

EPILOGUE

WHAT IS LATIN AMERICAN  
PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION?  
LA FENOMENOLOGÍA DEL  
ORIGINARIO<sup>1</sup>

Eduardo Duarte  
Hofstra University

ORIGINALLY PRESENTED  
April 29th, 2014

Philosophical ideas sometimes appear to develop continuously one on top of another, but at other times they disappear to reappear again in the same or different form. They always seem to be 'there,' seemingly waiting to be gathered by a certain type of sustained reflection. However, the reflection does not produce them. Instead, our reflection comes across them being worked on endlessly by social and cultural forces that, like the ocean surf polishing rock and shell, deposit them ashore and draw them back into the depths of reality."<sup>2</sup>

In the summer of 2001 I wrote a review of Mario Saenz's *The Identity of Liberation in Latin American Thought: Latin American Historicism and the Phenomenology of Leopoldo Zea*, and the excerpt from the book that serves as the epigram for this epilogue also served as the epigram for my review.<sup>3</sup> When I wrote my review thirteen years ago my principle point of departure for the review was the 2000 census data that revealed Latinos to be the fastest growing group in the United States. The 2010 census data confirmed that

- 1 → I would like to thank the editors of *Lápiz* (Ana Cecilia Gallindo Diego, Jason Wozniak, and David Backer) for their invitation to write this epilogue.
- 2 → Mario Saenz, *The Identity of Liberation in Latin American Thought: Latin American Historicism and the Phenomenology of Leopoldo Zea*, 2. (Emphasis mine.)
- 3 → Eduardo Duarte, "Review Essay of Mario Sáenz's, *The Identity of Liberation in Latin American Thought: Latin American Historicism and the Phenomenology of Leopoldo Zea*," *Encounter*. Winter, 2001, pp. 51-55.

trend, and also showed that 'Hispanics' were the fastest growing 'home grown' demographic, i.e., folks with Latin American roots were making the most babies in the U.S. The 2014 re-election of Barack Obama left no doubt that Latinos in the U.S. were not simply the fastest growing demographic, but, more importantly, had become a significant political force, a voting bloc with the power to decide a national election. Back in 2000 I conjectured that beyond the obvious contribution to academic philosophy, Saenz's book had a much wider context: the ongoing question concerning the identity of Latin America, now complicated by what I described as "the inevitable latinozation of el norte." I added: "It is not an imaginative leap to suggest that we are witnessing the northward migration of Latin America as a geocultural phenomenon. And like all migratory phenomenon, the extension of Latin America brings along it most fundamental elements, specifically, its perennial struggle to understand itself. In essence, this northward migration is the next big evolutionary moment in Latin America's attempt to define itself."<sup>4</sup>

A decade and a half later, as I write this epilogue that feels very much like a sequel to the 2001 piece, the epigram from Saenz's book has a much more existential import for me; as it indicates the *reappearance* of the question, What is Latin American Philosophy of Education? Powerfully, in a way that has thrown me into an entirely familiar yet under-experienced situation, this question reappears as a sign that points (again) to a path for another possibility for thinking philosophy and education. This question is first and foremost an existential challenge for *ladinos*, especially those of us who have been 'trained' by and practice philosophy within 'Western' and Anglophone institutions of higher education. As an urgent, pressing existential question that borders on a crisis (in the sense of being a turning point), the question is a sign indicating the possibility of an alternative ontology for thinking, and, thereby reveals another genesis for the educational force that is generated by philosophy.<sup>5</sup>

4 → Saenz, *Identity of liberation in Latin American Thought*, 52.

5 → I have written on philosophy's pedagogical force in my paper, Eduardo

—CONTINUES

That is, the question points us back to ourselves, first, and then, through ourselves (people of flesh and bones) back to an 'other' ontological ground that has always been and remains since the moment of the original Taino/Iberian encounter. This is the ground where we locate the provenance of thinking now unfolding within the precinct of Latin American Philosophy of Education (LAPE).

~

“me lo llamo yo [mestizo] a boca llena y me honro con él” [I gladly call myself mestizo and feel honored by it]  
– Inca Garcilaso de la Vaga (b. Cuzco,1539)<sup>6</sup>

I have appropriated the sign 'ladino' to signify my ontic (existential) situation as a 'mestizo' in almost every sense that term can be used. I am particularly intrigued by ladino because of its genealogy, and also because it is an exotic category within the academic corridors where I move.<sup>7</sup> In turn, I deploy it because it simultaneously resembles and disrupts the widely circulated term 'latino.' I was inspired to replace 'latino' with 'ladino' when reading

Duarte "Apathetic Reading: Becoming Primed for Originary Thinking," initially written for and presented at the alternative session "Primers, Introductions, and Other Preparations in Teaching Philosophy of Education," *Philosophy of Education Society annual meeting*, Albuquerque, New Mexico, March 15, 2014. Available via academia.edu.

- 6 → Inca Garcilaso cited in Juan Marichal "The New World from Within: The Inca Garcilaso," in Fredi Chiappelli, ed., *First Images of America*. Volume 1. (Berkeley: University of California, 1976), pp. 57-61.
- 7 → I am using 'exotic' in the manner I deployed it in the aforementioned "Apathetic Reading" paper. When discussing what I call the 'domestication' of primary philosophical terms, I delineate the 'exotic' form of such terms as the sign through which the original force of thinking arrives: "'Exotic,' which means out of the ordinary, or strange, comes from the ancient Greek word *exōtikos*, which roughly translates as 'foreign,' and is built upon the root *exō* 'outside.' The feeling of kinship my students experience seeks to render the 'extra-ordinary' language of philosophy 'ordinary,' and thereby to import and place inside their language game words that in fact have no family resemblance to anything circulating in halls of Hagedorn Hall (Hofstra). This move to domesticate happens when they attempt to place the exotic language of philosophy within the apparently secure gates of contemporary schooling, which no one would mistake for a resort, but you get the point I am making."

Laura E. Matthew's *Memories of Conquest: Becoming Mexicano in Colonial Guatemala* Matthews writes: "Over the course of the three hundred years of living in colonial Guatemala the Mexicanos of Ciudad Vieja acquired *overlapping* and often *counterintuitive identities*. They were both indigenous and foreign, Indians and conquistadors. They were *Ladinos* in the early colonial sense of the Spanish term of being Europeanized Indians, but not in the later, racialized definitions of Ladinos as anyone who did not fall under an idealized European-Indian rubric."<sup>8</sup> The ladino as an ontological site of "overlapping" and "often counter-intuitive identities," and as an 'un-ideal racialized form' is what I'm presuming when I use the term 'ladino.' I'm interested in ladino as a dynamic and unstable signifier that signifies the complex genealogy of the 'mestizo consciousness' (see below reference to Kusch). In this sense, the move from the ontological to the ontic happens via the existential situation of the ladino and can be traced through its genealogy. As for the genealogy, here is a general depiction: "Del latín latīnus ("latino"), ladino es un concepto que puede tener significados muy diferentes.... En América Central, la idea de ladino está vinculada a la población mestiza. El concepto se desarrolló en la época de la colonia para nombrar a quienes hablaban español pero no eran parte de la élite dominante (formada por los europeos y los criollos) ni de las poblaciones indígenas. En Guatemala, los ladinos son reconocidos oficialmente como un grupo étnico que incluye a los mestizos y los descendientes de indígenas que se consideran mestizados desde el aspecto cultural."<sup>9</sup>

~

A short paper by Vincente Medina offers a place from which I can make a pivot towards la *fenomenología del originario*. Medina's paper was published, without any intended irony, in October of 1992 in the *American Philosophical Quarterly* with

8 → Laura E. Matthew's *Memories of Conquest: Becoming Mexicano in Colonial Guatemala* (Chapel Hill: UNC, 2012), 6. (Emphasis mine).

9 → 'Ladino' genealogy retrieved on April 9, 2014 from <http://Definicion.De/Ladino/>

the title “The Possibility of an Indigenous Philosophy: A Latin American Perspective.”<sup>10</sup> From the onset the paper implodes under the impossible weight of the sign ‘indigenous,’ which Medina raises as a generic category that intends to name the possibility of a school of academic philosophy emerging from the universities located south of the US/Mexican border. The move to call any such school ‘indigenous’ eclipses the traditions of indigenous thinking (Aztec, Incan, Mayan, Taino, etc.) and thereby repeats and regenerates the ineptitude of Columbus. I read his inscription of the sign ‘indigenous’ as an expression of the phantom quality of his thinking, and the dearth of flesh and bones in his writing. Indeed, the so-called ‘controversy’ over “the possibility of an indigenous ‘Latin American philosophy,’” is a contrived debate by members of Anglophone academia, which is to say an exemplar of the methodologies that most of us have been trained in and currently practice. Another example of phantom thinking is the work of Susan Nuccetelli, who offers us a concise and valuable resource with her *Latin American Thought*, but also remains detached and disembodied from the actual existing history that has moved such ‘thought’ into existence. In both cases, there is no reduction, no phenomenological turn to the source of the question that is ‘indigenous’ to the ‘Americas,’ no return to the original ground. The work is *poco profundo*. What is required, instead, is a form of embedded historicism described by Linda Alcoff.

As Marcelo Dascal reminds us, the question of the identity of Latin American philosophy (LAP) is a perennial question. I want to concur, and suggest further that it is the *sine quo non* of LAPE, the propelling force of this educational philosophy. This is why the take-off point for Eduardo Mendieta’s essay, when he identifies himself as a ‘novice,’ is in fact the recurring existential point of departure for LAPE: the being of a novice in the sense of being both a beginner and a beginning, an initiate and initiator; this is the ontological and existential situation of the *ladino* thinker. In some ways, like

10 → Vicente Medina, “The Possibility of an Indigenous Philosophy: A Latin American Perspective,” *American Philosophical Quarterly*. 29:4, October 1992, pp. 375-380.

the writers of poetry and literature taking up “the problem of Latin American expression,” (Carpentier cited in Dascal), the truth is that “quite a few philosophers take their main obligation to be the development of a philosophy that is original in that it stems from and reflects upon what is distinctive in Latin American reality.”<sup>11</sup> For me it is precisely this *deseo* (desire) for originality that forces the issue upon us, and it is the very matter of originality that is itself always under debate, which is to say that at its core our taking up of the question always turns on the articulation of what we mean by *indigena/indigenous*. La fenomenología del originario surge de la pregunta original: ¿Dónde Estamos?

Without exaggeration I want to argue that the originary question of Latin American philosophy is the question arising at the origin of the Latin American reality, at the inceptual encounter on the island of Quisqueya between Tainos and Iberians.<sup>12</sup> To borrow a term from Andean/Incan fundamental ontology, the question arises with the formation of the *uma pacha* (original time and place), an ontological ground thrown up as a new range of thinking when the cultural tectonic plates of previously co-existing ‘old worlds’ crashed into

11 → Marcelo Dascal, “Introduction,” *Cultural Relativism and Philosophy: North and Latin American Perspectives*. Edited by Dascal. (New York: E.J. Brill, 1991), p. 5.

12 → Here I am departing from Mendieta’s assertion that “we need to begin by acknowledging that Latin American philosophy of education is older than 500 years, as it has its roots in the pre-Colonial, pre-conquest time.” While I do not disagree that that fundamental sources of LAPE are located in indigenous philosophies, my claim is that these worldviews were *uprooted* from their ‘pre-Columbian’ ground with the formation of ‘Latin America.’ Consequently LAPE originates [is thrown up from] that ground-breaking collision. I wholeheartedly concur with Mendieta that the work of Miguel León-Portilla is indispensable; especially for my project’s *neologismatica*, which relies on gathering the remnants of indigenous philosophy that remain after the collision.

13 → As I was writing this piece and drawing inspiration from Andean/Incan fundamental ontology, specifically from their phenomenology of *enqa* or *sami* (the animating essence permeating all things) as being disclosed originally in the natural world, specifically in the mountains, I could not resist thinking in geological terms. The conceptual *mezcla* I make between the two allows me to describe the originary ground of *ladino* ontology as a mountain range created by something akin in human history to plate tectonics: a convergent plate boundary formed by cultural tectonic plates crashing into one another. This geological event is also called a collision zone, which is the term I am borrowing.

one another. At the summits formed by this cultural collision zone appears the unresolvable, perennial existential question of the ones thrown into existence from that eruption.<sup>13</sup> The question of the indigena (indigenous philosophy) is thus the question of the *nativo*, the one who is born at that inceptual encounter, and who remains moving there in the heights of this convergent boundary, but also concealed in its caves (*pacarinas*), and drinking from its highland springs (*puqyos*).<sup>14</sup> What we discover through the reduction I am proposing is a phenomenology of originary thinking arising from the originating *huacaslogical* question: ¿Dónde Estamos? (Where are we?). [*'Huacaslogical'* is a neologism that combines the Incan word *huacas* (sacred place) with the Greek word *logos* (philosophical account, wisdom)]<sup>15</sup>

The originary *huacaslogical* question propels the question of education as the epic history of the ongoing formation of the 'indigenous' *native*; a history that has given rise to the particular existential situations that we confront with LAP. We make LAPE in order to understand how we have been formed by this originating location. LAPE is a genealogy of the *ladino* happening by way of the *fenomenología del originario*; one that arises from and is put into motion by a specific originary time and place: *uma pacha*.

What I'd like to suggest is that the question concerning Latin American Philosophy of Education turns on what, for a lack of a better word, we should call 'methodology.' And, for the sake of discussion, let this word include all the possible available avenues for undertaking Mendieta's novitiate research agenda, which is another way of indicating the modality of originary thinking as de

14 → John E. Staller and Brian Stross, *Lightning in the Andes and Mesoamerica*. (Oxford: Oxford U, 2013), 22-23.

15 → 'Huacaslogical' is a neologism I have constructed for this project. The category combines the Incan word *huacas* (sacred place) with the Greek word *logos* (philosophical account, wisdom). I want to acknowledge and thank my colleague Tyson Lewis for a lively discussion that helped me find a way to phrase the cartographical turn I am making. When I offered him an overview of this project, emphasizing how it is making a sharp departure from Heidegger's project, Tyson recognized that the shift is one from Heidegger's and existential question of Being, i.e., Who are we?, to my project's question: Where are we?



novo, or from the new (*novus*). *La fenomenología del originario* approaches the question via a hybrid of existentialism and phenomenology because the LAPE question is ultimately part of the process of disambiguation concerning the so-called ‘identity’ of the ‘Latin American philosopher,’ which is itself a historical process embedded in and part of the larger iteration of what Walter Mignolo has called “the idea of Latin America”,<sup>16</sup> which is itself a process embedded in and part of the larger iteration of whatever we want to call the cultural history that begins with the Taino/Iberian encounter on Quisqueya in 1492 CE.<sup>17</sup>

The LAPE question turns on the matter of method because ‘method’ is always a translation and expression of the way the LAP question – any philosophical question for that matter – is received. For example, in the case of Medina, the question heard as the possibility of “an indigenous ‘Latin American philosophy’...is part of a broader and perennial controversy between *universalism*, on the one hand, and historicism on the other.”<sup>18</sup> In this sense there is nothing truly

16 → Walter Mignolo, *The Idea of Latin America*. (Oxford: Blackwell, 2005).

17 → A full articulation of this originary moment is not within the scope of this epilogue, which is more of a prolegomenon for the project I am undertaking. What I can say here is that I am not ignoring or being ignorant regarding the itineraries recorded by Columbus, and that my identification of Quisqueya as the principal point of collision is based on his own reckoning with the island that he named ‘Hispaniola.’ In turn, while the first ‘encounter’ occurred on the island of Guanahani (San Salvador) the collision zone of the *uma pacha* that gives rise to the question ‘¿Dónde Estamos?’ is identified on the island that Columbus was convinced was the “fabulous island” of Cipangu, chronicled by Marco Polo, and thought to be 1500 nautical miles east of the coast of China. Here I am following Beatriz Pastor Bodmer’s framing of Columbus’ first journey, and the emphasis she places on Columbus’ decision to move on from one island to another until “on January 4, 1493, after exploring Hispaniola for two weeks, Columbus decides he is right in thinking that the island is Cipangu...He thinks he hears the [Tainos] refer to Cibao, a region in the interior of Hispaniola, and although the names are quite different there is no question in his mind that Cibao is the same as Cipangu and that the Indians simply do not know how to pronounce the name of their own island.”(pp. 24-25) Bodmer, *The Armature of Conquest*. Translated by Linda Longstreth Hunt. (Stanford: Stanford University, 1992) The key here is the persistence of Columbus’ error, which produces the collision with the Taino ‘Cibao’ (a name for a specific region in the Dominican Republic that persists to this day). It is at this moment that we locate the beginning of the cartographical narrative of place that puts into motion the existential question of Latin American philosophy of education. That question, the originary question ¿Dónde —CONTINUES

'indigenous' (*indigena*) about the question; the question is not heard as *nativo* (native) to the particular history beginning with the original Taino/Iberian encounter, nor as *nacido* (born) from that encounter. On the contrary, the LAP question is reduced to an 'other' history, the one that has produced the so-called 'perennial P (philosophy) question.' With this 'other' history we are thrown all the way back to Parmenides, and onto the two principal paths he identified: being, becoming.<sup>19</sup> Susan Nuccetelli<sup>20</sup> more or less takes the same approach when making the distinction between "philosophy in Latin America versus Latin American philosophy," although she does not reduce the historicist side of the distinction to 'liberationists,' 'free-spirited philosophers,' or 'non-serious philosophers,' in the manner of Medina. Rather, she makes a claim I would embrace: philosophy is made up of a history of a plurality of sometimes incommensurable yet fundamental existential questions, which has given rise to a plurality of sometimes incommensurable ways of responding to these fundamental questions. But what neither Nuccetelli nor Medina recognizes is that the manner in which they are taking up the LAP question is both a translation and an expression of how

Estamos?, is taken up by a philosophy that has a kindred spirit in the situation of Plato's fictive xenos who dares to 'overturn' the logic of father Parmenides by thinking the being of non-being. Indeed, the philosophical 'logic' put to work with LAPE is one that can think the being of the non-being that is the Latin American existential situation, the fiction of our lives as neither 'Taino' (indigenous) nor 'Iberian' (colonist). In sum this philosophical project, which takes up the ongoing formation of the ladino, is written by an inherited cartographical imaginary. nb: I want to acknowledge the further clarification of this point happened during the intense discussion that occurred at my presentation of this paper to LAPES on April 29, 2014 at the Center for the Study of Race and Ethnicity, Columbia University.

18 → Medina, *Possibility of Indigenous Philosophy*, 375.

19 → nb: Medina, following Ernest Sosa, traces this history back to the fuzzy named "Platonic tradition." Let me clarify that in contrast to Medina's Sosasian genealogy that has exclusive roots in the history of so-called 'western philosophy,' my own project originates in the collision of the two 'old worlds,' and the subsequent demand for making neologisms that express that event. Thus, the project of la fenomenología del originario is one of responding to the question ¿Dónde Estamos? by making an original philosophical lexicon that synthesizes the remnants and ruins of the broken hegemonies.

20 → Susan Nuccetelli, *Latin American Thought: Philosophical Problems and Arguments*. (Boulder: Westview, 2002)

they are receiving/hearing the question. Both offer a methodology, or form, of LAP without recognizing their work as making such an offering. Hence the phantom, disembodied quality of their thinking and writing. And in both cases what we get when we read their work is a shallow form of LAP that does not in any way sound or feel distinct from AAP (American Analytic Philosophy), or ACP (American Continental Philosophy), which is to say, does not sound or feel as if it is an expression of the struggle of thinking aka dealing with the residual existential perplexity that marks the disambiguation of cultural reality of the 'Americas' since October, 1492.

If methodology represents the translation or expression of the manner in which the LAP question is heard, then each response to this question must be assessed against the originary disambiguation unfolding within the original collision zone. Each project can be understood as marking and then describing that location, and from there we can understand how the originary history is being worked out through specific philosophical projects and the philosophers undertaking them. For example, the groundbreaking work of Rodolfo Kusch and its articulation of "mestizo consciousness," which, as Walter Mignolo describes, emerges "from a body that experiences *existential Americana*." The *body* (carne y huesos) of Kusch's work emerges from the ground of what he names América Profundo, or along the peaks of what I am calling the cultural collision zone: "the existence of a European history as transplanted since its conquest and colonization into the history of América Profundo, a double history at once. On the one hand, Indian memories throughout the Americas needed to be reinscribed in conflictive dialogue and tension with the presence of people of European descent..."<sup>21</sup> What is crucial here is the recognition through a register of cartographical cultural assessment that the disambiguation of the original encounter is working itself out through a specific logic: the ongoing repetition of the originating collision. In turn, the production of LAPE is both propelled by and offers an account of the dynamic logic

21 → Walter Mignolo, "Introduction," to Rodolfo Kusch *Indigenous and Popular Thinking in América*. Translated by María Lugones and Joshua M. Price. (Durham: Duke University, 2010), p. xiv.

of an anarchic existential situation arising in the collision zone: it is an *itinerate iteration* (an ongoing redescription of the *ladino* arising in this unsettled and seismic cultural location).

The question of being *nativo*, that is *nacido* (born) *en América Profundo*, is the fundamental existential question that arrives to us, first, in the form of the question concerning Latin American philosophy (LAP), and, next, as the question concerning Latin America philosophy of education (LAPE). This existential question of origin (the ontic or existentielle question) that forces itself upon us arises with the birth or beginning of the history that begins with the initial Taino/Iberian encounter of 1492. In sum, *la ontología del originario* is disclosed by *la fenomenología del originario*, which propels the ongoing formation (education) of the *ladino*.

The thinking emerging from this collision zone is retrieved by what Sam Rocha is calling “folk phenomenology”, the reversal that takes us into our bodies, into the lived reality of our cultural selves, into the bodies of cultural expression, the artifacts, the artwork, the body of work, the world that we have inherited, and that has called and chosen us to repair and renew it. In turn, our work, specifically, our philosophical work is, as Leopoldo Zea announced it, the product of people “of flesh and bones struggling in their own circumstances.”<sup>22</sup> And this work, or the force of the embodied history that propels it, produces what Rocha has named *educación de carne y hueso*.

As Walter Mignolo has insisted, such thinking is not “alternative, peripheral, subaltern” to the modern Western philosophical subject, but is of “a consciousness-other...constituted by forms of de-colonial consciousness whose horizon is a pluri-versal horizon conceived as transmodernity.”<sup>23</sup> Put otherwise, when we take up the existential question of being *nativo*, *indígena*, we are taken up and put underway on a particular path of learning that forms us as a consciousness-other; and this always happens by way of a return

22 → Leopoldo Zea cited in J.E. Gracia *Latin American Philosophy in the Twentieth Century* (Amherst: Prometheus Books, 1986) p. 219.

23 → Mignolo, *ibid.*

to already existing and specific expressions of this thinking. In turn, the formation is properly an acculturation, a formation that happens via an encounter with the past as a living present that pushes us forward into an intentional future. Of course, because this past is formed by a ground that must be recognized as a site of contradictory and conflicting histories, as Anzaldua<sup>24</sup> mapped it so poignantly, we are prudent to move along it in the manner demonstrated by Maximiliano Valerio López, i.e., with a critical awareness of the crouching discourses of humanism that are lurking in the shadows cast by false idols, monuments of a colonial mythology.

~

The persistence of an originary ontic reality arises from the specific location of the ontology of the original (la ontología originario); that is, arises from the gap that is opened in human history at the moment of cultural collision, and represents the fissure that marks the fault line of the broken hegemonies left in ruins on either side of the disjuncture. This moment of collision is the accident of history producing the ontology of the original as the condition of perplexity and uncertainty, an an-anarchic modality. For example, if we consider the famous epigram for Heidegger's *Being and Time*, which he borrows from Plato's *Sophist* (244a), we realize the force of Heidegger's project arises from the ontology of the original. The epigram reads as follows: "For manifestly you have long been aware of what you mean when you use the expression 'being.' We, however, who used to think we understood it, have now become perplexed." By turning to the figure of the xenos (the stranger), Heidegger's project is initiated by that point of departure that gives rise to all existential questions: a deep perplexity and uncertainty about the meaning of Being. But Heidegger's project, by turning to a phantom figure from one of Plato's dialogues, is an example of what Sam Rocha calls a nostalgia for nostalgia: a longing for a homesickness that is not authentically his own. (By likening himself to the xenos

24 → Gloria Anzaldua, *Borderlands/La Frontera* (San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books, 1987).

who is raising the originary question, Heidegger is borrowing or appropriating the existential situation of the *xenos*.) Contrary to Rocha, I would suggest that the condition of the one taking up the question of Latin American philosophy of education is marked by a feeling of nostalgia proper, and not a nostalgia for nostalgia, which is a borrowed or appropriated sentiment of longing. For those of us taking up the LAPE question, we find ourselves experiencing an undocumented sentiment of regret, a remorse, a grief for the loss of a memory of the 'old worlds.' From this nostalgia arises the force of the originary ontology as the stranger's space, the existential place in-between the broken hegemonies.<sup>25</sup> For me, the challenge of the question, What is Latin American Philosophy of Education?, is first and foremost a challenge of making a discursive cartography, of mapping this collision zone, and, second, of moving onto and into this ground. To name the ontological ground where *ladinos* have been thrown as a 'collision zone' is to recognize the unpredictability of this ground, its seismic activity, and thus to understand it as a dynamic range of originary thinking. This is the *uma pacha* (original time and place) of *ladino* thinking (*la consciencia mestizo*). We are taken up to this range via *una fenomenologia originario*, which also moves and guides us along its peaks and into its caves.

In sum, the LAPE cartography I am announcing is practiced via the following phenomenological reduction: first, to the presence of an originary existentiell ((ontic human reality) persisting in *América Profundo*: *indígena*, *indigeneity* (adj. *originario del país* o lugar del que se trata: *tribus indígenas*); second, through the disclosure/revelation/realization of this originary existentiell an encounter/effacement with the still more originary existentielle, the (ontological) presencing of the pre-subjective/pre-historical *uma pacha*. The reduction reveals the *perpetuidad/perpetuity* of the *indígena/indigeneity*, the continuity of the force of an original time and place. And the reduction indicates the dynamic play between

25 → I am borrowing the category of 'broken hegemonies' from my grad school advisor, the late Reiner Schurmann. See Schurmann's *Broken Hegemonies*. (Bloomington: Indiana University, 2003)

the ontological and ontic, the originario and the indígena, as one of temporality, location and intentionality: a priority of time, place and the voluntary perpetuation of cultural distinctiveness.

~

The question concerning the identity of 'Latin America' has been disclosed to me Ahora! (at this moment) as the question concerning the identity of Latin American Philosophy of Education. Ahora! Saenz's description of the persistent flow of philosophical ideas as appearing, disappearing, and reappearing again in the same or different form represents a clarion call to take up the question concerning Latin American philosophy of education as a call to forge, in the manner of a struggle (pathos), the tools required for making an existential and phenomenological rooted response to the question itself. Put otherwise, I hear the question as demanding the making of an original philosophy that originates from the moment 'we' find ourselves in, the 'moment' where we are found (both located and recollected), the inceptual moment from which we originate, which is the existential moment of el nativo, el origen del ladino arising from the still more original time and place: the uma pacha of the original encounter, the cultural collision zone. ■

