



PROJECT MUSE®

Two Versions of the *Mestizo* Model: Toward a Theory of
Anti-Blackness in Latin American Thought

Miguel Gualdron Ramirez

The Journal of Speculative Philosophy, Volume 37, Number 3, 2023, pp.
319-332 (Article)

Published by Penn State University Press



➔ For additional information about this article

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/904117>

🔗 For content related to this article

https://muse.jhu.edu/related_content?type=article&id=904117

Two Versions of the *Mestizo* Model *Toward a Theory of Anti-Blackness in Latin American Thought*

Miguel Gualdron Ramirez

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

ABSTRACT: This article offers the first step in an ongoing project of revisiting the foundations of *latinidad* and *lo latinoamericano* by focusing on the exclusions enacted by the history of these concepts and the cultural and political identity that comes with them. In conversation with Susana Nuccetelli and Omar Rivera, the author focuses on two emblematic authors in the history of Latin American philosophy (Simón Bolívar and José de Vasconcelos) that are usually read as offering a novel, liberatory conception of the Latin American reality/identity, categorically different from European and Anglo-American conceptions. This common reading of some of the foundational texts on Latin American identity, however, conceals not only the active, textual removal of Blackness in the construction of this identity, but also the literal subtraction of Black bodies, lives, and histories from the Latin American nations and communities. Both of these elements are an explicit part of the philosophical programs of Bolívar and Vasconcelos. The article shows how the thought and political practice of these two authors, celebrated in different ways as foundational of what we understand as Latin America today, exemplify the exclusionary historical demarcation of *latinidad*.

KEYWORDS: Simón Bolívar, José de Vasconcelos, *mestizaje*, *latinidad*, anti-Blackness

In this article, I offer the first step in an ongoing project of revisiting the foundations of *latinidad*, or *lo latinoamericano*, by focusing on the exclusions enacted by the history of these concepts and the cultural and political identity that comes with them. I focus on how a Latin American identity, as fabricated in the history of Latin American philosophy, has been created on top of a removal of Black identities, cultures, and bodies. Given that such philosophical removal takes place not only theoretically, but also practically, I pay special attention to how central figures in the history of ideas enacted it through political projects and programs, and why we need to understand it as a conscious, explicit effort if we want to address the current manifestations of anti-Blackness in Latin American and Latinx communities.

The central question of the larger project might be presented as follows: What is it about the celebration of *latinidad* that so stubbornly resists to be connected with Blackness, to be touched or constituted by it? Why does a celebration of *latinidad* usually exclude the presence of Afro-*latinidad*? Consider, for example, a paradigmatic installment of Afro-Latinx erasure in US media such as the 2021 film *In the Heights* (directed by Jon M. Chu and based on the Broadway musical by Lin-Manuel Miranda), and the immediate controversy around its colorism, given that the cast included almost no Afro-Latinxs as lead roles in a film about Washington Heights, in New York City. Director, writer, producers, and cast members reacted with what seems to me genuine surprise to this controversy and appeared to be caught off guard, stunned at the realization that something had escaped their attention. While not affiliated with the film, the Puerto Rican actress Rita Moreno, irritated, came out in defense of Miranda in the face of these accusations: “You can never do right, it seems,” she said in *The Late Show with Stephen Colbert*. “Can’t you just wait a while and leave it alone?”¹

As I show in what follows, the roots of this expunging celebration can be traced already in some of the founding moments of the intellectual and political history of our contemporary ideas of Latin America and *mestizaje*. For the purposes of this article, I focus on two emblematic authors in the history of Latin American philosophy (Simón Bolívar and José de Vasconcelos) who are usually read as offering a novel, liberatory conception of the Latin American reality/identity, categorically different from a European and Anglo-American. Woven into these authors’ thoughts are ideas of *mestizaje*, self-determination, and anti-imperialism that embody the spirit of opposition to the colonial project, its racial hierarchies, and a philosophy of history that locates Europe and Anglo America at the end and

as goal. This common reading of some of the foundational texts on Latin American identity, however, conceals not only the sometimes active, textual removal of Blackness in its intellectual construction, but also the literal subtraction of Black bodies, lives, and histories from Latin American nations and communities. Both of these elements are a conscious part of the philosophical programs of Bolívar and Vasconcelos. The thought and political practice of these two authors, celebrated in different ways as foundational of what we understand as Latin America today, exemplify the demarcation of what *latinidad* effectively means and the efforts of nations to sustain this demarcation.

A Species Midway

In order to understand what is novel about Bolívar's reorganization of the American identity, Susana Nuccetelli reconstructs the thought of Bartolomé De las Casas, Bolívar, and José de Vasconcelos as an evolving model of *mestizaje* constituting a denunciation of European and US oppression and "a celebration of mixed heritage."² Nuccetelli emphasizes the liberatory aspects of conceptions of hybridity in the American continent, and the crucial Bolívarian formulations of ethnic and political identity that reclaim for *los americanos* the special, unique role of those who were fighting for independence at the end of the eighteenth century in South America. One of the fundamental elements of this *mestizaje* model in Vasconcelos, according to Nuccetelli, although this can be applied as well to Bolívar, would be the fact that it has no comparable formulation in the US at that time, and thus was novel when compared to the highly segregationist context in North America.

This is not an isolated position. This "celebration of mixed heritage" is a usual theme in the anthologies and introductions to Latin American philosophy in the United States. Discussing Nuccetelli and others who defend similar positions, Omar Rivera shows how the thought of some of these emblematic authors of Latin American philosophy (Bolívar included) is embedded in a liberatory framework that postulates the need to redeem "Latin Americans," in the sense of *criollos* or *mestizos*, from the political and cultural conditions that oppress them.³ In the case of Bolívar, this redemptive framework brings with it a necessary construction of Indigenous identity as passive and its expulsion of the self-creative commonality. I agree

with Rivera's reading, but I take a different route here to show this redemption: while Rivera focuses exclusively on Bolívar's treatment of indigenous peoples, I emphasize his particular treatment of Black populations in South America, and his take on the institution of slavery itself.

To analyze Nuccetelli's traditional conception of *mestizaje*, let us focus on what is perhaps the clearest formulation of the *mestizo* model of Latin American identity, Bolívar's "Reply of a South American to a Gentleman of This Island," better known as the "Jamaica Letter," September 6, 1815, written during his exile in Jamaica. Bolívar contends that it is now time that the world supports the just struggle for independence of the American nations being born, against the tyrannical yoke of Spain. Bolívar's formulation of this demand is tied to a form of independence that has already taken place. Even if historically the hopes for the independence of Venezuela looked grim in 1815, Bolívar locates already in the past the decision that has cut the ties that linked America to Spain.⁴ If before this decision of emancipation everything that nurtured America came from Spain, the severing of these ties with what Bolívar calls the "stepmother"⁵ has led to a state of insecurity and disjointedness that needs to be reorganized around an identity, that of the worthy victims of Spanish colonialism and the ones called to liberate the land.

Around what can this identity then be constructed? Certainly, not around those same ties that have been forever cut, because they connected the American peoples with an unnatural mother, Spain. The spirit of the people Bolívar defends in the "Jamaica Letter" is not even developed enough to be called a character, because it is still a "young people"⁶ and every possible ancestral tie has been either cut or does not apply to them. Unlike fallen empires, whose constituting nations can go back to their inherited customs and practices, Americans have nothing to go back to. "We scarcely retain a vestige of what once was; we are, moreover, neither Indian nor European, but a species midway [*especie media*] between the legitimate proprietors of this country and the Spanish usurpers."⁷

There is finally here a formulation of the identity of the "we" that Bolívar identifies with *los americanos* in his text, that of *criollos*, that has been put in the most impossible situation. As this midway species, "Americans" are born in a land that is not rightfully theirs because it belongs to the indigenous populations that inhabited it before the arrival of Europeans; *criollos* are thus foreign in the only land they know. Their only rights to ownership and extraction of land and peoples come from abroad, from Spain, but

these rights privilege foreign born authorities and take all political power away from *criollos*, forcing them into a state of “permanent infancy.” How should we then interpret this groundbreaking formulation of *los americanos* as a species midway? Not as mixture, contrary to what Nuccetelli contends.⁸ Nor as a creole identity as we can see exists in many islands of the Caribbean today. This young species is only midway, *media*, I contend, as lacking half of what the other two have, that is, rights and moral ownership over the land.

Bolívar’s “neither Indians, nor European” thus separates indigenous peoples from the “we” out of which he speaks. But if the “Jamaica Letter” at least locates them in the comparison of relevant species, it absolutely ignores the millions of Africans who had been brought against their will to the American continent, as well as their descendants; the hundreds of thousands enslaved in the Spanish territories of South America are not mentioned in the narration of the atrocities committed by the Spaniards, and also not part of any collective reconsideration of the identity of *los americanos*.

The erasure of Black lives toward the creation of a continental identity can also be seen, formally, in Bolívar’s address to British citizens and authorities, and in particular in his appeal to settlers in Jamaica. While the atrocities that the Spaniards have committed against *criollos*, are highlighted in the letter, with some mentions of the genocide against its indigenous peoples, the British crimes against enslaved Africans in the Caribbean, where Bolívar himself is formulating these demands for justice, are excluded from any consideration. The contradiction in appealing to a colonial empire for the moral and economic support against colonial atrocities is either completely lost to Bolívar, or conveniently masked in order to highlight more important atrocities committed against the victims worth fighting and dying for: non-Black Americans.

The *mestizo* model finds a different formulation in Bolívar’s thought almost four years later, on February 15, 1819, in a very different context, in the “Address Delivered at the Inauguration of the Second National Congress of Venezuela at Angostura” [“Angostura Address” from now on] the first congressional meeting of delegates for Venezuela and Nueva Granada.⁹ In front of the American elected delegates, and not any more appealing to foreign powers, Bolívar restates some of the main elements of the “Jamaica Letter,” in particular the notion of a special character of *los americanos*, neither European nor Indigenous, the severed ties with Europe together

with a dependency on their laws, and the lament of being condemned to a lower-than-slavery condition. However, a crucial change in the formulation takes place, one that pushes the argument against the stepmother even further and seems to recognize the ethnic and racial diversity of the continent.

It is impossible to determine with any degree of accuracy where we belong in the human family. The greater portion of the native Indians has been annihilated; Spaniards have mixed with Americans and Africans, and Africans with Indians and Spaniards. While we have all been born of the same mother, our fathers, different in origin and in blood, are foreigners, and all differ visibly as to the color of their skin: a dissimilarity which places upon us an obligation of the greatest importance.¹⁰

The first thing to notice in this crucial formulation of the plight of *los americanos* is that any conception of mixture in this model rests upon a heteronormative account of reproduction that configures motherhood as a passive, acquiescent, singular receptacle that does not determine in any way the character of the offspring. By emphasizing this passivity of the mother America, which provides only a surface upon which reproduction takes place, *mestizaje* conveniently covers over rape and other forms of forced sexual intercourse as some of the main drivers of this racial mixture. It conceals as well the exploitative character of these forms of reproduction and the traumatic effects of the violent removal and selling of the offspring from the enslaved mothers. At the same time, it romanticizes motherhood as always voluntary and signaling what *los americanos* need to embrace to become what they really are. Given the diversity in our fathers, we Americans need to gather around what is common to us all; not anymore the stepmother, but the “real” motherland, the vast and inexpugnable, but also loving and willing America. It is thus no longer a matter of the identity of the people (their race), but perhaps more of the passive, female continent itself that needs to be governed in order for the newly constituted Republic to be able to survive. The shift on this emphasis is thus not one relating to identity, toward further inclusion, or *mestizaje* as the recognition of the ethnic inseparability of the people, but more a political one, that is, how are they (*criollos*) going to manage such a diverse territory without a shared national myth or unique heritage.

The years before this declaration allow us to appreciate that Bolívar had in reality very little interest in the different origins of the young American population, and in particular a low esteem for the lives of enslaved people. Bolívar advocated for a political, genocidal project of diminishing the Black populations in Nueva Granada and Venezuela by conditioning the manumission of enslaved people to their joining the independentist army, or simply by drafting them by force. During his stay in Haiti, on the way back to South America from Jamaica, Bolívar had agreed with Pétion (the first president of Haiti) to abolish slavery in the freed territories in exchange for the guns and ammunition that Pétion was offering to the independentist cause in South America.¹¹ In keeping his promise, however, Bolívar instituted an ambiguous account. As early as June 1816, he decreed “the absolute freedom of slaves that have suffered under the Spanish yoke in the three precedent centuries,” imposing however some conditions: the new male citizens above the age of fourteen had to enlist in the army to fight for independence and their freedom. The one who refuses “will be subject to servitude; not only him, but also his children under the age of fourteen, his wife, and his elderly parents.”¹²

Bolívar’s reasons to decree the manumission of enslaved people, in any case, had little to do with a notion of freedom intrinsic to human beings, or with a direct regard for the lives of the enslaved. This is clear in one of the at least two letters Bolívar sent on April 20, 1820, to Francisco de Paula Santander, general of the independentist army. Answering Santander’s constant complaints against manumission as being disastrous to the economy and fostering the enmity of the slave-owner class, Bolívar reassured Santander that he had not declared freedom for the enslaved, but had only stated that “all slaves useful for the armed service will be destined to the army.”¹³

The objective of manumission was double, according to this letter. First, there is a clear military advantage to be won in enlisting “robust and strong men accustomed to inclemency and to fatigues . . . and in those who the value of the death is little less than the value of life,”¹⁴ as well as in preventing them from joining the opposite side. Second, from a political point of view and more importantly, maintaining slavery in a “free” government runs the risk of being punished by rebellion and extermination, as it had happened in Haiti fewer than twenty years before. “In effect, the law passed by Congress is in all aspects wise. What could be more suitable or more legitimate than to obtain freedom by fighting for it? Can it be just that only

free men should die for the emancipation of the slaves? Would it not be better that the latter win their rights on the field of battle and that their dangerous numbers be reduced through a powerful and legitimate action?"¹⁵

Mestizaje as Aesthetic Eugenics

Unity had been Bolívar's solution to the race problem, as we have seen, constructing a Latin American identity around the *mestizo* model that either completely denies the participation of Black peoples of the continent (as in the "Jamaica Letter"), or includes them only to be managed, governed, and sacrificed by *criollos* in the name of their own freedom and independence (as in the "Angostura Address"). Almost one hundred years later, José de Vasconcelos formulated a new model of *mestizaje* explicitly articulated as an alternative to the oppression lived, among others, by Black people in the whole American continent. Vasconcelos's model of *mestizaje* in *The Cosmic Race* implies a literal fusion of the races in the American continent into one, the fifth, cosmic race, that would elevate the human condition by reducing its historical differences and conflicts.

The unity in this different *mestizo* model is to be understood on the basis of a new valuation of the Latin American identity with which Vasconcelos attempts to overcome Bolívar's context and response. While Bolívar describes *los americanos* as a young people, Vasconcelos deploys a complicated (and flawed) metaphysics of history to locate the American continent, and its people as both the oldest place of earth (when all continents were united) and its telos. According to this view, the New World is neither new, nor more primitive than other continents and civilizations. Furthermore, its mission is not only local, as the one called to liberate the Spanish American territories, but "cosmic," not only called to liberate the entire Earth but also to redeem all past and present and manifest the plan of history. This mission of fusion, as the Spanish subtitle of the original publication of *The Cosmic Race* reads, can only be conferred to the Ibero-American race, in particular opposition to the Anglo-Saxon America of the North. However, even though this Ibero-American identity is not that of the *criollo*, and Vasconcelos has in mind a mixed conception of the *mestizaje* model, the emphasis on the Spanish/Portuguese approximates the source and model of liberation to that of Bolívar's. Ultimately, what will be performed is again a form of erasure, by assimilating or filtering out Blackness

from the American, *mestizo* identity; Blackness remains unwanted and it demands being sublimated into a higher form of being in the world, the celebration of the *mestizo*.

One of the things that more strongly distinguishes Vasconcelos's reconstruction of the mission and development of the fifth race from the Bolivarian midway species is the explicit condemnation of the annihilation of Indigenous and Black peoples from the American identity, and the explicit denunciation of white supremacist projects as the one being unfolded at that time in the United States. Unlike the Anglo-Saxons, who seized on the Napoleonic capitulation of Louisiana, and who have become more and more successful in deploying an exclusivist white identity on the North American territories, the Ibero-Americans have demonstrated "a greater facility of sympathy toward strangers. . . . If it were necessary to adduce proof, it would be sufficient to observe the increasing and spontaneous mixing which operates among all peoples in all of the Latin continent; in contrast with the inflexible line that separates the Blacks from the Whites in the United States, and the laws, each time more rigorous, for the exclusion of the Japanese and Chinese from California."¹⁶

At play here is a subtle critical take on the gesture captured in Bolívar's rejection of the ties linking America and Spain, the tearing asunder of the veil, and the constructed youthfulness of the "New World." Vasconcelos offers a detailed contrast between the tactics of colonization of Spaniards, by mixing with and assimilating the other, and the ongoing genocidal practices of the Anglo-Saxon, in order to show that to break so strongly with the Spanish heritage meant as well to lose a fundamental trait not only of what made possible *mestizaje* in Latin America, but also what identifies the peoples in the continent as the ones called to reunite the entire world. This strong rejection of the stepmother, to use the Bolivarian image, forces Latin Americans in the present to reject and separate from each other, to reject the Hispanic unity that is their legacy and biggest asset for the future.

How then does Vasconcelos propose to carry out this great plan of history that culminates in the fusion, and therefore abolition, of races and racism? For the purposes of this article, I focus on the third stage of this development, which, according to Vasconcelos, corresponds to what he calls a "spiritual or aesthetic" stage of miscegenation, one that comes after a first stage of materialistic mixing of races according to physical necessities and impositions, and then a second stage, intellectual or political, which is governed by reason and socioethical demands.¹⁷ The criterion in

this third stage of racial mixture will now be given by a highly developed sense of taste, the sole demand of attaining beauty for its own sake, or what Vasconcelos calls an “aesthetic eugenics”:

If we acknowledge that Humanity is gradually approaching the third period of its destiny, we shall see that the work of racial fusion is going to take place in the Ibero-American continent according to a law derived from the fruition of the highest faculties. The laws of emotion, beauty, and happiness will determine the selection of a mate with infinitely superior results than that of a eugenics grounded on scientific reason, which never sees beyond the less important portion of the love act. Above scientific eugenics, the mysterious eugenics of aesthetic taste will prevail. Where enlightened passion rules, no correctives are necessary. The very ugly will not procreate, they will have no desire to procreate. What does it matter, then, that all races mix with each other if ugliness will find no cradle?¹⁸

Once again, this version of the *mestizo* model mimics Bolívar’s heteronormative conception of mixture, but this time tying it to a higher form of desire, “enlightened passion.” Not only we would need the figure of a passive receptacle, “cradle,” to carry out this fusion, but such submission will ultimately be a voluntary one: Vasconcelos imagines that the law of beauty will be sufficient for the rise of the cosmic race. “Step by step,” he argues, and “by voluntary extinction, the uglier stocks will give way to the more handsome. . . . The Indian, by grafting onto the related race, would take the jump of millions of years that separate Atlantis from our times, and in a few decades of aesthetic eugenics, the black may disappear, together with the traits that a free instinct of beauty may go on signaling as fundamentally recessive and underserving, for that reason, of perpetuation.”¹⁹ To be sure, Vasconcelos says, the maxim racial type will not be the white either, but that other, fifth *mestizo* race, to which even the white will have to succumb. However, the gradation of inferior and superior races shows that the traits of the white race will not disappear, but actually become more prolific, contributing more to this fusion, better qualified according to the aesthetic rule in place.

It is precisely this form of the *mestizo* model, contrary to what Nuccetelli states, that continued and reinvigorated the most radical programs of *mejoramiento de la raza* (racial improvement) and *blanqueamiento* (whitening)

throughout Latin America. Latin American white and *mestizo* rulers realized an alternative way to the devised lessening of African descendants' dangerous numbers, as Bolívar proposed, by increasing the immigration of a European white population through subsidies of all kinds and the prohibition of immigration of Black and Brown peoples from other Latin American countries. The survival of Afro-Latin Americans was specifically targeted through programs of unequal mixture in the general population, not only in their representation in culture and national myths, but biologically by crafting measures to increase European immigration, sterilization of Black and Indigenous communities, continued disposessions of their ancestral territories, among many other tactics.²⁰

Conclusion

In his book *The Idea of Latin America*, Walter Mignolo shows that the invention of *latinidad* and *americanidad* is not merely a European construction, but that it is reclaimed by *criollos* as well as an extension of the West. This extension is fought for by independentists not as an annexation, but as a distinct, newer, even improved manifestation of the Western, enlightened spirit. This construction of the continent is, as we know, the construction of an invisible colonial matrix of power that locates certain racialized groups of people in lower strata of the power hierarchy, that survives by covering over the very own mechanisms that allow for its construction. "To embrace Americanness," Mignolo says, "is to dwell in the erasures of coloniality."²¹

In this article, I have approached the thought of two foundational authors of a *mestizo* model of *latinidad*, and thus of *americanidad*, and the specific mechanisms in which their thought erases Black lives, identities, and cultures, precisely when it proclaims to include and celebrate them. I have shown, in particular, the dangers of trusting that these two different versions of the model are in the course of improving themselves by their own inertia to finally include everyone and erase the structures of oppression and neglect. It is my contention that the underlying belief in a self-improvability of the model, or models, still resounds in the contemporary call by non-Black Latinx, celebrating their heritage, to "just wait a while and leave it alone?," to quote Rita Moreno again. On the contrary, it is precisely on the urgency of this question that we should focus, an urgency that, as

I have tried to show, might lead us to the very origins and foundations of Latin American thought.

NOTES

The first step in a larger project, this text has been enriched by personal conversations with Ben Davis, Nathifa Greene, Bonnie Sheehey, Scott Ritner, Rafael Vizcaíno, and Jason Walsh. I thank them for their insights and challenges, which have improved immensely the development of these ideas.

1. *The Late Show with Stephen Colbert*, CBS, June 15, 2021, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CrM5MiZK1JU>.

2. Susana Nuccetelli, *An Introduction to Latin American Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020), 167.

3. See Omar Rivera, *Delimitations of Latin American Philosophy: Beyond Redemption* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2019), 13–37.

4. See Harold A. Bierck, “Reply of a South American to a Gentleman of This Island [“Jamaica Letter”]” (1815), *Selected Writings of Bolívar*, trans. Lewis Bertrand (New York: The Colonial Press, 1951), 1:104–5; Gustavo Pereira, ed., *Simón Bolívar: Escritos Anticolonialistas* (Caracas: Fundación Editorial el Perro y la Rana, 2015), 88.

5. Bierck, “Jamaica Letter,” *Selected Writings*, 1:105; Pereira, *Simón Bolívar*, 88.

6. Bierck, “Jamaica Letter,” *Selected Writings*, 1:110; Pereira, *Simón Bolívar*, 94.

7. Bierck, “Jamaica Letter,” *Selected Writings*, 1:110; Pereira, *Simón Bolívar*, 94.

8. See Nuccetelli, *An Introduction*, 64. I follow here Rivera’s conceptual distinction between the *mestizo* model in the “Jamaica Letter” and the “Angostura Address,” which I analyze in what follows, although I focus on the mechanisms of erasure of the African populations in the continent. Nuccetelli takes both texts as advancing the same notion of *mestizaje*.

9. Bierck, “Address Delivered at the Inauguration of the Second National Congress of Venezuela at Angostura [“Angostura Address”]” (1819), *Selected Writings*, 173–97.

10. Bierck, *Selected Writings*, 38–39; Pereira, *Simón Bolívar*, 185.

11. See Nuria Sales de Bohigas, *Sobre Esclavos, Reclutas y Mercaderes de Quintos* (Barcelona: Ariel, 1974), 85–102.

12. Pereira, *Simón Bolívar*, 115–16; my translation.

13. Bierck, *Selected Writings*, “Angostura Address,” 1:182; Simón Bolívar, *Obras completas* (Madrid: Mavaco de Ediciones, 1984), 1:423–24.

14. Bierck, “Angostura Address,” *Selected Writings*, 1:182; Bolívar, *Obras completas*, 1:423–24.

15. Bierck, “Angostura Address,” *Selected Writings*, 1:183; Bolívar, *Obras completas*, 1:424. The enlisting in South America of enslaved people to fight in the armies of independence and later in wars with neighboring countries is well documented.

Nuria Sales de Bohigas offers a detailed overview of some of these practices in Argentina, Uruguay, Perú, and the Bolivarian armies. For the extreme case of Argentina, where the Black population is estimated to have diminished from 26,000 to fewer than 300 people, see Sales de Bohigas, *Sobre Esclavos*, 59–84.

16. José de Vasconcelos, *The Cosmic Race / La raza cósmica (Race in the Americas)*, trans. Didier T. Jaén (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997), 17–19.

17. Vasconcelos, *The Cosmic Race*, 28.

18. Vasconcelos, *The Cosmic Race*, 30.

19. Vasconcelos, *The Cosmic Race*, 72.

20. For examples of these cultural and biological programs of *blanqueamiento* in Cuba, Brazil, and Colombia, see Aviva Chomsky, “‘Barbados or Canada?’ Race, Immigration, and Nation in Early-Twentieth-Century Cuba,” *Hispanic American Historical Review* 80, no. 3 (2000): 415–62; Mara Loveman “The Race to Progress: Census Taking and Nation Making in Brazil (1870–1920),” *Hispanic American Historical Review* 89, no. 3 (2009): 435–70; and Peter Wade, *Blackness and Race Mixture: The Dynamics of Racial Identity in Colombia* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993).

21. Walter Mignolo, *The Idea of Latin America* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2005), 48; see as well Walter Mignolo, *The Darker Side of Western Modernity: Global Futures, Decolonial Options* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2011).

WORKS CITED

- Bierck, Harold A., ed. 1951. *Selected Writings of Bolivar*. Volume 1 of 2. Compiled by Vicente Lecuna. Translated by Lewis Bertrand. New York: The Colonial Press.
- Bolívar, Simón. 1984. *Obras completas*. Volume 1 of 6. Madrid: Maveco de Ediciones.
- . 1819. “Address Delivered at the Inauguration of the Second National Congress of Venezuela at Angostura” [“Angostura Address”]. In Bierck, ed., *Selected Writings of Bolivar*, 1:173–97.
- . 1815. “Reply of a South American to a Gentleman of This Island” [“Jamaica Letter”]. In Bierck, ed., *Selected Writings of Bolivar*, 1:103–22.
- Chomsky, Aviva. 2000. “‘Barbados or Canada?’ Race, Immigration, and Nation in Early-Twentieth-Century Cuba.” *Hispanic American Historical Review* 80, no. 3: 415–62.
- Loveman, Mara. 2009. “The Race to Progress: Census Taking and Nation Making in Brazil (1870–1920).” *Hispanic American Historical Review* 89, no. 3: 435–70.
- Mignolo, Walter. 2011. *The Darker Side of Western Modernity: Global Futures, Decolonial Options*. Durham: Duke University Press.

- . 2005. *The Idea of Latin America*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Nuccetelli, Susana. 2020. *An Introduction to Latin American Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2017. "What the 'Nina' Film Controversy Shows about African Heritage in the Americas." *APA Newsletter, Hispanic/Latino Issues in Philosophy* 17, no. 1: 4–7.
- Pereira, Gustavo, ed. 2015. *Simón Bolívar: Escritos Anticolonialistas*. Caracas: Fundación Editorial el Perro y la Rana.
- Rivera, Omar. 2019. *Delimitations of Latin American Philosophy: Beyond Redemption*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Sales de Bohigas, Nuria. 1974. *Sobre Esclavos, Reclutas y Mercaderes de Quintos*. Barcelona: Ariel.
- Vasconcelos, José. 1997. *The Cosmic Race / La raza cósmica (Race in the Americas)*. Translated by Didier T. Jaén. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Wade, Peter. 1993. *Blackness and Race Mixture: The Dynamics of Racial Identity in Colombia*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.