chela Sandoval has referred to as the "methodology of the oppressed."73 This meth­ odology has decolonization or decoloniality as its expressed goal and orientation. **Decoloniality is based on the introduction of a "decolonial attitude" that takes us beyond the Eurocentric and "'estadounidense" myths that put limits to the elaboration of theory**. The "decolonial attitude" **stands behind the efforts to elaborate new philosophies, critical theories, and forms of science that break away from the Euro­ centric attitude and its avatars in the United States, Latin America, and elsewhere**.74 The **decolonial attitude is the cornerstone of the unfinished project of decolonization and the main inspiration for the construction of a transmodern world**.71 In light of the work of Anzaldua and Fanon, **decolonization can be understood as the attempt to reintroduce a certain logic of the gift that takes us beyond the horizons of Eurocentrism and Americanism**.76 The **"decolonial attitude" has a generous and receptive subject as its basis. I mentioned before that imperialism also enacts a certain logic of the gift. But the gift of the master works like a venom that shatters a number of possibilities for the colonized to become a mature human being. The master is also a privileged giver: he gives and takes but never receives**.77 **Both Americanism and Eurocentrism, leftist or not, work according to this logic**.7H That is why it is necessary to find some impenetrable core in culture, or some unique radical element that can penetrate other cultures but which can't be penetrated. **Like the impe­ rial gift, the decolonial gift is a venom too, but in this case what it kills or attempts to kill is imperial identity itself**. The decolonial gift is a gift of death.79 Decolonial gifts (like those of Anzaldua and Fanon) seek to undermine projects that rest on the usurpation of goods and their redeployment in perverse imperial logics of concentra­ tion of power/capital/property and the monopolization of gifts. Imperial subjectivity affords certain kind of privileges to subjects who fit the racial profile of non-black­ ness and non-darkness in the modern/colonial world. **The radical suspension of this privilege is what I have in mind when I call for the Death of Imperial Man, both in its European and American expressions. Calling for the Death of European and American Man means to divorce ourselves from the ideas, feelings, and actions that inhibit the generous transaction of gifts. This is a call to engage in a praxis of libera­ tion which is also an ethics of risk and of generous encounter articulated from the position of the *damne*. The *damne*, as a generous and receptive self that emerges from the ashes of colonization, is proposed here as the subject of radical transformations and acts of creation that leads us beyond the horizon of Eurocentrism and Americanism today**.

#### The only option in this debate is to engage in fugitivity in which we recognize certain relations cannot be repaired, and instead be prepared to tear this shit down and build something new.

**Halberstam** (Professor of English and Director of The Center for Feminist Research at University of Southern California) **13** (Jack, “The Wild Beyond: With and for the Undercommons” found in “The Undercommons Fugitive Planning & Black Study by Stefano Harvey & Fred Moten, pg. 5-6) CA

**It ends with love, exchange, fellowship. It ends as it begins, in motion, in between various modes of being and belonging**, and on the way to new economies of giving, taking, being with and for and it ends with a ride in a Buick Skylark on the way to another place altogether. Surprising, perhaps, after we have engaged dispossession, debt, dislocation and violence. But not surprising when you have understood that **the projects of “fugitive planning and black study” are mostly about reaching out to find connection; they are about making common cause with the brokenness of being, a brokenness, I would venture to say, that is also blackness, that remains blackness, and will, despite all, remain broken because this book is not a prescription for repair.**¶ If we do not seek to fix what has been broken, then what? **How do we re- solve to live with brokenness, with being broke, which is also what Moten and Harney call “debt.”** Well, given that debt is sometimes a history of giving, at other times a history of taking, at all times a history of capitalism and given that debt also signifies a promise of ownership but never delivers on that promise, **we have to understand that debt is something that cannot be paid off.** Debt, as Harney puts it, presumes a kind of individualized relation to a naturalized economy that is predicated upon exploitation. Can we have, he asks, another sense of what is owed that does not presume a nexus of activities like recognition and acknowledgement, payment and gratitude. Can debt “become a principle of elaboration”?¶ **Moten links economic debt to the brokenness of being in the interview with Stevphen Shukaitis; he acknowledges that some debts should be paid, and that much is owed especially to black people by white people, and yet, he says: “I also know that what it is that is supposed to be repaired is irreparable. It can’t be repaired. The only thing we can do is tear this shit down completely and build some- thing new.”** The undercommons do not come to pay their debts, to repair what has been broken, to fix what has come undone.¶ **If you want to know what the undercommons wants, what Moten and Harney want, what black people, indigenous peoples, queers and poor people want, what we** (the “we” who cohabit in the space of the undercommons) **want, it is this – we cannot be satisfied with the recognition and acknowledgement generated by the very system that denies a) that anything was ever broken and b) that we deserved to be the broken part; so we refuse to ask for recognition and instead we want to take apart, dismantle, tear down the structure that, right now, limits our ability to find each other, to see beyond it and to access the places that we know lie outside its walls.** **We cannot say what new structures will replace the ones we live with yet, because once we have torn shit down, we will inevitably see more and see differently and feel a new sense of wanting and being and becoming.** What we want after “the break” will be different from what we think we want before the break and both are necessarily different from the desire that issues from being in the break.

**Our study of knowledge has practical historical effects. This is a key site for the opening up of practical space to challenge colonial power**

**Mignolo 2000** [Walter, William H. Wannamaker Professor of Literature and Romance Studies at Duke UniversityLocal Histories/Global Designs, 11-13]

Following the previous configuration of the field of knowledge in Western memory, 1 will use gnoseology as the discourse about gnosis and I will understand by *gnosis* knowledge in general, including doxa and **episteme. Border gnosis as knowledge from a subaltern perspective is knowledge conceived from the exterior borders of the modern/colonial world system, and border gnoseology as a discourse about colonial knowledge is conceived at the conflictive intersection of the knowledge produced from the perspective of modern colonialisms** (rhetoric, philosophy, science) **and knowledge produced from the perspective of colonial** modernities in Asia, Africa, and the Americas/Caribbean. **Border gnoseology is a critical reflection on knowledge production from both the interior borders** of the modern/colonial world system (imperial conflicts, hegemonic languages, directionality of translations, etc**.) and its exterior borders** (imperial conflicts with cultures being colonized, as well as the subsequent stages of independence or decolonization). By interior borders I mean, for instance, the displacement of Spain Irom hegemonic position by England, in the seventeenth century, or the entry of the United States, in the concert of imperial nations in 1898. By exterior borders I mean the borders between Spain and the Islamic world, along with the Inca or Aztec people in the sixteenth century, or those between the British and the Indians in the nineteenth century, or the memories of slavery in the concert of imperial histories. Finally, border gnoseology could be contrasted with territorial gnoseology or epistemology, the philosophy of knowledge, as we know it today (from Descartes, to Kant, to Husserl and all its ramifications in analytic philosophy of languages and philosophy of science): a conception and a reflection on knowledge articulated in concert with the cohesion of national languages and the formation of the nationMale (see chapter 6). "Gnosticism," said Hans Jonas (1958, 32), was the name for numerous doctrines "within and around Christianity during its critical first century." I lie emphasis was on *knowledge (gnosis)* with salvation as the final goal. As lor the kind of knowledge gnostic knowledge is, Jonas observes that the term by itself is a formal term that doesn't specify what is to be known or the subjective aspect of possessing knowledge. **The difference with the gnostic context can be located in the concept of reason. As for what the knowledge is about, the associations of the term most familiar to the classically trained reader point to rational objects, and accordingly to natural reason as the organ for acquiring and possessing knowledge.** In the gnostic context, however, "knowledge" has an emphatically religious or supranatural meaning and refers to objects which we nowadays should call those o( faith rather than of reason. . . . Gnosis meant pre-eminently knowledge of *God,* and from what we have said about the radical transcendence of the deity it follows that "knowledge of God" is the knowledge of something naturally unknowable and therefore itself not a natural condition. . . . On the one hand it is closely bound up with revelationary experience, so that reception of the truth either through sacred and secret lore or through inner illumination replaces rational argument and theory. . . . on the other hand, being concerned with the secrets of salvation, "**knowledge" is not just theoretical information about certain things but is itself**, as a modification of the human condition, **charged with performing a function in the bringing about of salvation. Thus gnostic "knowledge" has an eminently practical object***.* (Jonas 1958, 34) We are obviously no longer at the beginning of the Christian era and *salvation is* not a proper term to define the practicality of knowledge, and neither is its claim to truth. But **we need to open up the space that epistemology took over from gnoseology, and aim it not at God but at the uncertainties of the borders. Our goals are not salvation but decolonization, and transformations of the rigidity of epistemic and territorial frontiers established and controlled by the coloniality of power** in the process of building the modern/ colonial world system.