

MARIÁTEGUI IN RECENT DEBATES

EMANCIPATION, (IN)DEPENDENCE, AND “VESTIGIAL COLONIALISM”¹ IN LATIN AMERICA

EMANCIPATION, LIBERATION, INDEPENDENCE

In the context of recent capitalism and confronted with the processes of globalization and neo-regionalization that have emerged in the last few decades, debates about the meaning and achievements of the concept of emancipation have re-emerged. Current perspectives incorporate new ideological and philosophical positions on the topics of postcolonialism, decolonization, and related questions. In Latin America, reflections on this theme, which were reactivated in response to the bicentennial celebrations of continent-wide independence movements, became intertwined with postcolonial debates. This led to a historiographical review of the region's political and social history, as well as to a re-evaluation of the contributions made by intellectuals and political figures to the understanding of the colonial past. From the perspectives opened up by postcolonial thought, the critique of modernity, Enlightenment thought, and Occidentalism were undertaken as part of a broad theoretical and ideological agenda. The concept of emancipation (and, by extension, the notions of independence and liberation) constitutes a key element in

these reflections, since it is crucial for the understanding of social conflict in the region. However, in this context, the problem of emancipation also goes beyond the evaluation of formal independence movements that took place in the early decades of the nineteenth century. On the one hand, this subject is connected to the study of the origins of coloniality in the so-called “New World” and the conditions that allowed for the establishment of *criollo* hegemony once Peninsular rule yielded to the autonomist processes driven by Latin American elites. On the other hand, the theme of emancipation invites critical reflection on the present situation in Latin America, both on the national and international levels, as well as interrogations about its geopolitical future within the global order.²

According to Ernesto Laclau, the notion of emancipation has been definitively altered by changes that have taken place primarily since the end of the Cold War, a moment that he sees as the end of Enlightenment thought and as one of the events that most clearly marks the collapse of grand theory and the advent of postmodernity. Correlative to the fall of “real socialism” are different forms of political and social fragmentation that affect the modern categories of nation, identity, citizenship, state, subject, governability, such as they were all conceptualized in the Western world during the last few centuries. According to Laclau, we no longer live in “the era of emancipation;” instead, we must now develop plural, post-emancipatory, political bases capable of incorporating the large variety of agendas and subjectivities that make up the contemporary world.

This kind of politics can only exist as open assemblages that are able to integrate multiple political programs and popular demands through which different subjects, in spite of their specificities and particularities, would be able to articulate social actions through the organization of fronts, alliances, coalitions, and so on. From this perspective, the notion of emancipation denies any possibility of totalization and refers instead to modalities of pluralist interpellation according to the dynamics of a new era. Grand narratives of global emancipation are banished, and the possibilities of radical emancipation are diminished. What remains

is the negotiation of the terms in which non-radical emancipation can be effectuated. In this non-radical emancipation, particularisms displace universalisms, and antagonisms can be resolved without the total negation of otherness.

In his theory of emancipation, Laclau opens up a broad philosophical spectrum which he applies primarily to the social processes of the late twentieth century. However, we should expand his concepts and retrospectively examine Latin American independence movements as well as more recent efforts at liberation on the basis of these questions. Likewise, it is also fundamental that we use this perspective to interpret the contributions made by a number of Latin American Marxist thinkers to this line of inquiry by reflecting on the traces of dependence and the challenges presented by “vestigial coloniality” in postcolonial societies.

EMANCIPATION AND COLONIALITY

It should go without saying that the notion of *emancipation* itself should not be restricted to the analysis of political programs or protest movements that developed in or responded to the structural matrix of the nation state. Instead, it should mobilize questions related to models of social knowledge—that is, to the necessity of recovering forms of rationality that do not respond to the cognitive demands of capitalism but rather are connected to *other* sociocultural logics which are submerged, marginalized, or negated by dominant models. From a historical perspective, no reflection on these matters should fail to connect the process of disaggregation of colonial conglomerates and the consequent formation of national states to the recognition of the structures of domination that, having originated in the colonial era, have persevered within modernity and are linked to new forms of hegemony and social marginalization. In effect, the concept of coloniality, developed by Aníbal Quijano via the work of José Carlos Mariátegui, obliges us to rethink the foundations and evaluate the achievements of any emancipatory project in regions

that are to a greater or lesser degree economically, epistemologically, and politically peripheral to the capitalist centers of power.

Coloniality and emancipation thus constitute the conceptual poles around which the notes that follow are articulated. Although they are organized around Mariátegui's work, they point more broadly to problems connected to the role of the intellectual in Latin America and to the themes of Occidentalism and revolutionary thought in regions dependent on capitalist centers.

There is no doubt that the Latin American political landscape has experienced substantial changes since Mariátegui's day, the era when Marxism was introduced to Latin America. In the last twenty years, particularly since the fall of the socialist bloc, Leftist thought has suffered significant setbacks that have led to important theoretical revisions and reinterpretations, as well as to serious self-criticism regarding the conception and implementation of revolutionary praxis. Confronted with the changing scenario of a Latin America impacted by the violence of neoliberalism and globalization, there has been a growing awareness of the weakening of the traditional categories of social analysis and of the strength that collective movements are able to deploy. These movements, which emerged in the void left by traditional political parties, defy all notions of institutional order and socioeconomic hierarchy in modern societies. In these movements, social subjects are organized around various ethnic and economic agendas that are not always easily absorbed by existing institutions. In this context, broad segments of society reclaim forms of participation and identity politics that exceed the state apparatus's capacity to react and which are difficult to manage conceptually, even with the theoretical models that have emerged in the past few decades. This has prompted a number of rereadings of contemporary social theory, including the work of Mariátegui that analyzes the strength and weaknesses of concepts, models, and proposals originating in and intended for other cultural realities. Given these changing conceptual scenarios, the rereading of Mariátegui's work

suggested here attempts to connect aspects of his thought to present debates and thereby give new meaning to his elaborations on political and social questions, taking into account the dynamic of continuities and ruptures that characterize the political history of the Andean region.

In the case of Latin America, the connections between coloniality/eman-
cipation and coloniality/modernity have been analyzed from various
theoretical and ideological perspectives, including dependency theory,
liberation theology, neo-Marxism, and more recently postcolonial theory.
In all of these, Mariátegui's pioneering thought has been recognized
as a forerunner that illuminates not only the processes of oligarchical
and bourgeois domination since the creation of the nation state, but
also the multiple and undeniable continuities that colonialist structures
have had and continue to have in the region. Suspended between the
poles of nationalism and internationalism, the matrices of liberal and
Marxist thought, Andeanism and *mondialisation*, Mariátegui's thought
relativizes the triumphalism of the national project. At the same time, it
also aims to critically examine the political output of theories that have
been applied from very diverse ideological positions to Latin American
realities (Marxism, the ideologies of progress and *mestizaje*, etc.). Widely
known for his heterodoxy, Mariátegui made fundamental contributions
to the understanding of the economic, political, and social history of the
Andean region. At the same time, it also illuminates the real possibilities
for decolonizing the imaginaries through which national, postnational,
and transnational cultures are thought to this day. Actually, when social
movements are able to outperform traditional politics by mobilizing
different sectors around demands that are common to a broad range of
political movements, the subject of emancipation and coloniality returns
to the forefront, reactivating questions about the politics of knowledge in
postcolonial societies, the importance of criticism and tradition in social
change, and the relations between ideological projects, multiculturalism,
and revolutionary thought in the context of globality.

The colonial period, domestic colonialism, coloniality, or vestigial colonialism constitute variants of domination that are articulated through the expansive dynamic of global capitalism, historically reformulating themselves around axes that are still regarded as fully valid today: the transnationalization of capital, the celebration of modernity as a praxis for the redemption of peoples whom Hegel conceptualized as existing outside of history, the supremacy of white *criollos*, authoritarianism, and state centralization. These axes are supported by a cognitive apparatus that responds to the project of reproducing the class and race domination that has plagued the Latin American region since the Conquest. Mariátegui's thought points toward the deconstruction of discourses, values, and knowledges that legitimize this domination, which is to say, toward an emancipated—decolonized—epistemology that allows for the perception of social reality from new vantage points as well as for the production of agendas of radical transformation. Hence, his ideas offer fertile material for a critique of both the Enlightenment and modernity, for a political and philosophical reflection on the achievements and limitations of emancipatory projects, and for the development of utopian horizons oriented toward the liberation of oppressed peoples in peripheral societies. All this emerges from Mariátegui's work through his innovative reading of Andean history and cultures, as well as of Western discourses of modernization.

TOWARD A DECOLONIZATION OF KNOWLEDGE/POWER IN LATIN AMERICA

In order to summarize the parameters of Mariátegui's critical analysis of national projects—from the colonial origins of the "*criollo* nation" (Pagden) to the solidification of Latin American bourgeois republics—we must mention at least the following aspects:

1. SOCIAL COMPARTMENTALIZATION

Mariátegui focused on the recognition and denunciation of the economic and social compartmentalization that constituted the foundation of the new republics and contributed to perpetuate colonial power structures after Independence. With the establishment of democracy as a system of limited participation, *criollo* authoritarianism legitimized its positions and expanded its domination over the broad disadvantaged sectors that were pushed to the margins of national projects. The socioeconomic context that surrounded Mariátegui's reflections obliged him to develop a critical view of Marxist theory in order to account for the particular dispossession of classes in Peru and the power-labor-race relation that characterizes the Andean social formation. Mariátegui's perspective did not support either the idea of the revolutionary leadership of the bourgeoisie, nor did he recognize in this class the potential to overthrow premodern economic or social structures that originated in colonial times. As Mariátegui explains, the Peruvian bourgeoisie had developed very slowly since the nineteenth century without achieving a significant degree of differentiation with respect to dominant social sectors. For this reason, oligarchic domination and pre-capitalist forms of production continued to prevail. The introduction of British and North American capital and the presence of transnational companies (e.g., Cerro de Pasco Corporation, International Petroleum Company) have since the early twentieth century created financial enclaves that coexisted with the premodern forms of production and social organization on which this agro-export society is based.³ The control of agrarian economy by wealthy landowners, the system of *gamonalismo*, and the steady transformation of the peasantry into tenant farmers have slowed down the ascendance of the bourgeoisie, whose existence closely depended on the influx of foreign capital for "national" development. This process of the "semi-colonization of the Peruvian bourgeoisie" (Quijano, "José Carlos Mariátegui" xviii) prolonged the structures of coloniality and promoted the perpetuation of forms of social stratification, such as race and gender hierarchies that originated during Spanish rule, in

modern times. In this sense, according to Enrique Dussel, “for Mariátegui, the dominant landowning classes, the bourgeoisie, etc., are explicitly ‘classes,’ unlike the Indigenous ‘community’ that entered into crisis in the republic” (“El marxismo de Mariátegui” 34). In fact, in “El problema del indio,” Mariátegui argues that independence and the resulting insertion of indigenous communities in the national space would contribute to a process of organization and emancipation of indigenous people aimed at developing their class consciousness. The indigenous sector would thus be assimilated into the international proletariat, a process that was never completed. In any case, what is essential to retain here is Mariátegui’s perception that, beyond a theoretical orientation toward translating—if not reducing—social conflict into the vertical terms of class struggle, Andean society required instead a different terminology in order to retain the importance of “horizontal” factors, such as traditions, cultural politics, and ethnicity, which considerably complicated social and political dynamics. For example, referring to *gamonalismo*, a legacy of colonial feudal relations, he explains:

The term *gamonalismo* designates more than just a social and economic category: that of the *latifundistas* or large landowners. It signifies a whole phenomenon. *Gamonalismo* is represented not only by the *gamonales* but by a long hierarchy of officials, intermediaries, agents, parasites, et cetera. The literate Indian who enters the service of *gamonalismo* turns into an exploiter of his own race. The central factor of the phenomenon is the hegemony of the semi-feudal landed estate in the policy and mechanism of the government. Therefore, it is this factor that should be acted upon if the evil is to be attacked at its roots and not merely observed in its temporary or subsidiary manifestations. (Mariátegui, *Seven Interpretive Essays on Peruvian Culture*)⁴

This passage explains *gamonalismo* as a phenomenon that is specific to the Andean region and which integrates multiple factors that ended up forming part of postcolonial debates many decades later: the complicity between what is called the *latifundista* “caste” and the state apparatus,

the relation between culture and politics, hegemony and subalternity, class and race, the ethics and pragmatics of socialist revolution, and in particular the consciousness of the coloniality of power discussed by Quijano as a deep structure of the power relations that persisted even after formal independence from Spain. In Mariátegui's perception, several aspects of the Andean problematic exceed the categories of Marxism, hybridize political analysis, and reveal the tensions that accompany the adaptation of Latin American specificity to theories conceived of in other political, economic, and cultural realities as a part of the grand narrative of global capitalism.

2. THE EXPANSION OF THE HISTORICITY OUT OF WHICH NATIONAL CULTURE IS CONCEIVED

Mariátegui's thought is articulated around the recognition of temporalities that included both a reappropriation of the past (particularly the pre-Hispanic era represented by Inca cultures) and a leap into the future: the utopian projection of indigenous American socialism. His vision of history informs political action: he proposes the recovery of traditional forms of socioeconomic organization that become strengthened with new meaning when they are inscribed in the stages of contemporary civilization.⁵ In this sense, Sara Castro-Klarén has noted that by introducing a historicity that goes back to the colonial period and to Inca prehistory, Mariátegui's interpretation of history launches an effective interrogation of European historiography, a critical revision that had already begun with Inca Garcilaso de la Vega and Guamán Poma de Ayala. Mariátegui's appeal to forms of historical memory that exceed the temporal and spatial limits of the nation state also destabilizes the universality and predictability of European models. Mariátegui "provincializes," so to speak (using Castro-Klarén's repurposing of Dipesh Chakrabarty's expression), European thought, a move that would situate him as a predecessor of the postcolonial theory (Castro-Klarén 352–353). Therefore, Mariátegui's historicism is not simply a flight into archaic formulas of return to the past in order to avoid

the challenges presented by social change in Peru but rather a utopianism rooted in a reinterpretation of cultural traditions capable of productively influencing political action. For Mariátegui, an historical and dialectical materialism allows for restitutive and undoubtedly heterodox socio-historical syntheses in which recovery and progress are both achieved and in which there remains the possibility for convergences between socialism and democracy, the European and the national, localism and universalism, modernity and tradition, contingency and transcendence. Although these positions could be considered voluntarist historical and political interpretations, Mariátegui's vision maintained connections with both political philosophy and the concrete conditions that characterized the Peruvian political landscape of the time.⁶

In this sense, Mariátegui bases himself in the organicist theory of Oswald Spengler who, in *The Decline of the West* (1918–1923), theorized the process of the emergence and demise of civilizations. Spengler thought that after having passed through the cultural phase of harmony and plenitude, Europe had found itself in the midst of a civilizing phase (which had begun with Napoleon). In this phase, increasing social conflict, mass uprisings, and economic crises brought about the inevitable collapse of the cultures of the Old Continent, which would then rapidly lead to the final, imperialist phase, in which the Caesars would provoke power struggles on a global level and cause societies to deteriorate and disappear. This conceptualization, which is both diagnostic and prognostic with regard to European cultures, strengthens the conviction throughout the Hispanic world that the new nations of the Americas would take on the historical role of the repository of Western civilization. This could be achieved through anti-capitalist reaction and the reactivation of ancestral cultures like those of the Inca Empire, which according to Mariátegui would promote the central role of the Indian, who appeared in peripheral capitalism as a new social actor whose labor power was essential to the development of the processes of industrialization. Thus, Mariátegui's new historicity reconsiders the myth of the American origin—no longer located in the Conquest or the formation of the nation state

but rather in the ancestral emergence of pre-Hispanic cultures. The present incorporates a new teleology: the goal of socialism, the articulator of thought and political action.⁷

3. OCCIDENTALISM

Through his vision of history and his conception of the place occupied by Latin America on the international level, Mariátegui proposes a groundbreaking reading of Occidentalism as a worldview that combines two perspectives that are only apparently irreconcilable in the context of an emancipated modernity. The first views Eurocentrism as a hegemonic space that imposes forms of domination intended to absorb regional particularisms and subsume them to the logic and the cognitive and reproductive demands of capitalism.⁸ The second, which recognizes the civilizing tide that began with the Conquest, holds that Europe provided from that point onward political, economic, and cultural models for Latin America, some of which served to oppress segments of society that had been subalternized by *criollo* domination. However, other perspectives, like Marxism, had an undeniable emancipatory value, and when adapted to the conditions and demands of Latin America, they were able to reactivate latent elements of indigenous cultures in Andean society—Incan communitarianism or “primitive communism,” for example.⁹ Although these forms of social organization from indigenous traditions had been almost completely destroyed by colonialism and the aristocratic republic, many of their principles endured in the *ayllu*, in the structure of sentiments that still inspired communities betrayed by *criollo* independence movements and which, according to Mariátegui, constituted an undeniable background for the construction of emancipatory projects in the Andean region. Mariátegui clearly perceives the historical lines of what Immanuel Wallerstein would later call the “world system,” which, organized beginning in 1492 and in the service of both European colonialism and transatlantic mercantilism, consolidated the centrality and hegemony of capitalism in the Western world and thus gave rise

to modernity (Quijano and Wallerstein).¹⁰ This critical and selective perspective of Occidentalism allows Mariátegui to think the realities of the Andean region as a specificity that is closely articulated to larger contexts and transnational dynamics. In “Lo nacional y lo exótico,” he writes: “la mistificada realidad nacional no es sino un segmento, una parcela de la vasta realidad mundial” (Mariátegui, *Peruanicemos al Perú*, 26), a concept on which he will insist throughout all his work. The attempt to define through *Amauta* the process of “Peruvianization” consisted precisely of the inscription of the national within broader spaces and is representative of the internationalist and conscious desire for the political and economic integration that was taking place in both the capitalist and socialist worlds.¹¹ This attention to macro-structural levels allows Mariátegui to overcome the limitations of national ideology and to think in broader and more fertile geocultural and geopolitical terms. He thus writes:

Nationalists understand a part of reality, but nothing more than a part. The reality is much broader, less finite. In short, nationalism is valid as a claim, but not as a negation. The current historical setting has the same values of provincialism and regionalism as before. Nationalism is a new style of regionalism. (Mariátegui, “Nationalism and Internationalism” 260)

Mariátegui understands that if the modern world-system began in “the long sixteenth century,” constituting the Americas as differentiated geo-social entities, then the twentieth century, which began after the First World War with the rearticulation of the dependency system that has as its center of hegemony the United States, reformulates postcolonialism, impacting the former European colonies with new forms of imperialist domination—those of transnationalized capitalism—that are part of the “vestigial colonialism” derived from Spanish colonization. Mariátegui is also conscious of the peripheral position of the postcolonial world, which had a marginal position even within the liberating narrative of historical materialism. As is well-known, this theory brought into focus the problems of the contemporary non-industrialized world only in Marx’s

latest writings, after 1869, and in terms that have been and continue to be criticized until today, both from within and outside Marxism.

4. PARADOXES OF AN INALIENABLE MODERNITY

The characteristics that make the Andean region singular (neo-feudal relations of production, the centrality of the question of race as an element that *intervenes* in class struggle, the presence of elements of traditional forms of socialization in indigenous cultures that precede and impact any project of programmatic organization, etc.) are brought together in Mariátegui with reflections on *modernity* and on how Latin American specificity can be incorporated into a transnational space. In Mariátegui's thought, modernity and coloniality are considered both inherent elements of the universal logic of capital and historical phenomena that are unavoidably connected to continental identity.

Referring to positions put forth by Luis E. Valcárcel in *Tempestad en los Andes* (1927) on the legacy of the Western world, Mariátegui writes that, in his opinion, "ni las conquistas de la civilización occidental ni las consecuencias vitales de la colonia y la república, son renunciables," and he recalls a commentary that Valcárcel's earlier book, *Del ayllu al imperio* (1925), provoked in him:

Valcárcel va demasiado lejos, como casi siempre que se deja rienda suelta a la imaginación. Ni la civilización occidental está tan agotada y putrefacta como Valcárcel supone. Ni una vez adquiridas su experiencia, su técnica y sus ideas, el Perú puede renunciar místicamente a tan válidos y preciosos instrumentos para volver, con áspera intransigencia, a sus antiguos mitos agrarios. La conquista, mala y todo, ha sido un hecho histórico. La República, tal como existe, es otro hecho histórico. Contra los hechos históricos, poco o nada pueden las especulaciones abstractas de la inteligencia ni las concepciones puras del espíritu. La historia del Perú no es sino una parcela de la historia humana. En cuatro siglos se ha formado una realidad nueva. La han creado los aluviones de Occidente. Es una realidad débil. Pero es, de todos modos, una

realidad. Sería excesivamente romántico decidirse hoy a ignorarla.
(*Mundial*, September 1925)

Recalling the Frankfurt School's critiques of Marx that argued his thought had not advanced past the Enlightenment with regard to the demystification of technology or in the idealization of modern life, one could argue that Mariátegui is also an adherent of the Romantic ethos of modernity, understood as a historical progression whose course can be corrected (including, for example, the transformative action of new social actors) but neither avoided nor disregarded in the interest of an archaist or nativist reclamation of premodern traditions and modes of production and socialization.¹² Thus, a mesh of dreams and prejudices is woven around the subject of modernity which, through a true practice of historical imagination, explores potential forms of keeping the promise of technological progress, urbanization, industrialization, and institutionality, thus displacing the dangers of homogenization, Europeanization, and commodification of social relations.¹³ However, Mariátegui clearly understands that coloniality—in his words, “vestigial colonialism”—constitutes, as Walter Mignolo might say, “the dark side of modernity” (“The Rhetoric of Modernity”), or rather, a dimension that is inseparable from the latter. Moreover, it is a defining feature that is as contradictory and polemical as it is inescapable in contemporary society.

The tensions between emancipation and dependence, class and race, tradition and modernity, state institutions and indigenous communitarianism, heterogeneity and nation, Europeanization and telluric beliefs, all occupy the core of Mariátegui's thought.¹⁴ This core conceives the peripheral present not as a byproduct of centralized capitalism nor as an archaicizing anomaly within the civilizing projects of Occidentalism, but rather as a differentiated reality that has been affected from its very origins by the violence of colonialist domination, which Marxism never could have foreseen or theorized in its moment. At the same time, it is precisely social consciousness that is developed through historical materialism, which will function as a platform for an Other, alternative

inscription of neocolonial social formations within the vast space of modernity. For Mariátegui, this modernity is an irrevocable dimension that can articulate the tensions that run through the modern project to the decolonization of the state and its institutions.¹⁵ However, we should also remember that the idea of a single modernity sounds excessively reductive, especially when it is based on a model surrounded in peripheral regions by populations with traditions, needs, and desires that substantially differ from those that guide the emergence and reinforcement of the paradigms of modernization and progress in centralized capitalism. Thus, some have proposed the idea that Mariátegui clearly perceived the possibility of what has come to be called “alternative modernity.” Aníbal Quijano, for example, sees in Mariátegui’s work the foundations of a project of modernity that did not pass through the channels of Eurocentric Occidentalism, nor is it folded into the features of capitalism; rather, it introduced an Other rationality into the interpretation of history and its possible transformations, a rationality capable of articulating tradition and progress, modernity and premodernity.¹⁶ Cornejo Polar in turn emphasizes Mariátegui’s wager on an Andean modernity that is neither a Eurocentric copy nor in need of (as Mario Vargas Llosa suggests in some of his statements) a process of de-indigenization.¹⁷

5. THE REDEFINITION OF THE COLLECTIVE SUBJECT

Utilizing present categories, one could say that Mariátegui conceives of the collective subject as the agent and principal addressee of political and social change in Peru. In this sense, his thought moves between two extremes present in the ideological horizon of his time. The first, represented by the concept of the masses understood as an amorphous (“disorganized,” according to Zavaleta Mercado) conglomerate with the potential capacity for struggle and a rich heritage of communitarian traditions and experiences. The second is the concept of citizen, elaborated as a symbolic and institutional key to nationalist imaginaries. With regard to the Marxist orthodoxy that designated the working class as the

revolutionary protagonist, Mariátegui redefines the question of the social subject while taking into account the still incipient development of class differentiation in Peru at that time. On the one hand, in Mariátegui's lifetime the national bourgeoisie was not yet sufficiently differentiated from the feudal landowning classes, and for this reason it had not been able to develop its own agenda of economic and political demands. On the other hand, the Peruvian proletariat still lacked the political identity and cohesiveness necessary to lead a revolutionary movement, while the peasantry—which Marxism up until the "late Marx" considered secondary to the political vanguard—actually made up the majority of the most exploited sectors of the region. According to Mariátegui, all of these facts showed that Marxist theory was in need of a creative and heterodox adjustment.¹⁸ Toward the end of 1915, Mariátegui was profoundly affected by the uprisings of Rumi Maqui, which, beginning in Puno under the leadership of Teodomiro Gutiérrez Cuevas, was felt as a "seismic wave" among the peasants of Puno. Mariátegui, thinking in a utopian way, interpreted this uprising as a restorative movement that evoked the emblematic figure of the Inca, connecting past and present, contingency and transcendentalism, driven by the ideal of Incan revolution. Through this revolution, the spontaneous and discontinuous drive of the masses would be organized as political action, a process that would indicate the importance and potential of the popular levels that regard the Incan Empire as an idealized form of agrarian communitarianism posed as an alternative to the *criollo* nation (Flores Galindo 40–41).

Between bourgeois nationalism and the latent subversiveness of the multitude, Mariátegui perceived a new conception of the national-popular subject that could redefine itself as antagonistic to the disciplining machine of the *criollo* state and its institutions. At the same time, he also understood that, far from being guided by a predetermined social group, the revolutionary process responds instead to concrete historical circumstances and to the characteristic features of each social formation. The clarification of the place occupied by the notion of the subject in Mariátegui's work obviously leads to the analysis of his specific

conceptualization of social classes and his subsequent adaptation of Marxism to the particular case of Peru. Mariátegui deviates from Marxist theory with regard to the crucial role of the national bourgeoisie in the revolutionary process and in anti-imperialist struggles and regarding the definition of the proletariat as the primary subject of the revolution. In this sense, Mariátegui proposes a plural and cohesive vision of different segments of society that includes and exceeds the limits of the industrial proletariat and extends it to agricultural workers, members of indigenous communities, office workers, students, intellectuals, miners, educators, and so on, who all form part of what he calls “the productive class,” which is to say, all those who might constitute a front-in-struggle, a broad and varied “plural historical subject” that is constantly redefined by praxis and by sociocultural circumstances.¹⁹ Contradictorily situated between the APRA²⁰ ideological apparatus on the one hand and the ideology of Marxist orthodoxy on the other, the definition of the national-popular subject that came out of Mariátegui’s project should be understood as a response to the populism of Augusto B. Leguía, particularly the principle of integrative, non-classist interpellation on which this current was constructed.²¹ The proletariat is therefore not the main revolutionary subject but rather one of its primary social and political components. Mariátegui’s position, which addresses the multicultural condition of Andean societies and the historical contingency that governed the alliances and negotiations that were possible between different sectors, was opposed to any polarization of classes that would reduce social conflict to a mechanical antagonism. Rather, Mariátegui recognized the hybrid nature of Andean social formations, which consist of elements that cannot be comprehended by orthodox Marxism and its theoretical orientation toward class conflict in advanced European societies of the nineteenth century. *Gamonalismo*, the relationship between race and exploitation, the social predominance of the peasantry, and the communitarian tradition of indigenous cultures are all examples of the distinctive elements of Andean society that require interpretative models that are substantially different from those provided by revolutionary

orthodoxy. In the twenty-first century, many of these characteristics persist, embedded in economies and forms of social organization in which neo-feudal structures coexist in an unstable equilibrium with modern forms of production and political and social domination that require, as in Mariátegui's time, specific paradigms of interpretation and social action. By perceiving and trying to elaborate the meaning and importance of these distinctive elements of Andean reality, Mariátegui creatively and in a heterodox way contributed to debates about the definition of the primary agents of social change, calling into question the tendency to identify them *a priori*, based on theory, as the protagonists of collective movements oriented toward social change. He suggested that, at least in postcolonial societies, a unique revolutionary subject that can be ascribed to a fixed position in the social pyramid does not exist. He proposed instead a constellation of social sectors—which Dussel identifies as “the social bloc of the oppressed” (“El marxismo de Mariátegui” 36)—that are defined as revolutionary subjects based on the mode in which they politically and ideologically live and elaborate their particular position in the productive apparatus and on the way in which they are connected to the projects of economic and social transformation.²² It is in this sense that José Ignacio López Soria discusses the emergence of a proletarian self-consciousness that functions as a “subject-object identity” and is essential to the formation of class consciousness, which is intrinsically linked to power relations and the historical and material conditions of workers' existence (“La teoría” 34).

6. THE CONCEPT OF TOTALITY

This leads us to one of the most fundamental aspects of Mariátegui's vision: the critique of the concept of totality, in reference to both the concept of the nation-state and the definition of the national-popular subject, which I mentioned previously. From the perspective of dependency, Aníbal Quijano noted the fundamental importance of the notion of heterogeneity in Mariátegui, conceived of as the destruction of the unitary

and homogenizing vision that informed the projects of nation-building in Latin America, particularly in Peru.²³ In Mariátegui's perspective, the concept of heterogeneity does not presuppose a merely descriptive notion of the social and cultural diversity of Andean society; rather, it recognizes the structurally contradictory nature that characterizes relations between the different social sectors of the region. Insofar as this characteristic is constitutive of social formations composed of multiple cultures whose ethnicities, traditions, interests, and worldviews are not only different from but antagonistic to the dominant *criollo* sectors (and have been since before colonialism), any emancipatory project should be based in the recognition and demands of the popular classes, which were never effectively or productively articulated in republican organizations.²⁴ Dussel has discussed the fundamental role that Mariátegui assigns to the principal categories of class, ethnicity, people, and nation, which he developed on the basis of the specificities of Andean society. As Mariátegui recognized, these categories cannot be applied in their pure form to the analysis of the region because, even though they make up part of the dominant epistemology and the traditional vocabulary of social sciences, they collide with the reality of the hybridities and trans-temporalities that exceed the conceptual limits that normally appropriate these terms.²⁵

The structural conflict that Mariátegui notes as the primary characteristic of Andean societies is thus not limited to the places that each social sector occupies in the region; rather, it also extends to the cognitive parameters that correspond to each cultural tradition and to the axiological modalities from which they derive. In this sense, Mariátegui does not only fervently and precociously develop the notion of difference that would come to constitute one of the key concepts of postcolonialism and of post-structuralist and post-Marxist thought in general since the 1980s. He also promotes the articulation of difference and inequality as central elements for a critique of the bourgeois nation and modernity and for an effective advance toward socialism.²⁶ If difference establishes the sociocultural question as an unavoidable aspect of the ideological debate

when recognizing the plural and multiple nature of Latin American societies and cultures, the emphasis on social inequality underscores the economic and political basis of the *criollo* nation since the colonial period and the privileges, hierarchies, and exclusions that would later legitimize the Republic.²⁷ This notion makes it impossible to limit the debate to the mere recognition of the different perspectives that make up Latin American cultures and the need for a harmony or synthesis that could resolve social antagonisms. Instead, it establishes the discussion on the basis of social conflict in which belligerent groups confront one another with opposing and frequently irreconcilable agendas. It is from this consciousness of difference that Mariátegui is able to see the divergences between the state and the nation that have troubled Latin American social formations up to the present day. The state, as the political and administrative core of authority and power, is thus seen as a necessary moment for the institutionalization of unity, the administration of identity politics, and the centralization of social projects. The nation is in turn conceived of as the space of territorialization of subjects who exist in conflict with one another under the *criollo* system of national domination. Out of the gaps between both moments—state and nation—emerge constant disruptions of institutionality, authoritarian experiences, and the progressive weakening of civil society characteristic of the region. In other words, determined by the Eurocentric matrix from whence it came, the concept of the nation, adopted and implemented through *criollo* domination from Independence onward, does not adapt to the multicultural and multi-ethnic conditions that characterize the Andean region. The inability of the state to manage the identitarian politics of cultural difference and respond to the profound structural transformations to the drama of socioeconomic inequality makes it impossible to think Andean social transformation on either a regional or national level in terms of organicity, totalization, harmony, or synthesis. For Mariátegui, a socialism rooted in a perspective that represents the traditions and interests of the lower classes is the only form not only for questioning but also for radically intervening in the bourgeois republic

and for productively developing social conflict, seeking solutions that would neither impose a programmatic homogenization of Andean society nor get in the way of the utopian dream of a democratic consensus that would only result in the capitulation of indigenous peoples and other exploited segments of Andean society.

7. THE REDEFINITION OF INTERSUBJECTIVITY AND ITS ROLE IN THE PROCESSES OF SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION AND REARTICULATION OF THE RELATIONS BETWEEN THE STATE AND SOCIETY

In order to construct the utopia of an Indigenous American socialism, Mariátegui places special importance on the contradictory coexistence of multiple symbolic universes that require the elaboration of an emancipatory discourse that can interpellate different social strata and sectors and articulate them around a common agenda. The discontinuous and disintegrating sociocultural constitution that characterizes the region obviously exceeds the boundaries of instrumental Enlightenment rationality and therefore requires a reconstruction of the historical meaning of modernity and a substantial modification of its cognitive models and forms of social action. In his attempt to redefine the national-popular subject in Peru, Mariátegui analyzes the role of myth and religion, which is to say, phenomena of belief, as explosive elements of political action.²⁸ Among those elements he encountered revolutionary optimism, the “heroic faith” that a realistic evaluation of historical circumstances allows social actors to recognize one another in a common agenda and to fight for a new world.²⁹ Hence the importance Mariátegui places on Valcárcel’s essay *Tempestad en los Andes*, which he considered a prophetic book (with “algo de evangelio y algo de Apocalipsis”) and which records the myths that inspired the imaginaries and actions of indigenous communities. At the beginning of the essay “The Problem of the Indian,” Mariátegui argues, citing Valcárcel:

The soul of the Indian is not raised by the white man's civilization or alphabet but by the myth, the idea, of the Socialist revolution. The hope of the Indian is absolutely revolutionary. That same myth, that same idea, are the decisive agents in the awakening of other ancient peoples... (*Seven Interpretative Essays on Peruvian Reality*)

Hence, as well, the importance Mariátegui bestows on messianic sentiments as a fundamental component of achieving a bond with the masses and of promoting the "materialist idealism" that guides the revolutionary project. In both *Seven Interpretative Essays on Peruvian Reality* and *Defense of Marxism*, Mariátegui develops the "essentially religious" character of communism not only as a tool for overcoming social injustice and building interclass solidarity but also as a form of spiritual elevation.³⁰ In light of more recent debates and theories, much could be said about the relation that Mariátegui established between myth and politics, belief and social change. These articulations, which can be translated into the dualisms of materiality/spirituality or particularism/universality, indicate a fundamentally Christian basis with regard to the "logic of spectrality" analyzed by Jacques Derrida and in other deconstructive readings of Marxism. It suffices to say that it establishes the basis for a debate on the possibilities of an "ontology without specters" and on Mariátegui's implicit discussion of Marxism as a "messianic eschatology" (the idea of revolutionary (emancipatory) theory and praxis as a "promise" with ethical and existential connotations).³¹

As has been previously indicated in this essay, another fundamental element of the analysis of intersubjective relations that Mariátegui redefined through his work is the incorporation of the theme of cultural difference and of the ethnic and racial elements that make up the Andean social formation, and which the editor of *Amauta* saw as essential to the constitution of inclusive Peruvianness as conceptualized from the ideological horizons of socialism. In Mariátegui, difference implies not only the incorporation of the philosophical notion of alterity or the

perception of a rhetorical otherness, but rather the delimitation of a concrete historical and political position that is ethically situated in relation to networks of power and the political and ideological alternatives of a given era.³² From this conception of difference, he sought to define social identity not by relying on essentialisms but instead through the materiality produced by experience and social consciousness.³³ Mariátegui's method dialectically articulates spirituality and materiality, with particular attention paid to the relations of power and without losing sight of the subjective elements that compose and model the social and which make it possible to understand what the journal *Amauta* calls "the absolute humanism of history."

Quijano identifies this new form of conceptualizing social relations and the structures of domination implemented around the globe as beginning precisely from the moment of the conquest of the Americas and the consequent growth and hegemony of global capitalism ("Colonialidad del poder y clasificación"). By referring to a system of "social classification" and its influence on Mariátegui's thought, Quijano understands that the category of race for Mariátegui has a bidimensional sense that "se refiere simultáneamente a las características biológicas y a la historia civilizacional particulares de un grupo humano" (Quijano, "Raza, etnia" 17). This allows us to understand the connection between race and power both in the sense of economic exploitation (feudalization, *gamonalismo*) and in its naturalization on the level of collective imaginaries. Social identities and intersubjective relations are thus results of the structures and dynamics of domination that are historically rearticulated and which are necessary guideposts toward the integrative utopia of socialism. This integration is not, in Mariátegui's vision, synonymous with centralism or homogenization but rather points to the crisis of a system of privileges and the legitimation of power and, consequently, as Quijano ventures, toward other forms of state organization (e.g., plurinational states, new nation-states) that could go beyond the Eurocentric model and accord with the needs and particularities of Andean society.

8. TOWARD A DECOLONIZATION OF THE STATE

Alongside the critique of the nation as a totalizing structure imposed over the heterogeneous cultures that make up the social formations of the Andean region (a critique which is connected to a broader interrogation of the exclusionary and classist paradigms of Eurocentric modernity), Mariátegui emphasizes the need to transform the state, beginning with strategies that would productively articulate the necessities, traditions, and expectations of the plural social subject he outlines in his essays, underscoring the leading role of indigenous communities in social struggles. In Mariátegui's perspective, the state does not coincide with the nation: it does not represent the multicultural interests of the population, nor does it satisfy the needs of sectors that have been marginalized from the colonial period onward, nor does it eliminate the privileges of the white *criollo* elite that has controlled the means of production and used the ideological state apparatus to administer a verticalized, homogenizing, and reductionist conception of Peruvian identity.³⁴ From the perspective of Mariátegui's journal *Amauta*, the decolonization of the state entails above all reversing the structures of domination that were imposed with the Conquest and which continued to be enforced by the Republic to reaffirm its oligarchical hegemony.³⁵ This process of decolonization, which was motivated years earlier by Manuel González Prada, presupposed to a large extent an ethno-racialization of the state as a critical and interpellative principle as well as a platform for political demands out of which it might be possible to build a new national project conceived of as an open, multicultural, and multiethnic structure.³⁶ Mariátegui's program thus does not imply the negation of the concept of race but rather its re-signification and political radicalization. The concept of race is one of the central axes of Mariátegui's vision because it allows for a comprehension of the system of social classification on which *criollo* society has been organized since the colonial period and of how these same principles, hierarchies, and privileges are perpetuated in the present.³⁷

Drawing on Gramsci, Mariátegui conceives of Peru as the product of various moments of domination that culminated in a “domestic colonialism” that is impossible to analyze without understanding that the category of class intersects with ethnic and racial conflicts as well as with elements of collective subjectivity. These factors, which make up community intersubjectivity, are deeply rooted in traditions, historical memory, and beliefs or elements of the indigenous past that constitute a conglomeration of the region’s differential characteristics and denote the existence of a social subject who belligerently exists outside the white *criollo* tradition.³⁸ However, it is worth emphasizing that, even assuming a full knowledge of the importance of the ethnic and racial problems of the Andean region, both with regard to the conception of the national state and in its broader internationalist version, Mariátegui eschews a nativist solution that would close off all contact with currents of thought and political experiences that are unrelated to indigenous issues and which might be reluctant to form possible supra-national alliances. Instead, his thought is oriented toward the recognition of the relation, which he qualifies as “obvious,” between indigenous movements and revolutionary movements on a global level. The temporality of local cultures is reactivated in the present, combining itself with elements of a modernity that must be domesticated and assimilated to the needs of the specific social subject that Mariátegui conceives of as having deep roots in the pre-Hispanic world. This subject suffered first from colonialist depredation, then from the repression of the republican oligarchy, before setting out on the road to socialism in search of the restitution of human rights and dignity.

In this way, the national moment is founded on the ruins—to use the concept in its Benjaminian sense—of the pre-Hispanic world and the fragmentation of the space-time that is imposed on each successive modernizing wave from the colonial period onward:

El Perú es todavía una nacionalidad en formación. Lo están construyendo sobre los inertes estratos *indígenas*, los aluviones de

la civilización occidental. La conquista española aniquiló la cultura incaica. Destruyó el Perú autóctono. Frustró la única peruanidad que ha existido. Los españoles extirparon del suelo y de la raza todos los elementos vivos de la cultura indígena. Reemplazaron la religión incásica con la religión católica romana. De la cultura incásica no dejaron sino vestigios muertos. Los descendentes de los conquistadores y los colonizadores constituyeron el cimiento del Perú actual. (*Peruanicemos al Perú*, 26)

One cannot go from the annihilation of indigenous communities to the construction of the nation without an inclusive configuration of identity that incorporates difference into society (and does not merely celebrate diversity) and which understands this difference as radical inequality, thus converting the state into a restitutive, decolonizing instance:

Una política realmente nacional no puede prescindir del indio, no puede ignorar al indio. El indio es el cimiento de nuestra nacionalidad en formación. La opresión enemista al indio con la civilidad. Lo anula, prácticamente, como elemento de progreso. Los que empobrecen y deprimen al indio, empobrecen y deprimen a la nación. Explotado, befo, embrutecido, no puede el indio ser un creador de riqueza. Desvalorizarlo, depreciarlo como hombre equivale a desvalorizarlo, a depreciarlo como productor [...]. Cuando se habla de la peruanidad, habría que empezar por investigar si esta peruanidad comprende al indio. Sin el indio no hay peruanidad posible. (*Peruanicemos al Perú*, 32.)

The theme of "Peruvianness," which is connected to the Romantic myth of national "essence," is presented here as a process, and above all, as a desire. As Neil Larsen argues, in Mariátegui's perspective the Peruvian nation would thus be a form in search of its content, a configuration of a historical, political, and administrative character that does not cease to appropriate productively the elements that constitute it (language, customs, diverse and antagonistic cultural forms) and which inorganically coexist within the social formation that encompasses them. As a discontinuous, inconclusive process that perhaps cannot be completed, Peruvianness should be apprehended and integrated into the diverse

perspectives that compose the national “soul” through an emancipatory and decolonizing process that offers indigenous people and the other components of the Peruvian nation inclusive epistemological (cognitive and representational) platforms that are open to the problematics established by the difference and inequality that have characterized Andean society since the colonial period. It is only in this way that indigenous, marginalized, or subalternized elements will be able to integrate themselves productively into the structure of the republic and claim their place as organic constituents of the nation.³⁹

9. THE “BLIND SPOTS” OF MARXISM: COLONIALISM, NATION, COLONIALITY

The aspects we have examined up to this point demonstrate Mariátegui’s acute perception of the complexity and specificity of the Andean region and show the creativity of the journal *Amauta* in interpreting and applying Marxist theory to the Latin American context. Socialist theory did not offer all the answers to the problems of capitalism in this era, nor did it address certain key aspects necessary for the emancipation of marginalized sectors in postcolonial societies. Consequently, properly Latin American socioeconomic phenomena (such as *gamonalismo*, the coexistence of modern and premodern modes of production, and the development of concrete forms of dependence in peripheral areas) and political phenomena (like the processes of the formation of the nation state in the postcolonial world, nationalism, populism, etc.) demanded, according to Mariátegui, an analysis that would be at once both original and tentative.

In addition to the developments Marxist theory has made with regard to the theme of the nation, it is already commonplace to recognize that Marx did not completely understand the meaning of Latin American independence movements, nor did he grasp the historical mission of Latin American liberators as key figures of the dismantling of “formal” colonialism in the Americas.⁴⁰ In this sense, Marx’s criticism of Bolívar,

whom he considered a simple tool of the *criollo* elite (among other things), is one aspect that is frequently cited by those who want to dismiss Marxism out of hand on the basis of its concrete political “applications” or by those who, more constructively, endeavor to analyze the real value of Marxist theory for contemporary Latin American reality. Among these latter, Santiago Castro-Gómez, for example, has called attention to the fact that Marxism does not attempt to theorize neocolonial reality because it was beyond the European social spectrum in the mid-nineteenth century. It would not be until Marx’s last writings that one finds any reflection on the phenomenon of colonialism, and even in these cases (according to Castro-Gómez), this phenomenon only appears as a “collateral effect of European expansion”—that is, as a necessary stage for the emergence of the bourgeoisie and the incorporation of the Americas into universal history. The Latin American periphery was situated, for Marx, in a historical moment prior to that of Europe with regard to economic, political, and social development—a pre-bourgeois, pre-capitalist, premodern stage—in which certain forms of exploitation and class practices established by colonialism still survived through perpetuation by the *criollo* elite. Other critics have ventured different explanations: Alfonso Sánchez Vázquez and others have drawn attention to certain evolutions in Marx’s work that did not always reach Latin American readers in a timely manner, as was the case with the question of relations between the empire and the colony, giving rise to the idea that Marxism excludes peripheral nations from its theoretical considerations. Sánchez Vázquez argues that, starting from the analysis of non-industrialized social formations, the category of the “historical Western peoples” can be expanded when one takes into consideration the oppressed populations for whom Marx recognized the necessity of national liberation struggle as an indispensable condition of socialist revolution.⁴¹ That is to say, he addressed the problematic issue of decolonization, although he neither developed nor characterized it with that name.

Many agree that it is precisely these voids or fissures in contemporary theory where Latin American Marxism, particularly Mariátegui’s contri-

butions, can infiltrate and strengthen it. These same critics emphasize the complementarity between Marxist theory and reflections capable of incorporating the reality of the region to the grand narrative of historical materialism. Along these same lines, they have also analyzed the specific ways in which Mariátegui complements or summarizes Marxist theses, for example in his *Defense of Marxism*.⁴² If, for Mariátegui, colonialism is clearly the primary matrix of imperial domination and the first instance of the establishment of the Americas under the aegis of capital, then the nation is to be understood as the space in which social conflicts are generated and organized in relation to the institutions of the state. At the same time, the nation is also the realm in which strategies of resistance and popular liberation are configured, at least in the first instance before their eventual internationalization. What matters for Mariátegui is comprehending and elaborating these articulations that are the basis for the social transformations that took place in the first decades of the twentieth century and were marked on an international level by major events like the Mexican Revolution, the student uprisings in Córdoba, the consolidation of US hegemony, the First World War, the global economic crash of 1929, the expansion of populism, and other significant phenomena—all without losing sight of Latin America's inherent structural problems, such as the question of multiracial societies and the continuing effects of colonialism within modernizing projects.

On the basis of Mariátegui's efforts, Aníbal Quijano developed the idea of coloniality, which was later taken up again by Latin American and North American critics concerned with the deconstruction of Occidentalism and modernity, as well as with the recovery the theme of race, which Quijano approached as a key concept of the systems of "social classification" brought about by colonialist domination. As Quijano himself recognizes, there is already in Mariátegui a reflection on this theme oriented in the first instance toward an evaluation of the Conquest and colonization as processes of the dismantling of indigenous civilizations and the establishment of systems for the exploitation of individuals and natural resources that have been occurring for centuries. In fact,

far from disappearing with the independence movements of the early nineteenth century, coloniality was extended, as Mariátegui predicted, into the different stages of the consolidation of Latin American republics, filtering into all levels of economic, political, and social organization in these new nations.

One consistent theme in *Seven Interpretative Essays on Peruvian Reality* is the analysis of what Mariátegui calls *coloniaje* (colonization)—for example in “The Problem of Land”—and an inquiry into the modalities of Andean production in that period. Mariátegui is referring here to the colonialism that affects coastal agriculture in Peru, laying the foundation for a dependency-theory based reflection on the national economy. In Mariátegui’s understanding, the country’s interests must be subordinated to the needs of the hegemonic centers of capitalism that impose disadvantageous conditions on the economies of peripheral nations, which in turn provide raw materials and consume the goods manufactured in industrialized nations. In “The Problem of Land,” he writes:

The obstacle to a solution is in the very structure of the Peruvian economy, which can only move or develop in response to the interests and needs of markets in London and New York. These markets regard Peru as a storehouse of raw materials and a customer for their manufactured goods. Peruvian agriculture, therefore, obtains credit and transport solely for the products that benefit the great markets.... Our *latifundistas*, our landholders, may think that they are independent, but they are actually only intermediaries or agents of foreign capital. (*Seven Interpretative Essays*)

Mariátegui registers similar effects in his analysis of economic development, public education, religion, and other issues, and he discusses them in relation to very concrete aspects of the organization of political and economic power in Peru as evidence of the persistence of *gamonalismo*, that archaic structure of power and control of the means of production which Mariátegui defines as fundamentally “the problem of the Indian.” Socialism is thus understood as restitution, or rather, as the moment that

returns a productive and spiritual relation with the Earth to indigenous communities, a connection that was destroyed by Spanish colonization and the reestablishment of which would confer onto peasant forms of sociality the sense of community that was lost with the adoption of the capitalist mode of production.

Between the concept of *coloniaje* Mariátegui used to name a stage or moment of colonialist domination and the notion of the coloniality of power developed by Quijano there is a critique of modernity that makes it possible to relativize the effects of emancipation and to shed light on the continuity of the structures of power, privilege, and exclusions institutionalized by the *criollo* elite since independence. Mariátegui's references to "vestigial colonialism" undoubtedly opened up a path for later developments around this problem, which the modern nation naturalized with the advent of liberalism and the development of dependent capitalist economies in Latin America. As Mariátegui correctly observed, the nation state thus emerged in connection with these continuities, which were evidently not present in the more developed nations of the European context so thoroughly theorized by Marxism.⁴³ In response to Luis Alberto Sánchez, Mariátegui establishes the national question as related to the colonial condition of Latin America in the following terms:

El nacionalismo de las naciones europeas—donde nacionalismo y conservatismo se identifican y consustancian—se propone fines imperialistas [fascismos]. Es reaccionario y antisocialista. Pero el *nacionalismo* de los pueblos coloniales—sí, coloniales económicamente, aunque se vanaglorien de su autonomía política—tiene un origen y un impulso totalmente diverso. En estos pueblos, el nacionalismo es revolucionario y, por ende, concluye con el socialismo. En estos pueblos la idea de nación no ha cumplido aún su trayectoria ni ha agotado su misión histórica. (Qtd. in Dussel, *El último Marx* 282)

It is important to remember that Mariátegui combines two only apparently contradictory positions in relation to the theme of the nation. First, there his understanding of the (politically and ideologically) strategic

importance of national organization and the institutions of the state as an indispensable reference for social struggles and popular protest movements. The nation is the “emancipated” obverse of colonialism: the door of history open to the future of liberation. However, the bourgeois nation, which is what Mariátegui had in mind, has its own forms of domination and exclusion. This is what makes the second movement of Mariátegui’s thought necessary; it is what inspired his radical dismantling of the mechanisms of control and subalternization of the lower classes that dwell within the heart of the *criollo* nation. In this respect, Mariátegui was not ignorant of the lack of representation of popular cultures and interests within state institutions, which only respond to the dictates of elites, and to a broader extent, to the logic of international capitalism and the values it produces in order to assure its perpetuation. Mariátegui’s “nationalism,” just like his “liberalism,” one could say, is a *function* of his political realism and therefore of his recognition of the need to fundamentally understand the purpose and functioning of existing structures on both a material and a symbolic level as an indispensable moment of their radical transformation. As Enrique Dussel has argued, in Mariátegui’s work, the “philosophy of revolution” would be

impregnada de realismo psicológico y sociológico, ya que esa *realidad* está antes que las teorías, el mito antes que la racionalidad abstracta, el mundo espiritual del trabajador antes que la pura materia, el socialismo antes que el comunismo, el indigenismo antes que la abstracta lucha proletaria europea, los sindicatos antes que el partido. (Dussel, “El marxismo de Mariátegui” 27)

Moreover, prior to utopia, which is so essential to Mariátegui’s thought, there is the recognition of social reality (the structures of which it is composed, the interests that maintain it, the subjectivities that constitute it), which is to say, the profound comprehension of the (historically constituted) *social being* from which political consciousness is determined and developed.

10. CULTURAL RE-SIGNIFICATIONS

It is impossible to summarize here the innumerable contributions Mariátegui made to the redefinition of national culture, both “from within,” as a critic of the processes of cultural homogenization and state centralization, and “from without,” emphasizing the importance of conceiving of the national as a moment of shifting toward continentalism, Occidentalism, and internationalism, all very different moments of the articulation of Peru, the Andean region, and Latin America, to the “contemporary scene” of the world-system. In Mariátegui’s work, culture is in fact an unavoidable platform for social and political struggles. It is the arena in which the processes of collective identity formation and the economic, ideological, and social dynamics that intersect with them are resolved. The Cuban critic Roberto González Echevarría considers Mariátegui “the Walter Benjamin of Latin American letters” (34), which is to say, someone capable of perceiving in a rigorous and original way the bonds that unite local culture, history, and literary production and able to penetrate the challenges and contradictions of modernity from an ex-centric position that empowers his critical perspective. Antonio Melis had previously explored the relationship between Benjamin and Mariátegui, affirming the presence of notable convergences between these two thinkers, particularly with regard to their vindication of irrationalism and the importance they both grant to subjectivity as a mobilizing element of social consciousness (*Leyendo Mariátegui* 49–51). In the same way, the attention that both Benjamin and Mariátegui paid to the materiality of culture (e.g., the concrete conditions of production and cultural reception, technical elements as fundamental factors of the conceptualization and reproduction of art, the position of the intellectual with respect to political parties, cultural institutions) points to similarities in their concepts of the symbolic product, and they also coincide with regard to their heterodox interpretations of Marxism and their rejection of any kind of artistic realism, which, because of its narrow prescriptivism, ends up negating the liberating drives of fantasy. All of this indicates a revolutionary conceptualization of culture that, despite the historical

distance that separates Mariátegui's work from contemporary contexts, makes it possible to perceive multiple lines of connection that open the way for thinking present circumstances through vibrant, living traditions. To illustrate some of the contributions of Mariátegui's cultural vision that connect to problems and situations that are characteristic of our own horizon in the first decades of the twenty-first century, it suffices to mention the following aspects of his thought.

a) Firstly, the multicultural question that permeates Mariátegui's work and organizes his heterodox political thought exceeds, as we indicated earlier in this essay, the mere identification of cultural diversity and goes on to thoroughly investigate the themes of identitarian difference and social justice, themes that encompass the issue in relation to the models of knowledge production in postcolonial and multicultural societies. For Mariátegui, the demand for alternative epistemologies and local knowledges, ideas that circulate today as a common currency in postcolonial debates, was a *sine qua non* condition of the construction of socialism and the appropriation of a modernity that would integrate the diverse traditions of the Andean region.⁴⁴ The coexistence within the political and administrative parameters of the liberal project of the nation state, of traditions and cultures that are clearly different from one another implied not only, as Mariátegui perceived, the configuration of opposite agendas but also the existence of cosmovisions that differed and frequently were antagonistic to dominant forms of knowledge and representation. The reclamation of forms of belief and religiosity proper to vernacular cultures and the connection of belief and productivity (what Mariátegui worked out through his readings of George Fraser, Waldo Frank, and others), the recuperation of popular culture and the place that experience, community, and the past occupy in collective imaginaries, were all aspects of a vision of social relations that the Andean *criollo* project has displaced (if not erased completely) since the beginning of the Latin American republics. In Mariátegui's thought, to recognize these levels of social functioning was a form of intervening in the discourses of power on the basis of a political vision that implied

above all a “philosophy of praxis” that understood theory as a moment of political action, never its replacement. In addition, although Mariátegui’s rationality is not absolutely foreign to that of the Enlightenment—which for Mariátegui constitutes an instance of the dialectical sublation of the colony and of forms of thought controlled by the alliance between the Church and the state—it is evident that his ideology includes multiple elements that are irreducible to the philosophical, political, and cultural parameters of Enlightenment Europe. His knowledge of Latin American specificity certainly appeals to an intellectual universe open to *other* epistemologies and requires a diversity of sources and canons, of styles and languages that the models received from Eurocentric modernity cannot provide. His notion of ethics is also Other because the subject he addresses is primordially Other, defined by other ideological and philosophical protocols and an Other conception of which values should rule the relations of a community.⁴⁵

b) In the same sense, Mariátegui made a groundbreaking contribution to the field that is known today as multiculturalism or identity politics. The Quechua/Spanish duality that Mariátegui correctly perceived as one of the keys to understanding Andean social formations and their cultural and historical development is barely the tip of the iceberg (as he acknowledges) when it comes to the breadth of the ethnic and cultural complexity of the region. Quechua, Aymara, and Spanish represent the dominant codes in this cultural region and usher in the larger problematic of internal domination through which hegemonic cultures marginalize or subalternize segments of society that have not been able to assert their specificity or to exert sufficient pressure for the recognition of their identity on a national level. A number of critics have objected that Mariátegui does not focus as much on ethnic backgrounds that do not come from the main branches of the Quechua and Aymara cultures in the Andean region, such as African and Asian cultures (primarily Chinese, who have had a somewhat visible presence in Peru), as he does indigenous communities (understood as a collective which implies the multiplicity of ethnicities of which it is composed). We can affirm that,

concerned with defining and emphasizing indigenous subjectivity as the revolutionary vanguard in the Andean region, Mariátegui produced a partial and selective analysis of the cultural diversity (understood as a plural system of differences and inequalities) which to a certain extent limited his analysis's ability to destabilize the uniform and homogenizing projects of the bourgeois nation. In any case, Mariátegui's contribution to the subject of cultural multiplicity and the political importance of this phenomenon for revolutionary thought is fundamental, both in its historical moment and in its historical projections. His comprehension of the political implications of multiculturalism makes it possible to understand the notion of subjectivity not as determined by class, race, or gender but rather as a flexible, relational category that is not necessarily directed by the institutions of the state or developed on the basis of dominant discourses. Through the implicit ethno-racialization of his political vision, Mariátegui was able to cut diagonally across the category of class and to decenter the revolutionary subject by pluralizing agency and the political agenda—which is to say, by making the proletariat *one* revolutionary agent among many and by making class *one* category of social analysis among others. Subject positions are mobile, fluctuating: they are articulated in different ways on ethnic, social, political, economic, and cultural levels and according to the subject's relation to present ideological projects.

c) Recent Latin American history, which many identify with post-modernity, is full of “anti-systemic movements” that have gone beyond the parameters of traditional politics, which is to say, partisan politics linked to the leaders of trade unions and political institutions. These movements are often interpreted as novel experiences in Latin American history. However, despite their historical specificity, many of the principles around which contemporary collective struggles are articulated have much in common with the processes connected to relations of power and socioeconomic organization that Mariátegui analyzed because they have been assimilated by different political regimes and have survived for centuries. In light of the topics toward which postcolonial criticism

has turned in recent decades, Mariátegui's historical intuition about the crisis of the nation state as a primary category of cultural analysis and about the articulation between difference and inequality as a catalyst for social movements seems all the more prescient. Likewise, the ideological critique of indigenism, as well as that of *mestizaje* and in a broader sense the ideology of progress, order, and social consensus, has come a long way since Mariátegui's time, especially from the horizons of postmodern thought in which the "hermeneutics of suspicion" are applied to any discourse or project that attempts to reduce political and economic antagonisms to the simple confirmation of cultural diversity in Latin American social formations and to affirm as a collective desideratum the elimination of social conflict before its productive elaboration. However, the changes registered in the contemporary world and political scene throughout a large part of the twentieth century are both obvious and significant. The twin assault of globalization and neoliberalism has accelerated the political evacuation of the state and its institutions, increasing to previously unknown degrees the influence of transnational companies and firms that control the global flows of financial capital. Regimes of flexible labor and the increase in migration have clearly relativized the importance of territoriality—as well as the importance of common languages and histories—as the center of national identity and created new forms of "affiliation" for subjects in societies to which they either belong or have adopted as their own.⁴⁶ All of this has caused substantial modifications on the level of collective identity in terms of the forms of interaction and participation that subjects either take over or imagine as part of their being with others. Therefore, it is undeniable that many contemporary phenomena avoid, perhaps not unexpectedly, what the editors of *Amauta* were able to conceptualize with regard to the ethnic and cultural transformations of the Andean region. To give just one clearly identifiable example in the case of Peru, the dynamics of cholification that have existed in the Andes since the end of the Second World War have produced, as Quijano argues, a process of de-Indianization in Peru that is occurring at the same time as a noticeable hybridization of the

primarily urban *criollo*-señorial culture in that country, which reinforces the marginality of broad segments of society that remain trapped between diverse social and political forces.⁴⁷ In Quijano's words, "una amplia parte de la población que no se des-indianizó fue víctima de la guerra sucia entre el terrorismo de Estado y el de Sendero Luminoso entre 1980 y 2000. Según el *Informe de la Comisión de la Verdad y la Reconciliación*, la mayoría de los más de 60 mil asesinados en ese periodo eran precisamente campesinos indígenas" ("Don Quijote" 19–20). Situations such as these demand an expansion of the analysis of the Andean region to include categories, methods, and principles that can address new social subjects and new problems arising out of postmodern forms of subjectivity and socialization and to claim any discourse that becomes established within the ethics of community relations and struggles against social inequality and political impunity. The new social dynamics registered in Latin America, characterized by the importance of phenomena like migration on both a national and transnational level, the effects of political violence, drug trafficking, and so on, all introduce substantial transformations in individual and collective subjectivity that Mariátegui never could have foreseen.⁴⁸ In any event, this does not detract from the value of his work. Rather, read with the requisite historical perspective, Mariátegui continues to surprise us with his multiple and insightful intuitions and projections, providing us with a corpus of challenging readings that are capable of articulating continuities and variations in Latin American cultural history without discarding the entirety of a body of thought that contributed much more than merely particular reflections on a specific but in many respects paradigmatic cultural region of "Nuestra América."

d) In the context of his political ideology and his adherence to the "philosophy of praxis," the attention Mariátegui paid to the relations between aesthetics and politics cannot help but be pragmatic (or perhaps programmatic—implying with this term a close connection between the interpretation of the symbolic product and the project of political emancipation), although he never stooped to reductive or mechanistic interpretations. Castro-Klarén has correctly argued that the gesture of

reading and evaluation that Mariátegui set forth in his notion of the “process” of literature in *Seven Interpretative Essays*, but which is also present in many of his essays and in the editorial program of *Amauta*, produces a polemic against the lettered city as a space for the production and reproduction of ideology. We should emphasize the obvious: this polemic was also produced from within the lettered city, which is to say, as a critical operation that assumed a belligerent perspective with regard to the restrictions and elitism of “high” culture but which was also marked by those same epistemological protocols, thus making Mariátegui a “man of the frontier” (Flores Galindo, *La agonía* 377) in whom contradictory ideological affiliations, cultural perspectives, and sensibilities were combined and which gave his thought its characteristic agonic tension. This situation is indicative of the conflicts that not only permeated Mariátegui’s exceptional work but also characterized *criollo* culture in general as a product of imaginaries colonized by Eurocentric thought and institutions and/or processes of production that represent “high” urban, bourgeois, patriarchal culture. Mariátegui’s thought, which conceives of and works toward the decolonization of imaginaries, undoubtedly entails an intellectual and ideological tour de force whose inherent conflicts should not be ignored or minimized. From this complex position, which is nonetheless clarified by his political thought, Mariátegui perceives the constant and profuse “contaminations” between “high” culture and popular culture, as well as the exchanges and borrowing that take place between the different systems that tensely coexist in the diversity of Andean society. He also advises us of the necessity to historicize cultural development through models that do not reduce these processes to verifiable stages in metropolitan cultures or to rigid principles of connection between imagination and reality, between ideology and aesthetics. The organicity of natural culture is a difficult goal to achieve when taking into account the profound fragmentations that affect postcolonial society. Hence, the fluid and without-fixed-temporal-limits, three-way partition Mariátegui proposes for the study of Peruvian literature focuses in particular on the connections symbolic produc-

tion has with the conditions of cultural production and with Peruvian international relations. Colonial, cosmopolitan, and national literature constitutes the formula for an order that seeks not to reduce but rather to liberate discourse as the product of a creativity that can only serve to found what is proper to it once it has been liberated from the colonizers' yoke and then nurtured by the multiplicity of registers and models that the world of culture offers to the national-in-formation. Mariátegui separates César Vallejo, whom he considered the founder of Peruvian literature and at the same time a worthy member of the prestigious canon of "world literature," from any folklorist tendencies: the voice of this at once atypical and paradigmatic poet speaks for a transnationalized subject who is both individual and collective, national and universal, indigenous but connected to the European avant-gardes that enabled the birth of a new sensibility. With an avant-garde voice he expresses a split and potent subjectivity, desolate and at the same time full, overflowing, capable of interpellating the diversified audience of his day with lyricism, altered by the radical contradictions of global capitalism, trapped in the paradoxes of the tragedy of world war, and anguished by the search for social alternatives and new symbolic forms with which to represent the fragmentation of bourgeois rationality and the drama of large groups of people marginalized by modernizing projects. In Vallejo, as in Arguedas, language constitutes a decolonizing praxis; imagination is an agency that moves between the individual and the community, nurtured by reality only to denounce it and perhaps overcome it.⁴⁹ Mariátegui perceives the flows that permeate Peruvian culture, derived from the postcolonial condition of Latin America: orality/writing, myth/history, Quechua/Spanish, localism/cosmopolitanism, Occidentalism/pre-Occidentalism (that is, colonized cultures versus vernacular perspectives that cannot be assimilated to European models)—all elements that constitute the polyphonic and split subject who inhabits the Andean world.

Mariátegui, "the Walter Benjamin of Latin American letters," incorporated into his reflections commentaries on the effect of technology in general and on cinema in particular, referring in many cases to the

intersections between science, art, and technology that characterized the first decades of the twentieth century and which Futurism and other tendencies developed in a polemical way.⁵⁰ However, perhaps the most original aspect of Mariátegui's work on the process of cultural re-signification is his early awareness of the knowledge/power relationship, which incorporates intercultural dynamics into the problem of inequality in struggles for representational hegemony. Not simply dual or diverse, Peruvian culture is for Mariátegui a multiple, motley, and contradictory culture in which plural systems coexist in constant conflict, in agony, due to the originary trauma of the Conquest, which marked an anomalous and always disadvantageous entrance into the exclusive space of Occidentalism. Mariátegui is conscious that the distance between lettered culture and represented realities—that is, what Cornejo Polar would call, following the path opened up by *Amauta*, the heterogeneity of Andean literatures—creates inevitable distortions in the symbolic production of the region. Thus, he refers, for example, to the “stylization and idealization” of the Indian, romanticized by visions elaborated by urban intellectuals who, although sympathetic to the indigenous cause, cannot but offer images mediated by the experiences and imaginaries of their own social universe, which in Mariátegui's day was still engaged in the processes of self-recognition and symbolic self-representation. Indianism is thus a transitional, “*mestizo* literature” that surpasses Indianism without overcoming the foreignness that operates as a referent for the symbolic forms elaborated to re-present it from the *criollo* perspective.

BY WAY OF CONCLUSION

Emerging a little more than one hundred years after Latin American independence, Mariátegui's work is a critical reflection on diverse registers that is still germane to us today and which is still admired for the conceptual and ideological accomplishments it inspires in contemporary contexts, as well as for the polemics that its premises and historical interpretations undoubtedly continue to provoke. Some have wondered

what Mariátegui's direct influence has actually been on Peruvian thought and political processes, concluding that, even recognizing the enormous importance of his work, his "value" seems to be nonexistent, if we understand value to be a matter of concretely connecting his analysis and arguments to contemporary processes and the actions of political leaders and thinkers in the Andean region. In this sense, Mariátegui has not, strictly speaking, had any significant followers. David Sobrevilla, for example, has attempted to catalogue those aspects that would constitute "what is living and what is dead in Mariátegui's thought." He avers that both Marxism in general and Mariátegui thought in particular provide an insufficient treatment of the base-superstructure relation and absolutize the category of class as a foundation of political analysis, and that these aspects require significant clarification from the perspective of the present. Sobrevilla questions Mariátegui's adherence to what he calls "the dead path of socialism": the Sorelian valorization of myth as a revitalizing element of collective imaginaries (424). He nevertheless reaffirms the need "to preserve the ethical component of Marxism" emphasized by Mariátegui's thought, and he recognizes that some of the latter's analyses are still valid, such as those related to the duality between the Westernization of the Peruvian coastal region and the conservatism of the Quechua-speaking areas in the highlands, or those that give prominence to economic issues over cultural, political, religious, or educational issues in the analysis of indigenous matters. For Sobrevilla, the greatest challenge to Leftist thought in Peru is "to go with Mariátegui beyond Mariátegui" (426), which is to say, to manage to revitalize the thought of one of the core founders of Latin American Marxism, converting it not into a sclerotic repertoire of propositions and political and ideological formulas but into a platform for new approaches that respond to the challenges of the present.⁵¹

The continuity of Mariátegui's analysis and proposals, as well as of the problems he confronted, is significant and points to the perpetuation of forms of domination that affect postcolonial societies where, nevertheless, emancipatory thought continues to develop in alternative spaces, oriented

not toward the goal of formal independence but toward the total political, economic, and epistemic liberation of postcolonial societies. Strongly bound to its historical moment and at the same time sharply oriented toward the grand horizons of modernity, Occidentalism, and coloniality, Mariátegui's work remains relevant to contemporary conflicts and debates and is still full of meaning and challenges. If it does produce, as some have argued, "a postmodern reorganization of coloniality," then it is also certain that our era shows obvious signs of the gradual recuperation of his political thought in different contexts and on distinct levels.⁵² The presence of social movements in the arena of Latin American political struggle, the processes of cholification in the Andean region, the challenges of globalization, the activation of segments of society invisibilized by modernity that articulate agendas for public demands, testing state institutions' flexibility and capacity for cooptation, as well as the reemergence and internal revisions of Marxism (which we see today laboriously negotiating within the context of neoliberalism and appealing to a state populism whose seductive power and demagogic inclinations are known all too well in Latin America), all constitute variants of a process with deep roots in colonialism. These problems call for a relativization of the triumphalism of the formal independence that ended "historical" colonialism and demands a confrontation with the challenges of liberation from the disillusioned horizons of a present that confront us with the failures of modernity and new forms of global political and economic hegemony are clear. From this new stage of Latin American history, Mariátegui's thought still interpellates the political imaginaries of the region, where the spectrality of the Left once again is reincarnated in the social body, confronting theory with the inescapable materiality of the processes and agents that inhabit the peripheral societies of Latin America.

NOTES

1. [The original Spanish expression used by Mariátegui is “colonialismo supérstite,” which refers to the remnants or surviving traits of colonialism in the modern era. —Tr.]
2. It is not my concern here to elaborate at length on the differences between the concepts of independence, emancipation and liberation. Suffice it to say that the first of these terms generally names (within the historical contexts that we are analyzing here) the culmination of colonial domination as a result of *criollo* uprisings and is associated with the notion of sovereignty and the formation of the nation state. The second, frequently regarded as synonymous with “independence,” emphasizes an autonomy that is ideally derived from the severing of connections with the metropole. More broadly, it is linked to the discussion of topics like self-determination, liberty, free will, etc. It is thus inscribed within Enlightenment logic. Like “independence,” “emancipation” refers to the cancellation of forms of subordination or submission to conditions imposed on the basis of inequalities that emerged in Latin America with the advent of colonization. For this reason, some critics consider “emancipation” to be a term that continues to orient the debate around European models. Finally, “liberation” has a broad meaning that indicates the overturning of various forms of slavery, submission, exploitation, subalternization, etc., frequently associated with a utopian horizon that guides anti-status quo and anti-imperialist social action and directs the production of politico-ideological agendas, as suggested by the phrase “national liberation movements.” In “The Rhetoric of Modernity,” Walter Mignolo discusses the differences between emancipation and liberation, noting that Ernesto Laclau, for example, opts for the first term while Enrique Dussel uses the second, a difference that goes beyond the merely terminological and signals an emphasis on the continuation or the overcoming of Eurocentrism. In this same study, Mignolo develops the idea that emancipation and liberation are two sides of the same coin: modernity/coloniality. However, in the present book the three terms are used in a way that is more or less unbound by these definitions, as the different contexts of their usage will help show.

3. On the relations between the national bourgeoisie, the oligarchy, and imperialism in Mariátegui's Peru, see Quijano, "José Carlos Mariátegui: Reencuentro y debate."
4. [marxists.org/archive/mariategui/works/7-interpretive-essays/essay02.htm. Unless otherwise noted, all translations of Mariátegui's works in this essay are from the Marxist Internet Archive. —Tr.]
5. In this sense, Cornejo Polar remarked that Mariátegui held the idea that only from a revolutionary position could one actually strengthen tradition and convert it into a "living history" ("Mariátegui y su propuesta," 58).
6. Without entering here into a discussion about the much-debated question of "Mariátegui's Marxism" (even though he more than once declared himself to be a "confessed and convicted Marxist"), it suffices to mention that his project of "Peruvianizing" Marxism (in order to use Raimundo Prado's idea) constitutes one of the most groundbreaking and productive efforts to think the specificity of Latin America, while putting European theories in the service of this task (and not the inverse). Aricó correctly argued, as Dussel recalls, that *Seven Interpretive Essays* is "the only theoretically significant work of Latin American Marxism" (see Sobrevilla [1995] 31). Sobrevilla offers a brief summary of the main positions elaborated on the relation between Mariátegui's work and Marxism, the degree to which he was heterodox, romantic, "confusionist," or utopian, his relations with APRA and social democracy, and his debts to Nietzsche, Sorel, Bergson, Croce, Lenin, Freud, and Gramsci. See also Sobrevilla's detailed work, *El marxismo de Mariátegui y su aplicación a los 7 ensayos*. For his part, Quijano contextualizes "Mariátegui's Marxism" according to the challenges of his time. His hypothesis is that Mariátegui developed "una propuesta autónoma tanto frente a ese historicismo chato y positivismo pálido que él encontraba en la social-democracia europea de su tiempo, como frente al llamado bolcheviquismo y al marxismo-leninismo, sobre todo tal como éste comenzaba a desarrollarse desde mediados de los años veinte" (Quijano, "El marxismo en Mariátegui" 41). In examining these debates, it is important to remember that several of Marx's key works were only published after Mariátegui's death, like the *Grundrisse*, *The German Ideology*, and the *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844*, which Quijano argues underscores the significance and originality of many of Mariátegui's political and economic intuitions ("El marxismo de Mariátegui" 42). Nor was he aware of later editions of *Capital*, as Dussel has demonstrated. According to

- Dussel, this allowed Mariátegui to orient himself instead toward political praxis and to “oponerse al positivismo, al materialismo ingenuo y aún a las filosofías de la historia propias del idealismo italiano—pero también al etapismo y a la visión unilineal de la historia del mismo Lenin” (*El último Marx*, 282).
7. According to Bolívar Echeverría’s analysis of Walter Benjamin’s thesis in *Valor de uso y utopía*, the very idea of temporality should be rethought in a socialist frame, which was folded into the liberal conception of this category without managing to propose its substantial transformation. The notion of progress intrinsic to the liberal conception of modernity supposes an “empty and homogeneous” temporal development that “mira el transcurrir de la vida como una serie de alteraciones que siguen una trayectoria rectilínea y ascendente; alteraciones que acontecen dentro de un receptáculo, el tiempo, que no es tocado por ellas y al que ellas no afectan.” This “apreciación instrumentalista y espacialista del tiempo histórico como un lugar indiferente o ajeno a lo que acontece en él” creates an “aversión progresista a la tradición” that Mariátegui tries (we can speculate) to recover, opening up “una dimensión [...] hacia el pasado” (Echeverría 138–139) that allows for a heterodox reformulation of Andean historicity, productively incorporating premodernity into the utopia of indigenous American socialism. (This note freely borrows from Echeverría’s reflections in *Valor de uso y utopía* 133–141).
 8. We would do well here to remember Mariátegui’s critique of the regional as an instance coopted by state centralism, an instance that should be re-empowered and re-signified in order to thus activate local agendas on this level (see, for example, *Peruanicemos al Perú*). In the present essay, *the regional* is understood in relation to the “Andean region,” or what Ángel Rama called “the Andean cultural area.”
 9. According to Cornejo Polar, this idea of an “Incan communism,” even though technically untenable, had served as the basis for Mariátegui’s thinking on the “nationalization of socialism,” which is to say, the organic link between Andean history and Western history (“Mariátegui y su propuesta” 58–60).
 10. In this regard, Dussel remarks: “Sin clara conciencia del ‘sistema-mundo’ [Mariátegui] usa la categoría ‘feudal’ para caracterizar la economía peruana en su conjunto. En efecto, si ‘los colonizadores se preocuparon casi únicamente de la explotación del oro y de la plata peruanos’ [Ensayo 1] es porque por la España ‘moderna,’ mercantilista, el Perú se integraba al ‘sistema-mundo,’ aportando con México el primer

'dinero mundial': la plata (y en menor medida el oro). No era un sistema económico feudal, pero sí periférico." (Dussel, "El marxismo de Mariátegui" in Sobrevilla 32).

11. This is most likely the only form of totalization (a concept analyzed in part 6, "The Concept of Totality," on page 48) that Mariátegui did not analyze on the national level.
12. With regard to the Frankfurt School critics, Bolívar Echeverría says of Marxist theories of modernity: "Fuertemente influido, en contra de su estirpe hegeliana, por la visión del progreso técnico propia del Iluminismo francés que permeaba al Industrialismo inglés de su época, Marx no avanzaría en verdad en el camino de una crítica radical de la forma natural del mundo y de la vida en la época moderna. El ejemplo más claro es el que muestra a un Marx acrítico ante la idolatría de la técnica, confiado, como los filósofos del siglo XVIII, en que el desarrollo de las fuerzas productivas habrá de ser suficientemente poderoso como para vencer la 'deformación' introducida en ellas por su servicio histórico a la acumulación del capital" (*Valor de uso*, 65). Although Echeverría recognizes that the Frankfurt School is discussing a form of modern life that Marx never could have predicted, he believes that the subject should be taken up again in order to think the problem of modernity from present circumstances. On this point, Kohan writes: "El tratamiento marxiano de la modernidad se apoya implícitamente en un tipo de racionalidad dialéctica de neta herencia hegeliana. Intenta nutrirse —no siempre sin problemas y con no pocas contradicciones— tanto de la visión ilustrada, cientificista y moderna, como de la constelación cultural romántica, anticapitalista y crítica de la modernidad (recuérdese la huella del joven Goethe, para dar sólo un ejemplo en este último sentido)" (Kohan 220). Dussel also analyzes the topic of modernity (although from a post-Marxist perspective) in developing his concept of *transmodernity*.
13. The changes related to the desacralization and re-enchantment of the world that mark the passage from *The Communist Manifesto* (which Kohan refers to as a "modernist" manifesto [224]) to *Capital* center on the subject of commodity fetishism as a principal notion for the development of the theory of value. This theory allows Marx to elaborate an increasingly demystified vision of progress and to concentrate on the processes of reification, oppression, and alienation associated with modernity. Mariátegui was obviously more influenced by the "modernist" vision of Marxism because he never knew (although he could have thought or intuited) some of the developments in Marxist thought

that were published after his death. On the ideological displacements between the *Manifiesto* and *Capital*, see Kohan 219–225. On Marxism and modernity, see Löwy, “La crítica marxista de la modernidad.”

14. It is precisely this connection that Mariátegui is able to conceive of between tradition and modernity that allows him to resolve other antagonisms and to articulate new proposals that address the specificity of the Andean world. According to Cornejo Polar, “Mariátegui obviaba las voluntariosas e improbables predicciones del indigenismo más duro, que presuponía el futuro como un desarrollo de lo indígena, con la menor cantidad posible de contaminaciones foráneas, y en cambio producía una imagen convincente en la que lo nuevo, cualquiera que fuera su procedencia, se injertaba en el viejo tronco de la tradición nacional y lo hacía reverdecer” (“Mariátegui y su propuesta,” 60).
15. In the Andean context, other approaches come to similar conclusions by trying to comprehend the national question and the behavior of the ruling classes and the oppressed masses in dependent, multi-ethnic, and multicultural societies. For example, in the Bolivian context, the “apparent state” to which René Zavaleta Mercado refers once again takes up the idea of the phantasmatic quality of the feudal *criollo* state in which elitist and aristocratic ideas predominated, disregarding the plural nature of the national-popular subject in the Andean region and imposing an illusory unity and cohesion onto the heterogeneity of social formations marked by the violence of colonialist domination and the dynamics of popular resistance.
16. See Quijano; Cornejo Polar, “Mariátegui y su propuesta de una modernidad de raíz andina;” and Beigel, 207–208.
17. Cornejo Polar comments on a text Vargas Llosa published in *Harper's Magazine*, quoting the latter: “[Vargas Llosa] says: ‘Perhaps there is no realistic way to integrate our societies other than by asking the Indians to pay this high price [that is, ‘renunciation of their culture, their language; their beliefs, their traditions, and customs, and the adoption of the culture of their ancient masters’]. Perhaps the ideal—that is, the preservation of the primitive cultures of America—is a utopia incompatible with this other and more urgent goal—the establishment of societies in which social and economic inequalities among citizens be reduced to human, reasonable limits and where everybody can enjoy at least a decent and free life” (“Mariátegui y su propuesta” 60).
18. It is on this basis that Mariátegui elaborated his position regarding the transition to socialism, with the understanding that, to the extent that

the working class continues to develop, a gradual proletarianization of the state occurs. The class character of the revolution is one of the points of divergence between Mariátegui's perspective and the more orthodox positions of the Third International. On the relationship of "local history and the world conjuncture" that informs these adjustments, see Quijano, "José Carlos Mariátegui: Reencuentro y debate."

19. See Beigel, "La relación entre el proyecto mariateguiano y los sujetos sociales." On the class-subject-nation relationship, see Laclau, *Politics and Ideology in Marxist Theory*, and Quijano, "Raza, etnia y nación en Mariátegui."
20. The American Popular Revolutionary Alliance (Alianza Popular Revolucionaria Americana) is a center-left political party in Peru.
21. For more on this topic, see the chapter "Crisis y populismo en América Latina," as well as "Indigenismo y nacionalidad en el Perú," in Moraña, *Literatura y cultura nacional*. Mariátegui's divergence from the Stalinist leadership of the Third International is widely known, particularly with regard to his interpretation of imperialism in Latin America and its relation to class struggle. Mariátegui understood the phenomenon of imperialism as a manifestation of the final stage of capitalism (the transnationalized expansion of capital and the international alliance of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat).
22. Developing this line of Mariátegui's thought, but applying it strictly to the cultural level, Cornejo Polar also discusses the notion of the subject, recognizing the Romantic imprint of this concept on modernity and thus comparing the qualities that are attributed (because of its simplifying uses) to the Marxist category of social class. According to Cornejo Polar, this notion also has many vulgar uses with flattening connotations attributed to an internal, "identitarian" coherence that does not conform to the cultural complexities of the contexts in which it is applied. Instead, he elaborates the notion of a "complex, scattered, multiple subject" "formed by the unstable fissures and intersections of many dissimilar, oscillating, and heterogeneous identities," a definition that attempts to demystify "the monolithic, one-dimensional and prideful, coherent subject" (Cornejo Polar, *Writing in the Air* 7, 8, 10).
23. In theoretical work inspired by Mariátegui, Quijano was one of the first critics to discuss the political potential of the concept of heterogeneity as a theoretical tool for deconstructing nationalist ideology and the forms of domination that it supports. Thus, Quijano refers to the "tension of intersubjectivity" that, beginning with the trauma of European coloniza-

tion, characterizes Latin American imaginaries (“La nueva heterogeneidad” 58). On the cultural level, in the 1970s Cornejo Polar would develop a productive use of the concept of heterogeneity, particularly in literary studies, placing emphasis on the non-dialectical character of conflict in the region. On the uses and evolution of the concept of heterogeneity in Cornejo Polar, see my essays in *Crítica impura*.

24. In a sense similar to Mariátegui’s, other analysts of Andean society have also attempted to theorize the ethno-cultural multiplicity of the region vis-à-vis national consolidation projects, noting that these projects presuppose a unification around state institutions, the homogenization of the citizenry, etc., and that such conditions contradict the multifaceted nature of Andean social formations, which have been subject to unequal treatment since the colonial period. Referring to this problem, Fernando Calderón argues that in the case of Bolivia, “fueron muy importantes los estudios sobre la cuestión nacional que realizaron Sergio Almaraz Paz y René Zavaleta Mercado, preocupados como estaban por comprender el problema de la constitución nacional y las vinculaciones entre las fuerzas externas y los procesos internos. El primero interesado más en la crítica al comportamiento psico-social de las nuevas clases dirigentes; el segundo más obsesionado por las fuerzas de las masas, pero ambos instalados en el tema de cómo construir una nación en un país dependiente en medio de una sociedad abigarrada.” However, Calderón adds, “Es curioso cómo Almaraz y Zavaleta no lograron analizar la cuestión nacional desde la óptica del pluralismo sociocultural, especialmente respecto del problema étnico y campesino, pero también urbano y regional, temas por lo demás tan afines al pensamiento gramsciano y a la construcción de una democracia pluralista” (Calderón 157). Zavaleta Mercado developed his theory of the “motley society” [*sociedad abigarrada*] (which was in many ways similar to the theory of “heterogeneity” elaborated by Mariátegui, as well as Cornejo Polar’s “contradictory and non-dialectical totality”) to refer to the complexity of Bolivian social formations, which bring together different temporalities, modes of production, and imaginaries that are incoherent or poorly articulated in the “totality” of the nation (Zavaleta Mercado, *Lo nacional popular en Bolivia*). In a study of Zavaleta Mercado’s work, Luis Tapia loosely associates the concept of the “motley society” with the Baroque as it is defined by Carpentier, since, according to Tapia, “el barroco es un tipo de producción cultural que se hace sobre las condiciones del abigarramiento social” (Tapia, 320). This approach tends to “naturalize” the disorder of society as a

Latin American *quality*, which, in my opinion, weakens the concept of Zavaleta Mercado's more overtly political content.

25. As Dussel argues, to give one example, "las comunidades indígenas no son clase ni nación-Estado, sino etnias o naciones originarias, anteriores a los Estados criollos-mestizos del capitalismo dependiente y deben ser tratados como sujetos autónomos en los niveles político, económico, cultural, educativo, religioso, etc." ("El marxismo de Mariátegui" 37).
26. It is important to retain here Homi Bhabha's distinction between the notions of cultural diversity and cultural difference. The notion of cultural diversity indicates an "epistemological object" ("culture as an object of empirical knowledge"), while the concept of cultural difference designates a process of enunciation of culture as "knowable"—that is, a process of signification connected to the production of fields of power and social identification. For Bhabha, the notion of cultural diversity, based in relativism, gives way to liberal developments in the politics of multiculturalism: "Cultural diversity is also the representation of a radical rhetoric of the separation of totalized cultures that live unsullied by the intertextuality of their historical locations, safe in the Utopianism of a mythic memory of a unique collective identity" (49–50). Instead, Bhabha wants to call attention to the problems related to cultural difference as a space in which power struggles are produced as manifestations of efforts to exercise cultural supremacy or cultural authority in processes of cultural identification (epistemological domination). Bhabha's perspectives are useful for reflecting on Mariátegui's cultural(ist) conception, which recognizes the need for alternative models, traditions, and systems of reference that can perceive the historical drama of difference and inequality where liberal perspectives are only in the best of cases able to recognize that evidence of diversity exists (Bhabha 4–56).
27. According to Quijano, "Determinadas sociedades se establecen como un orden de dominación entre grupos sociales portadores de universos culturales distintos estructuralmente, no sólo en cuanto a los elementos que las constituyen, a su modo de ordenamiento interno, sino también a su orientación valórico-cognitiva básica [...] La categoría 'heterogeneidad estructural' fue acuñada en América Latina, después de la Segunda Guerra Mundial, para dar cuenta del modo característico de constitución de nuestra sociedad, una combinación y contraposición de patrones estructurales cuyos orígenes y naturaleza eran muy diversos entre sí." As Quijano remarks, he himself uses the concept of structural heterogeneity in his book *El proceso de urbanización en América Latina* (1966),

as does Aníbal Pinto in *Tres ensayos sobre Chile y América Latina* (1971) ("La nueva heterogeneidad estructural de América Latina" 28–29). Mirko Lauer also contributes to this genealogy of the concept of heterogeneity, which was used in the field of sociology before it was ever applied to literary studies (140; special thanks to Sergio R. Franco for this reference). On the contradictory coexistence of social sectors and cultures that come from different traditions, see also Quijano, *Dominación y cultura* 28.

28. According to Mariátegui in his prologue to Valcárcel's book, the value of myth had already been discovered by Georges Sorel as a reaction to the "mediocre positivism" of the socialism of his day. Much has been written on the influence of Sorel (and through him, of Henri Bergson), on *Amauta*, the journal edited by Mariátegui. These influences, as well as those of Benedetto Croce and Miguel de Unamuno, connect with Mariátegui's early mystical inclinations and with his ethical and aesthetic interests, frequently leading to a heterodox theorization of socio-cultural issues and their relation to politics. Sorel's polemical work, which Mariátegui discovered during his stay in Italy and which he cites profusely in his writings, was also admired by Gramsci. Passing from his monarchist phase to Marxism, Sorel counterposed Marx's rationalism and utopianism with the principles of Christianity, closely investigating the moral implications of politics and the legitimacy of revolutionary violence. On this basis, he developed a radically heterodox variant of Marxism: anarcho-syndicalism, or revolutionary syndicalism. He regarded the decadence of civilization as an evil that affects all levels of Western society and ended up opposing historical materialism, dialectical materialism, internationalism, and any partisan affiliation of the proletariat. According to the principles of the First International, he understood the workers as constituting an autonomous class that will historically redeem itself through its own revolutionary dynamic, unconnected to any established institutions, including political parties. Other authors, such as Michael Löwy, have seen Mariátegui instead as a representative of a "Romantic Marxism" that would indicate the crisis of instrumental reason and the search for a dimension that would articulate presence and desire, reality and the ideal, integrating archaicizing elements of pre-modernity into the socialist project. See Löwy, "Marxism and Romanticism in the Work of José Carlos Mariátegui," as well as Löwy's interview with Néstor Kohan.
29. The place of belief is also recognized within liberation struggles as a fundamental element of activating the masses and getting them to par-

ticipate in independent projects. For example, Bolívar recognized in his “Letter to Jamaica,” referring to the importance of the Virgin of Guadalupe in Mexico’s independence, that “el entusiasmo político ha formado una mezcla con la religión, que ha producido un fervor vehementemente por la sagrada causa de la libertad.”

30. For Mariátegui, Valcárcel’s “prophetic book,” *Tempestad en los Andes*, announced a political messianism through indigenism. On the “spiritualization of Marxism” in Mariátegui, see Beigel 208–211, París, and Guadarrama González, as well as Quijano, who discusses París’s interpretation, among others, in “José Carlos Mariátegui: Reencuentro y debate” li–lvi.
31. This discussion implies a reinterpretation of Mariátegui that has not yet been undertaken through the kind of deconstructive reading Derrida makes of Marxism and through Derridean theories that have been produced on the theme of emancipation. See, for example, Laclau in his commentary on *Specters of Marx* in *Emancipation(s)*. It would also be productive to establish critical and theoretical interrelations between Mariátegui and Benjamin, especially in relation to the way in which they both conceived of modernity and in their heterodox elaborations of Marxism in distinct but convergent registers.
32. See Fernández Díaz, who elaborates on the theme of subjectivity/otherness in Mariátegui’s revolutionary vision, as well as on the historical and ideological importance of the journal *Amauta*.
33. Recall the positions Mariátegui expressed in *Defense of Marxism*, where he polemicizes against the Belgian social democrat Henri de Man. Among other things, the book explains Mariátegui’s ideas on the role of the proletariat, the subjective dimension of social struggle, and the ideological axes that define his “philosophy of praxis,” rejecting de Man’s disillusioned and reformist positions and arguments about the determinism and voluntarism of Marxism (which its philosophical detractors never fail to emphasize).
34. This difference between state and nation is also noted in the case of Bolivia by Zavaleta Mercado, who discusses the contradictions of nationalization without equality and discovers the definitive character of Andean “motley society” in social disarticulation. As Rossana Barragán argues, referring to Luis Tapia’s book *La producción del conocimiento local* [The production of local knowledge]: “Tapia nos recuerda que cuando Zavaleta hablaba de formación social abigarrada se refería no sólo a la coexistencia de distintas temporalidades, de distintas formas

políticas en un mismo espacio, sino fundamentalmente a la desarticulación que existía entre estos factores conformantes del entramado social. La desarticulación de estas formas sociales es lo que principalmente define su carácter abigarrado" (Barragán 3).

35. As Guillermo O'Donnell writes, "El Estado garantiza y organiza la reproducción de la sociedad *qua* capitalista porque se halla respecto de ello en una relación de complicidad estructural [...] La sociedad capitalista es un sesgo sistemático y habitual hacia su reproducción en tanto tal: lo mismo es el Estado, aspecto de ella" (qtd. in Dussel, *El último Marx* 281).
36. Mariátegui greatly admired González Prada and was strongly influenced by his impassioned writings, in which Mariátegui claimed "the seed of the new national spirit can be found." Despite González Prada's anarcho-positivist orientation, Mariátegui maintains that, starting with his work, the limitations of the colonial period began to be overcome and an era of cosmopolitanism was established. In addition, González Prada was the first to recognize in Peru the importance of the masses as a social force and the weakness of any national project that disregards them. "No forman el verdadero Perú," as González Prada writes in his celebrated speech at Politeama in 1888, "las agrupaciones de criollos y extranjeros que habitan la faja de tierra situada entre el Pacífico y los Andes; la nación está formada por las muchedumbres de indios diseminadas en la banda oriental de la cordillera." See González Prada, *Páginas libres* (1894) and *Nuestros indios* (written in 1904 and published posthumously) in his *Obras*.
37. On the relationship between coloniality and race, see Walter Mignolo's development (based on Quijano's work) of the notion of colonial difference. See also Quijano, "Colonialidad del poder y clasificación social" and "Don Quijote y los molinos de viento."
38. "In an exploration of the political-intellectual links between Gramsci and Mariátegui, Timothy Brennan has noted how the latter seems to translate Gramsci's notion of a domestic colonialism to Peru, so that 'the language of class wears the garments of race and ethnicity, where each of those categories corresponds to a sub-population with its own histories and traditions possessing uneven potential in providing a basis for a not-yet-realized national culture'" (Young 199).
39. Larsen identifies the theme of the national as one of the central debates of Latin Americanism. According to Larsen, most reflection on this topic appears by means of a "sterile oscillation" between two forms of reification or ideological mystification. One form is the "essentialist fallacy,"

in which the nation corresponds to something given, to an inert and immediate empirical object which relates in a transparent and mechanical way to collective imaginaries. The other form is the “textualist fallacy,” in which the concept of the nation is understood as a variable and contingent construct, an “effect” or “illusion” derived from the narratives generated by each culture’s own imaginaries. Mariátegui’s perspective provides an alternative to this dilemma, combining the materiality of the national—which does not precede but instead presides *over* ideological elaborations—and the ideological (representational) dimension from which collective imaginaries are expressed with the temporal dimension (of historical development and the integration of simultaneous temporalities) and the elaboration of power as the determining instance for the articulation of the social and political elements that constitute the nation.

40. In his note on Simón Bolívar (solicited by Charles Dana, the Publisher of the *New York Daily Tribune* in 1857 as a contribution to the biographies to be included in the *New American Encyclopaedia*), Marx expressed his criticisms of Latin American emancipation, considering it to be a matter of a series of movements representing the interests of the *criollo* elite with an aristocratic orientation toward political power with hints of Bonapartism. Marx claims these movements diverted revolutionary attention away from both the national bourgeoisies and the working classes, which he perceived as the primary subjects of popular revolution. Marx’s claim, which overlooks the major problematic of colonialism and includes biographical errors and exaggerated and insulting claims about Bolívar’s character (in a letter to Engel of 14 February 1858, Marx called Bolívar “miserable, brutal, and cowardly”), has often been cited by critics of Marxism. As Aricó and others have argued, Marx himself would revise many of these claims in his later writings. It is interesting to note that in this same letter to Engels, Marx includes an observation on the mythical character of the Bolivarian movement that connects on various levels with the idea of myth as the motivating force of history, which Mariátegui would later address: “The myth-creating force of popular fantasy has manifested itself in all times in the invention of ‘great men.’ The most striking of this sort is indisputably Simón Bolívar.” From the context of this passage, we can deduce that the notion of myth is used by Marx here in a derogatory way. On Marx’s correspondence with Engels, see Radditz. On the circumstances surrounding the writing of Marx’s polemical text on Bolívar and on the relation between

Marx's claims and Hegelian ideas about "people without history," see Aricó, *Marx y América Latina*, especially chapter 8.

41. Eric Hobsbawm also made important contributions toward correcting the idea that Marxism is limited to theorizing the situations of industrialized nations only and leaving to the side any consideration of peripheral regions. See Hobsbawm, "Introduction" in Karl Marx, *Pre-Capitalist Economic Formations*.
42. We should also mention here the work of (among many others) Adolfo Sánchez Vázquez, Michael Löwy, José Aricó, Alberto Flores Galindo, Oscar Terán, Enrique Bolívar Echeverría, Néstor Kohan, Robert Paris, Fernanda Beigel, Francis Guibal, Alfonso Ibáñez, David Sobrevilla, and José Ignacio López Soria.
43. Elsewhere I have elaborated on Mariátegui's positions with respect to the "national question," a theme that for some constitutes another of Marxism's blind spots. At the same time, it is considered one of the most important elements for the adaptation of Marxist theory to Latin American contexts. See my book *Literatura y cultura nacional* and articles like "Mariátegui y la 'cuestión nacional'" and others included in my *Crítica impura*. Suffice it to say, in my estimation, Mariátegui made significant contributions to reflections on the national question and established a groundbreaking connection between this category and the notions of diversity, difference, and social inequality that I have been discussing in the present text and which became central to postcolonial theory in the final decades of the twentieth century. On Marxist theory and the national question in Latin America, see Echeverría, "El problema de la nación," particularly note 38.
44. On local knowledges, particularly in Bolivia, see Tapia, whose work is in turn based on developments made by Zavaleta Mercado.
45. For some critics, the alternative epistemology perceptible in Mariátegui's work is distinct from both bourgeois rationality and its Enlightenment-derived cult of reason and Stalinist orthodoxy. According to Arroyo Reyes, "[Mariátegui] supo intuir las bases de una racionalidad alternativa tanto a la racionalidad dominante, capitalista y eurocéntrica, como a la racionalidad reduccionista y tecnocrática que ya por ese momento se imponía en la Rusia de Stalin."
46. In this regard, see my text "Identidad y nación: ¿más de lo mismo?" in *Crítica impura*.
47. On the dynamics of discrimination and marginality associated with the phenomenon of cholification, see Nugent.

48. See Cornejo Polar's analysis of "the migrant subject" in "Una heterogeneidad no dialéctica."
49. Cornejo Polar perspicuously interprets Mariátegui's idea of cosmopolitanism as "una acumulación de capital simbólico-tecnológico, con obvias connotaciones de internacionalización, de la que surgirá la literatura nacional, como re-encauzamiento de esas energías," which is to say, as the form in which "la convergencia entre el indigenismo and el socialismo" is realized.
50. In this regard, see Kraniauskas' study, which connects Mariátegui's thought, the cinema of Charles Chaplin, and the ideas of Walter Benjamin and addresses the development of the art of film as a form of globalization that prompted Mariátegui to reflect on its historical development in relation to the advances of science and the critique of modernity. See also Melis, "Chaplin, arte aristocrático y arte democrático," in *Leyendo Mariátegui* 283–284. With regard to this aspect of Mariátegui's cultural sensibility and his interpretations of the artistic movements that appeared in the interwar period, we should recall his nuanced interpretation of the *avant-garde* as a symptom of the crisis of Western Civilization in the Old World, perceiving the capacity of these latter to destabilize the foundations of bourgeois culture, an achievement that is uncharacteristic of futurism *à la* Marinetti, who had connections to European fascists of the period and about whom Mariátegui expressed his reservations on more than one occasion.
51. With regard to the debates over Mariátegui's continued value, there is an abundance not only of critical approaches but also a number of encomia. Examples of these include, in addition to Melis, Sobrevilla, Guibal, and other classical critics of Mariátegui's work, the perspectives of Abimael Guzmán, delivered at a conference at the University of San Cristóbal de Huamanga (Ayacucho) in 1968 (geocities.com/comunismoenperu/mariategui68.htm), and Gustavo Flores Quelopana (librosperuanos.com/articulos/gustavo-flores9.html).
52. Castro-Gómez's argument, which is opposed to Hardt and Negri's positions, proposes that, before the contemporary hegemony of capitalism and its epistemological models, a hegemony that originated in the idea of the supposed ethnic and cognitive superiority of the colonizer, it is necessary to achieve an "epistemic democracy" that would allow for alternative forms of knowledge and ways of knowing that come from non-Western cultures ("Postmodern Reorganization").