

INTRODUCTION

PRACTICING PLURIVERSAL LITERACIES

Ellen Cushman, Romeo García, and Damián Baca

We open this book with acknowledgment. We think and do where we are. The unsettling of pretended universality's of particular ethnies generating knowledge out of and from factitious privileged spaces-places of enunciation begins by taking seriously how one thinks and does from where they are. As with scholars who have come before us (Arturo Escobar, María Lugones, Walter D. Mignolo, Catherine Walsh, Sylvia Wynter), we think and write from multiple positions in Western universities. We write as fully human beings practicing knowledge making with our minds and hearts in the memory of our spaces, places, and ancestors, with gratitude for the support of our families, colleagues, and communities, and in the guiding light of future generations and futures to come. We write on lands scarred by the colonial wounds of settlement, displacement, enslavement, and ecological wreckage. And we write in/with the demand for something else: to get caught up in and learn how to *be with* land, memories, and others *otherwise*. Contributors in this collection come together united by effort to return to and carry out an agenda to deliberately think and do where one is in and with pluriversal literacies.

There is a hope and struggle that underwrite the possibilities of pluriversal literacies. If we are going to unsettle, disentangle, and decolonize the hegemonic architectures of *Americanity*, *coloniality*, and/or *modernity/coloniality* that settler colonialism instituted five hundred years ago, we must begin where we stand as scholars who study colonization, racialization, and epistemic racism/sexism in the Americas—the historic sites of colonial wounds. Although as editors of this collection, we think and do in the United States, the

idea and invention of the Americas, as well as the emergence of Americanness consubstantial to Western modernity, provides the bedrock for the concept of a Western tradition of the idea of race, (coloniality of) being, and (coloniality of) thought that persists today. We begin here humbly and fully knowing that the perspectives on coloniality we speak to are not unique to this continent but rest on and resonate with imperial practices that have profoundly impacted the peoples of Europe, Africa, East and West Asia, and Oceania. This acknowledgment sets the stage for a premise picked up by this collection of contributors: if an epistemic system of ontologies instituted by epistemologies that devalue and dehumanize people has evolved into a five-hundred-year-old universal project by an *association of social interests*, pluriversality must be pursued on the same scale and with an unsettling vigor.

We recognize the long journeys ahead of all of us as we write from the legacies of colonial wounds. A hope for pluriversality, it must be acknowledged, does not come at the expense of but animates a collective struggle to work out possibilities in what seems to be impossible. So, we recognize with humility the legacies of thinking and doing brought together in these pages to project possibilities for livable futures. Although what that looks like is unclear, the demand for “otherwise” persists, because a *coloniality of being and knowledge* only sees things to thingify in relation to the observing observing rather than relations. We find ourselves then writing to unwrite; learning to unlearn; thinking and doing to rethink and do better; delinking from hierarchies that create a humanity-of-difference and relinking to a humanity-in-difference. Because a coloniality of being and knowledges that presupposes epistemic and ontological difference has contaminated ways of *being with* each other. The exigence for this project is to think and do from elsewhere and otherwise, to connect with others and suggest praxes for re/searching, being, and thinking where we are. Although thinking and doing from elsewhere and otherwise only promise possibilities, it is the hope that these possibilities can lead us on a journey to struggle together in learning-unlearning—relearning. The challenge has pointed us toward two paths of intervention: first, to understand the tools for creating difference and to oppose the categories of thought and being that lend themselves to the ongoing maintenance of the colonial wound as an epistemic project; second, to use these tools differently relative to these structuring tenets of thought by suggesting, creating, and practicing options of connectedness within and across differences. Now, pluriversal does not mean everyone will harmonize in a utopian way, only that relations and critical dialogue are necessary for worlding otherwise.

Decolonizing thought and being go hand in hand. Both projects must be inseparable to change the contents (ontologies of Man-Human) and terms (principles, assumptions, rules) of conversational means. Decoloniality provides the analytic and the prospective that can begin to imagine livable futures.

What Aimé Césaire ([1972] 2000, 41) argues about colonization resonates to this day, to wit: “colonization dehumanizes even the most civilized man; . . . colonial activity, colonial enterprise, colonial conquest, which is based on contempt for the native and justified by that contempt, inevitably tends to change him who undertakes it.” When people are dehumanized by grinding poverty, when animals are objectified as products, when women are told what to do with their bodies, when land is categorized as a natural resource, when police are licensed to kill Indigenous, Brown, and Black bodies, then as Césaire reminds us, we all are dehumanized and rendered “less civilized” by a “civilization” that is already sick and diseased. We are inspired by the project of decoloniality specifically because it is *an-other* set of choices, options, and responsibilities available to everyone. It does not undermine the projects of reparation but rather complements that work even as it places emphasis on Eurocentrism as an epistemic and aesthetic issue.

The pillars of the decolonial analytic taken up in this collection work to reveal, as well as to unsettle, the creation of difference while the prospective calls for a commitment to epistemic delinking, epistemological decolonization, epistemic reconstitution, and pluriversality. Scholars contributing to *Pluriversal Literacies: Tools for Perseverance and Livable Futures* are committed to decolonial options and pluriversal possibilities by way of geo-and-body politics of knowledge, understanding, and being. The collection brings together decolonial and Indigenous and Native American scholars from across humanistic disciplines (English, communications, education, applied linguistics, American Indian studies, Hispanic studies, rhetorical studies) who study literacies and language using the dynamic, adaptable framework of decolonial thinking and doing, so as to better understand sites, practices, and processes of meaning making. *Pluriversal Literacies* presents a collective effort of a learning-unlearning-relearning path in both the analytic and the prospective tasks of a decolonial option.

Let us be clear from the outset that we are not replacing or transplanting one knowing and knowledge-making path with another. There must be a coexistence of and dialogue between worlds and knowledges. Otherwise, pluriversality is at risk of being reduced to maintaining dichotomous and oppositional-informed cultural and thinking programs. Such a replacement would serve only to re-create the hegemon of knowing (the enunciation) and knowledge (the enunciated)—an epistemic system that seeks to dominate, manage, and control information. Such a replacement would also serve only to create yet another set of hierarchies of knowing within the same epistemic hierarchies created by Western knowing and knowledge—an epistemic system that seeks to also dominate, manage, and control the modes through which knowledge travels. We are not offering one history; that would be normative historical thinking. We are not offering one pluriversal; that would be

an abstract universal. We are not presenting one livable future; that would be the myth of modernity. And we're not curating a collection of star scholars aligning their lights to ours; that would be a cult of personalities. Rather, we are *building with* and alongside and making connections among and across a diversity of decolonial options and paths associated with thinkers and doers from elsewhere and otherwise. We do this with three goals in mind: (1) to provide perspective on sign tools and methods of representation from literacies and rhetorical frameworks, (2) to better understand the ways that writing and language can work to disrupt/unsettle normative structures, and (3) to create pluriversal possibilities elsewhere and otherwise. Pluriversality is not only a principle of coexistence, as contributors' evidence, but also what Nelson Maldonado-Torres (2007, 260–61) might call *receptive generosity* and/or playful world-traveling, in the words of María Lugones (1987, 4). Contributors illustrate how both ideas require ways of *being with* each other otherwise, which undoubtedly demands languages, literacies, rhetorics, and practices otherwise.

The range of topics in this collection includes representations, literacies, and rhetorics; critical revisionist historiography and comparative rhetorics; and delinking from literacies of coloniality and modernity, “Northern” and “Southern” Hemispheric relations, and theorizations of/from border spaces. Each chapter grounds the pluriversal spirit of “I am where I do and think” (the geopolitics and body politics of knowledge and understanding). Why? Because this perspective unsettles the settled idea of abstract universals, the hubris and pretense of a singular, Eurocentric epistemic standpoint. We do not suggest that a return to that which has been negated will automatically equate to a decolonial option or livable future. Our returns can only ever guarantee, with certainty, *possibilities*. Contributors in this collection struggle to bring that hope of possibilities into fruition through the work they do.

THE ANALYTIC OPTION IN DECOLONIALITY AND DELINKING

An epistemic system of ontologies gained currency at the epistemological level, hence someone like Anibal Quijano refers to Western imperialism as an association of social interests. A decolonial option, thus, is an analytical option called to intervene in the “hegemonic architecture of knowledge and the principles, assumptions, and rules of knowing” (Mignolo and Walsh 2018, 212). The analytic does not assume a hegemonic architecture is discrete or settled but rather premises that disputes are what strengthen it as an association of social interests share in, import, and expand it. The decolonial turn is about making visible what is felt but not necessarily observable: coloniality and modernity/coloniality. And it is about locating, identifying, naming, and unsettling the mechanisms that produce those logics of domination, management, and control as well as absences and silences (Maldonado-Torres 2007, 262). What it

means to decolonize will vary between the *who* is doing decolonial work and the *where*, *why*, and *how*. Yet, a common thread within and outside this collection is *how* decolonial thinkers ask *who* are the knowing subjects, *what* are they saying/doing (and how are they reflecting about it), and *how* were institutions architected and left behind meant to promote and reproduce ideals and support and defend posterity (Mignolo 2011, 188)? The last question situates many of the decolonial efforts in the Americas during the sixteenth century and among an association of social interests invested in inventing, grounding, and circulating the ideas of Man-Human (see Mignolo 2011, 3).

An important intervention and contribution into the ways in which we think and talk about colonialism and coloniality and decolonialism and decoloniality is informed by the Modernity/Coloniality Collective. Scholars of the Modernity/Coloniality Collective, initially comprising Latinamericanists, typically begin with the Renaissance period in colonial discourse for a reason. The contribution of the collective thus rests in both their intervention by way of a temporal and spatial break and shift and in their introduction of categories of analysis: Americanness, coloniality, and modern/colonial gendered world systems. These institutions as they evolve into are possible because of a settler colonialism that took and made place five hundred years ago in the Americas. Perhaps the greatest contribution within such conversations on colonialism is that modernity is inseparable from the idea of the Americas. The Americas provide a historical backdrop and a prism by which to see a logic of domination, management, and control no longer needing historical colonialism.

There is an important distinction between colonialism and coloniality in this collection that we want to emphasize. When Aníbal Quijano (2007) speaks of a five-hundred-year-old colonial structure of power as an institution architected and left behind, he is breaking from discourses about colonialism and shifting it to coloniality. Coloniality reflected a new pattern of power of/for domination, management and control and an organizing power for relations between people and states (Mignolo 2011, 17). Its structuring nodes include land and nature, knowledge and subjectivity, racism and phallocentrism, power and authority, and governance and economy (9–16, 17–21). But it is a logic that cannot begin to be conceived without Americanness and the variegated methods of installing technologies of domination and exploitations in and around race/labor within the Americas.

There would be no coloniality without the Americas and Americanness. As Aníbal Quijano and Immanuel Wallerstein (1992, 549–51) argue, three pillars are requisite to the modern establishment of a capitalist world economy: control of land, methods for labor control, and the creation of state mechanisms of control and authority. Quijano and Wallerstein understood then, however, as scholars do today, that ideas dwell across space and time

in human-built institutions that have allowed them to appear and become consequential (Gordon 2007, 123, 137). This is why Quijano and Wallerstein situated coloniality in the institution of Americanness: the idea that land was waiting to be discovered, owned, and transformed as “natural resources”; the invention of a notion that some people are indispensable and destined to bring about the world’s salvation, progress, and development, whereas others were labeled dispensable in the technological matrix of race/epistemic-ontological difference/labor; and the idea of images portraying empty landscapes from which inhabiting bodies vanished or disappeared into the shadows. These ideas are theologically and secularly structured; they are innocently manufactured in progress narratives (see Mignolo 2011, 124–25). Recognizing and acknowledging Americanness’s four central contributions (coloniality, ethnicity, racism, and newness), Quijano and Wallerstein (1992, 556) argue that the Americas were never merely an “extension of Europe” but rather an “original” invention and creation. Americanness set in motion the emergence of a new pattern of power (coloniality) and became a testing site for a new system predicated on a logic of coloniality implementing modern imperial narratives (salvation, progress, development) and ends (modernity/coloniality).

Modernity as conceptualized in Eurocentric social theory explains history, institutions, culture, and ontology (concepts of “Rationality” and “Man”) by reference to circumstances internal to Europe: from Enlightenment thinkers to the Frankfurt school of philosophers to social theories of globalization and modernity made common by the likes of Anthony Giddens, Jürgen Habermas, Jean-François Lyotard, and Richard Rorty (Escobar 2007). The success of these social theories rests in their description of modernity’s structuring tenets in and on Eurocentric terms and conditions. They reflect a totalizing tendency of thought and practice—a universalizing of a Eurocentric consciousness of anthropocentrism, logocentrism, and phallogocentrism—such “that all world cultures and societies are reduced to being a manifestation of European history and culture” (184). Santiago Castro-Gómez (2007) and Quijano (2007) also speak specifically about the epistemological hegemony and the eventual rise of a dualistic and evolutionary hierarchy around which an *epistemic zero point* and the ideal representations of knowledge, understanding, and being could be mapped and carried out. Although modernity did not succeed in constituting a total reality in every corner of the world, it did help to enact “a totalizing project aimed at the purification of orders,” for example, the separation between “us” and “them,” nature and culture, the sexes, and the races (Escobar 2007, 183). What this tells us is that Americanness, coloniality, and modernity/coloniality are geopolitical and epistemological matters too (see Mignolo 2009, 5). We simply cannot ignore this.

Decoloniality speaks to us because of its emphasis on knowers and where they stand. Mignolo appeals for public archiving and recording of knowing

subjects and their enunciations. In “Geopolitics of Sensing and Knowing” (Mignolo 2013) he reassures us that the “anthropos” does not exist ontologically but rather is invented. “Such an invention,” he argues, “is the outcome of an enunciation,” and he explains to readers that this enunciation “needs an enunciator (agent)” in a “position of managing the discourse” and “an institution” to succeed in making the Other exist through the universalizing of knowledge as *humanitas* and being, against which all others are measured and placed into subordinate positions (134). Mignolo (1992) understands that modern/colonial situations of epistemic racism and sexism are largely shaped by semiotic interactions, cultural productions, and literacy and rhetorical work (329). And herein lies the contribution of a collection such as this one that emphasizes tools of literacies and praxis. Contributors not only work to unsettle inhumane enunciators, irrational enunciations, and fabricated loci of enunciations but also work to restore all people as fully human.

THE CREATION OF DIFFERENCE

The invention of the Other was established on the idea of race, epistemic racism, and ends to dominate, manage, and control. In “Coloniality and Modernity/Rationality,” Quijano (2007) understood, as Frantz Fanon ([1963] 2004, 1986) and Ngũgĩ wa Thiong’o ([1986] 1992) did, that the coloniality of knowledge that produced the idea of the Other’s supposed epistemic and ontological difference was essential to the settler epistemic practices and strategies of relegating place to “death-spaces” (see Taussig 1991) and people at the “company of death” (Maldonado-Torres 2007, 257). The colonization of the Other cultures, Quijano explains, always already had in its purview the colonization of the mind. Although epistemic practices and strategies unfold unevenly, the threads that bind are the systematic repression of Othered, meaning-making practices and tools of representation; the mystification (and seduction of) ideal representations of knowledge, understanding, and humanity; and an epistemology of provenance, which holds that there are grave problems in the world and people in need of saving that only one civilization with letters is capable of resolving and civilizing as per divine (e.g., theopolitics) and natural (e.g., egopolitics) designs (Quijano 2007, 169).¹ Both Castro-Gómez and Quijano speak to each other as they illustrate for us the two inextricable structural and material consequences of these epistemic practices and strategies:

The coexistence of diverse ways of producing and transmitting knowledge is eliminated because now all forms of human knowledge are ordered on an epistemological scale from the traditional to the modern, from barbarism to civilization, from the community to the individual, from the orient to the occident. (Castro-Gómez 2007, 433)

This leads to conceiving society as a macro-historical subject, endowed with a historical rationality, with a lawfulness that permits predictions of the behavior of the whole and of all its parts, as well as the direction and the finality of its development in time. (Quijano 2007, 176)

Castro-Gómez's and Quijano's passages are naming an epistemology of the zero point: a pretended universality of a particular people and place as the center of space and present of time. The observer observing, or what Ramón Grosfoguel (2007, 214) refers to as the "God-eyed view," allows the knowing subject to "represent his knowledge as the only one capable of achieving a universal consciousness, and to dismiss non-Western knowledge as particularities and, thus, unable to achieve universality." Castro-Gómez's passage above also calls our attention to a genealogy of thought and doing that, beyond partitioning geography and chronologizing history, propagated the idea that Others are without history (e.g., coloniality of being). The idea of race as "biologically structural" and "hierarchically constructed" emerges here (Quijano 2000, 216–19) as epistemic and ontological differences. The invention of the Other could at the same time be the invention of a people without history, alphabetic writing, language, and culture, hence the invention of an idea of a people less knowing, less civilized, and less human in need of salvation, civilizing, progress, and development through the alphabetic tools of literacy. María Lugones (2010, 746) importantly adds to this by reminding us that a coloniality of gender works in similar ways.

From both theology and natural science, we have the creation of difference at the heart of zero-point epistemological approaches. In the Renaissance, we witness rhetorics featuring taxonomies of being such as the Great Chain of Being thinking popularized by Diego Valadés in *Rhetorica Christiana* in 1579. From science, we have the frame of taxonomies of knowledge and peoples popularized in theories of evolution, such as Ernst Haeckel's *Natürliche Schöpfungsgeschichte* in 1868. Our quick trip through the zero-point enunciation of knowledge demonstrates the colonial matrix of power (CMP) at work, for "rational classification is racial classification" (Mignolo 2002, 83). The primitive Other (Anthropos) is that whose traditions (knowledge, beliefs, language practices) and being (race, gender, sexuality) were enunciated by the knowers (Humanitas). Herein lies the significance of a decolonial perspective: it provides a robust framework for naming and detecting the paradigms of thought and their means of operation. These are the literacies of coloniality, the structuring tenets of thought that work through reading and writing practices, which have legacies in the gendered and racialized literacies of Americanness and beyond.

LITERACY AND COLONIALITY

We cannot come to terms with settler colonialism, Americanness, coloniality, and/or modernity/coloniality without coming to terms with their literacies and rhetorics. The effects of Western literacy thus cannot be understated. Herein lies the relenting decolonial perspective, which continues to ask, Where did that idea or institution come from? Another significant aspect of the Modernity/Coloniality Collective research paradigm is to reveal the workings of logocentrism with its insistence on alphabetic literacy and the imposition of a ruling language that destroyed other forms of mediation of knowing. Earlier decolonial texts, such as *Writing without Words* (Boone and Mignolo 1994) and *The Darker Side of the Renaissance* (Mignolo 2003), provide decolonial and Indigenous scholars a means for understanding the epistemic obedience engendered by various sign tools and methods of representation.

Let us bring the analytic all together through a return to the invention of the Americas, a necessary return if we are to trace the literacy practices of the Spanish, French, and English that laid the foundation for Europe to become Europe. It was no coincidence that in these Europeans' discussions of ideal representations of knowledge, understanding, and humanity, "the Indian" exhibited defects and/or was lacking in qualities. Gerónimo de Mendieta (1870, 237, 264) discusses, for example, how "the Indian" was marked by error, blindness, and absence. He, as well as others, observed that they lacked letters (*á falta de letras*), a language (*falta de su lengua*), a spirit (*de este espíritu que á ellos les falta*), and doctrine (*por falta de doctrina*) (143, 210, 296, 451, 665). For Mendieta, this *lack* informed their "natural qualities" (*cualidades naturales*), which in his view were contrary to and different relative to "the Spanish" insofar as they personified for him a state of childhood (*vuelven los hombres causi al estado de la niñez*) (454). Ultimately, this allowed him to rationalize how conversion and civilizing projects were needed as examples of acts of love and as being of doctrinal and spiritual "use" to the Spanish (416, 451). Indeed, Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda ([1892] 1987) would also play a significant role both in advancing the binary between the perfect (*lo perfecto*) or excellent (*lo excelente*) and the imperfect (*lo imperfecto*) and the idea that natural and divine laws dictate the just causes for war against the Other.

The Modernity/Coloniality Collective importantly points out that "the Indians" were not epistemically and ontologically different—less knowing, less human—but rather were first invented as "the Indians" and then maintained as "inferior" by a discourse of invention. The collective would come to refer to this kind of territorial and epistemological project of expropriation as the hallmark of colonial difference. The graphism and knowledges represented by the Indians of the Americas were replaced with alphabetic literacy, such that literacy came to be a stand-in and representation of all forms of knowing

central to the colonial/capitalist/modern world. A lettered person is a learned person.

Our decolonial and delinking analytic has moved us from the zero-point enunciation of knowledge that creates difference and ensures singular tools of encoding meaning (literacy as tool and instrument of coloniality) and continues to create valued knowledge and even become a substitute for knowledge. The influence of literacy, racial differencing, who gets to make knowledge, and who has knowledge are all key to being fully human, a full-fledged citizen, and learned or lettered within the colonial matrix of power. And this is where decoloniality is helpful, because it allows those of us occupying the borders to detect loci of enunciations—for whom we make knowledge, why we do so, and how.

Our discussion thus far has made apparent what the Modernity/Coloniality Collective has been up to as it has made apparent the Eurocentric notions of thought, being, and doing in a singular locus of enunciation of knowledge, a tradition against which nothing but alternative traditions might exist. True, the Modernity/Coloniality Collective suggested another intellectual heritage for social theorizing from the Indigenous Americas and Latinidad, but it cautioned against universalizing that intellectual tradition as the only possible pathway to decoloniality. Rather, many intellectual traditions share the common task of unveiling and revealing without any one intellectual tradition becoming the new hegemon. “If that were the case,” Mignolo (2011, 176) cautions, we would remain “within the rules of the same games imposed by Western modernity. In such a scenario, the ‘content’ would change and become the cultural biases of the new hegemon.”

PROSPECTIVE EPISTEMOLOGICAL DECOLONIZATION

The Modernity/Coloniality Collective provides a spatial and temporal foundation for situating our positionalities and the work we do within the Americas and the United States specifically, where these legacies persist in the everyday aspects of the wounded and wounding places where we reside and in which we work. Although these efforts have a short historical trajectory, there remains a need to understand more broadly, from a transrhetorical (see Jackson, chapter 3, this volume) and transglobal perspective—the pluriversity of literacies. Assumptions that the meaning-making practices and symbolic tools of one region must apply to a global plurality produce a false universalism with destructive, dehumanizing consequences. There is no totalizing of meaning-making practices that encodes any one theoretical lens, perspective, or locus of enunciation. The prospective task of a decoloniality option holds us accountable and responsible for unlearning this.

Educators can unsettle Eurocentric literacy by refusing its location as the colonial center against which all other meaning-making practices across the

planet are to be compared, and we can work to unsettle literacy instruction by struggling against the colonial impulses in our own institutions and classrooms (see Alvarez 2016; Baker-Bell 2020; Daniel, Malcolm, and Rai 2021; Hernandez-Zamora 2010; Jones and Medina 2021; Lyons 2000; Patel 2021; Villanueva 2006; and Zhang-Wu 2021). What is offered, then, becomes the notion and praxis of pluriversality: “pluriversality means unlearning, so to speak, modernity, and learning to live with people one does not agree with, or may not even like” (Mignolo 2011, 176). An appeal for *epistemic disobedience* or *disengagement* and *extrication* (e.g., epistemic delinking) is not a postulating of an outside-of-modern epistemology, a primordial figuration, or an outright denial of modernity’s emancipatory potential. Pluriversality, rather, is one opening for decolonial options among options for livable futures, both locally and globally.

The second movement or task of a decolonial option is affirming the modes and principles of knowledges and understandings denied by the agendas of salvation and civilization, progress and development, and capitalism and market democracy. Quijano understood that coloniality situated us squarely on epistemic issues. So he called for an epistemological reconstitution or a process of learning how to unlearn in order to relearn. Madina Tlostanova and Walter Mignolo (2012, 7) would come to describe this as learning to unlearn: “to forget what we have been taught, to break free from the thinking programs imposed on us by education, culture, and social environment, always marked by the Western imperial reason.” Quijano (2007, 177) argued that it was necessary for everyone to “extricate oneself from the linkages between rationality/modernity and coloniality,” a linkage that he believed spoiled the promises of modernity. (A decolonial option works to disentangle the ways in which a rhetoric of modernity cloaks a logic of modernity.) He named this process of extrication “epistemological decolonization,” a central premise underwriting the principle of pluriversality, which he claimed was needed to “clear the way for new intercultural communication” (177). Epistemological decolonization and pluriversality would become two sides of the same coin aimed at such ends.

Pluriversality is a core tenet of a decolonial option. Pluriversality seeks to make visible and to value intersecting perspectives, practices, and positions, each with its own full right to exist. It takes seriously the plurality of knowledges while unsettling the idea of a pretended universality of a “particular ethnic” that comes from “Western Europe” and propagates the epistemic and ontological difference of the Other (Quijano 2007, 177). In *Local Histories/Global Designs*, Mignolo (2012) understands pluriversality as a universal project, which would seem to go against his own position on and against (abstract) universals. However, for Mignolo (2005), because what connects each local or regional history is a modern/colonial world and its power differentials, what must connect the world is a universal project of and for inventing decolonial

discourses, visions, and institutions. Pluriversality, underwritten by decolonial options, is the opening of the doors to all forms of knowledges and understandings (Mignolo 2007, 494), a world in which “many worlds can co-exist . . . made by the shared work and common goals of those who inhabit, dwell in one of the many worlds co-existing in one world and where differences are not cast in terms of values of plus and minus degree of humanity” (499). Decolonization involves us in understanding pluriversality as a decolonial option, a worldwide connector of one locus of enunciation to many, with each locus of enunciation being anchored in local histories, terms, and tools for meaning making and conditions of being and doing.

Pluriversality does not globalize literacy because globalization is something that Western literacy is always already doing (Baca 2009, 231). Kristie Dotson (2018, 195) elaborates: “What needs to happen here is connected in obvious and less obvious ways to struggles elsewhere. But what is most important is that any struggle in the USA is always already a global phenomenon. We have never not been global.” Thus, pluriversal literacies offer an epistemic delinking from global coloniality, or what Tlostanova (2020, 24) might call “pluriversal unsettlement,” in an effort to “generate new transversal relational solidarity beyond the bankrupt institutions and power structures, if it can launch new communities of change which would also change us as humans.” As the pluriversal projects described in this collection demonstrate, meaning making with and in communities is both a moment of epistemic reconstitution and renaming—a praxis of unsettling coloniality’s structuring tenets of thought and replacing thought, representation, and action in collective intersectional relation to each other. Cameroonian philosopher and political theorist Achille Mbembe (2019) reminds us that the structuring tenets of thought and orders of domination in Africa closely resemble those of the Americas. Mbembe’s work underscores how the tools of representation and meaning making (e.g., masks, amulets, weapons, ceremonial pieces, etc.) came to be understood via the colonial gaze as markers of subhuman, demonized savages. When said another way, pluriversal literacies provide a practice of placing a multiplicity of meaning-making practices into dialogue without political rankings. Pluriversal literacies present localized approaches to meaning making as grounded knowledge offering livable futures.

EPISTEMIC RECONSTITUTION THROUGH REEXISTENCE AND COEXISTENCE

Pluriversal Literacies: Tools for Perseverance and Livable Futures advances from the ethical basis of pluriversality. Our stance for the current collection has been and continues to be one of a constructive reimagining of the study of difference with and through literacies, one in which research, scholarship, and praxis meet to offer a plurality of methods and tools for epistemic delinking.

Pluriversality is a practice of flexibly structured knowledge creation reflecting both local and connected loci of enunciations. The important point is this: the exigence for all the chapters included draws from the locus of enunciation of the authors as place-based knowledge makers and doers: *we are where we think* (Mignolo 1999; Escobar 2007). As we respect the specificity of place-based cultures and peoples, we open inquiry into meaning-making practices that locate knowledge and being with dignity, shared resources and respect, and multiple meaning-making materials, languages, and media. Such a move is vital considering that global coloniality manifests through the particularities and specificities of the local (Tlostanova 2015).

Pluriversal Literacies hopes to realize the grounded, dispersed loci of enunciations of knowledge connected to each other, not as a universal totality but as interrelated possibilities for thinking and doing to enact a more fully human existence. We strive to locate the exigence for decolonial work in the locales where authors are doing their work rather than within the constellation of our intellectual lineages and trajectories or any other particular disciplinary conversation. This project was conceptualized as one that invited scholars from a range of global positionings and disciplinary perspectives to describe their projects that implicitly or explicitly derive from their decolonial thinking and doing in their respective locales. As such, *Pluriversal Literacies* delivers on the promises of pluriversal literacies set forth in a special issue of *College English*, also edited by Cushman, Baca, and García (2021).

In that special issue of *College English*, we presented the idea that the purification of orders of thought and being in the colonial matrix of power are structured and produced in disciplines, economies, and institutions of control. When contextual frames for discourse are more regulated, complex, and bound by rules, they become scholarly disciplines, meant to secure epistemic obedience from all who enter them (Mignolo 2011, 141). This is the *coloniality of disciplinarity*. We present “a pluriversal praxis” as one space for restoration, repair, and dialogue, as enabling “a dwelling and flourishing in one of many coexisting worlds with valued importance, mutually inclusive meaning making practices, and intersectional positionings” (Cushman, Baca, and García 2021, 25). As the articles in that special issue of *College English* demonstrate, pluriversality is a capacious concept for a study of difference that advances scholarly praxes in the elsewhere and otherwise. Pluriversality already creates a space for acknowledgment and repair. We offer a pluriversal praxis precisely because it can function “as a mediator or connector across difference, offering not one but a multiplicity of ontological and epistemic rhetorical practices and rhetorical histories. . . . Pluriversality prompts a departure from hubris, ownership, gatekeeping, and other tactics of control. Thus, pluriversal praxis is possible within and across a necessarily diverse range of options working toward sustainable futures” (25). The articles presented in that special issue

illustrate the possibilities and limits of pluriversality that necessarily span disciplines, objects of analysis, places, and methodologies, and each one stands alone as a unique contribution that is nevertheless connected in the pluriversal possibility of decoloniality thinking and doing.

Just as we stand by the articles presented in that special issue of *College English*, so too do we stand behind the ideas presented in our controversial introduction to that special issue “Delinking: Toward Pluriversal Rhetorics” (Cushman, Baca, and García 2021). Many of the ideas presented in the introduction to that special issue had germinated in earlier iterations of our respective works, including in *Rhetorics of the Americas* (Baca and Villanueva 2010), *Mestiz@ Scripts, Digital Migrations, and the Territories of Writing* (Baca 2008), in the introduction to *Landmark Essays in Rhetorics of Difference* (Baca, Cushman, and Osborne 2019), and in *Rhetorics Elsewhere and Otherwise* (García and Baca 2019), as well as in articles and book chapters. Critique is an important point of departure for epistemic delinking from the alternatives available to BIPOC scholars and their allies when working *within* and *from* imperial categories of thought. We critiqued a particular school of thought, including its epistemic categories, that has claimed for itself the territory of “cultural rhetorics” but not for the sake of critique. Fanon’s ([1963] 2004, 36) warning regarding decolonization is applicable to cultural rhetorics: “it cannot be understood, it cannot become intelligible nor clear to itself except in the exact measure that we can discern the movements which give its historical form and content.” We identified two problems with the purportedly decolonial idea of cultural rhetorics as it had come to be practiced within that school of thought: “The creation of ‘cultural rhetorics,’ however, has had an unfortunate effect on the field of rhetoric and writing: On the one hand, the normative baseline of Western rhetorics is rendered invisible or accepted as immutable; and, on the other hand, narrow lineages of scholarship and classroom practice perpetuate and reproduce exclusive multicultural silos” (Cushman, Baca, García 2021, 7).

In short, we argue that cultural rhetorics has invented for itself a monopolistic territory of thinking and doing that masks its own logic of the coloniality of disciplinarity as its scholars attempted to make it intelligible and clear unto itself on the basis of iteration and differentiation. Thus, the dilemma we observed in that school of thought was that cultural rhetorics demanded epistemic obedience to its own articulation of its boundaries. We remain concerned, and the social-media reaction to our *College English* special issue introduction makes it clear, that certain ideas cannot be critiqued, questioned, or challenged. All of it illustrated the domination, management, and control both of information and of the modes through which knowledge travels. We were interested in identifying the processes and production of knowledge that demand epistemic obedience, loyalty, fidelity, and homage to particular

scholars within that school of thought and that created systems of exclusion for anyone whose scholarship on rhetorics of difference did not gesture or genuflect appropriately. The intention was to unveil and oppose a system and method of knowledge production and production of knowledge, understanding, and feeling; beyond that, the intention was to advocate for constructive unsettlement as well as constructive reimagination for livable futures. Again, we were not critiquing for the sake of critique but were more interested in reconstructing “how to make truth claims both responsible to political realities as well as reliable and adequate to the complexity of reality” (Alcoff 2011, 70). This was not to suggest that we were in possession of truth but to think through the effects and consequences of truth claims. We continue to believe criticism is necessary for strengthening any epistemological project.

The ideas and questions we raised in our introduction to that special issue of *College English* in September 2021 were ours and ours alone. So too with the introduction to this book. The works within these collections share a framing within literacy and language studies on the one hand and a framing in decoloniality on the other. This does not mean that the authors contributing to either one of these collections shared in the critique we level regarding the practices of knowledge making in the school of thought claiming cultural rhetorics as its territory.

We remain deeply concerned by the silencing, policing, and canceling rampant in social media and elsewhere by way of scholarly citation and review practices wherein scholars are pitted against each other or otherwise compelled to “take sides,” to “virtue signal,” and to “cancel projects.” These policing practices replicate the same tactics of silencing and exclusion meted out to the first women, LGBTQ, and BIPOC scholars to land jobs in academe decades ago (although such practices continue to this day). They also do double harm by demanding that scholars take sides and show fidelity to a school of thought at the same time they let stand white-supremacist tenets of thinking and doing. We too are people of color studying rhetorics of difference and promoting the work of other scholars of color, many of whom are in the early stage of their careers, and we should be allowed the academic freedom to do so. The controversy surrounding the publication of “Delinking: Toward Pluriversal Rhetorics” itself helps us to animate the challenges presented by practicing decoloniality. We are very grateful to one anonymous precontract peer reviewer of this collection who helpfully outlined the challenges we faced as editors during the controversy and thereafter:

1. How to approach the genre of scholarly criticism that may well be fueled by the imperialist logic of negation
2. How to study the creation of difference when the process itself is vexed with the troubled idea of equality

3. As always an intersubjective matter, the study of difference as it has been reproduced in four decades of multiculturalism and multiliteracies lets stand systems of oppression masked by the creation of more multicultural silos of thought and representations of experience.

We critiqued and opposed the replication of hegemonic practices that seek to replace Eurocentric practices of knowledge making with cultural rhetorics under the framework of decoloniality. We found in these disturbing practices the formation of new biases, means of exclusion and inclusion, and modes of domination, policing, and control. From this controversy, we have learned that “conviviality is not holiday, but a hard and relentless effort toward . . . pluriversal futures” (Mignolo 2011, 176). With this edited collection, we maintain that critique alone is never enough because it often does not lead to a reimagining of decolonial options as alternatives to the imperial legacies of thought, especially in the study of difference.

The chapters in this collection model for readers ways of producing knowledge centered on symbolic tools for perseverance and livable futures. They provide insight into intellectual heritages and projects located in the local global perspectives. Our stance for the current collection’s interdisciplinary decolonial project has been and continues to be one of constructive reimagination of the study of difference, one in which research, scholarship, and praxis meet to offer a plurality of methods and tools for epistemic delinking. To be transparent about how we reached this goal, let us briefly describe our editorial praxis.

As editors, we have no intention of marginalizing previous and ongoing decolonial struggles. *Pluriversal Literacies* is situated in the political and epistemic project referred to by Latin Americanists of the Modernity/Coloniality Collective as modern/(de)coloniality. Within this collection, decoloniality serves as an analytic or intervention into a hegemonic architecture of ideal representations of meaning making with symbolic, representational tools. It also serves as the prospective agenda of and for building pluriversal projects.

We avoid conflating decolonial projects with Indigenous and Native American struggles, and we recognize the fight and right for Indigenous and Native American peoples to both decide what is best for their communities and to affirm efforts toward liberation from centuries of coloniality. We acknowledge distinctions and discontinuities, yet we cautiously seek out connections between and across such complex differences. What connects these projects is the wreckage left behind by colonialism and coloniality, the specific colonial structure of power architected, imported, shared in, and disputed since the *discovery* and *invention* of the Americas—Americanness). The Modernity/Coloniality Collective provides us with an epistemic foundation on which to situate, unsettle, and disentangle Western epistemologies and epistemic practices.

Last, we would be remiss if we did not recognize the work of those helping to clarify decoloniality's own limitations (Cintrón, Corcoran, and Bleeden 2021; Mbembe 2019; Pérez 2010; Tlostanova 2020; Vuola 2000). Criticisms are necessary for the strengthening of any epistemological project. In "On the Way to Decolonization in a Settler Colony: Re-introducing Black Feminist Identity Politics," Kristie Dotson (2018, 198n13) addresses the importance of avoiding illusions that any articulation of colonialism "can (or should) apply to all settler colonial spaces and all settler machinations. Nobody, no matter how grand their understanding of themselves and/or their theory, can make those kinds of pronouncements without the aid of colonial imaginaries that need those kinds of mono-theoretical orientations." Dotson's critique echoes Tlostanova's (2020, 18) insights: "Decolonial thought is most acute in its critical interpretation of the past and its effects on the present, yet this critique is often balancing at the edge of stand-pointism (limited to the position of exteriority or colonial difference) which divides the humanity in a potentially essentialist way and defutures the human species[,] closing any possibilities for communal refuturing action." The colonial imaginary risks too narrow a focus on epistemic delinking from moments when difference has been created as its primary intervention, potentially rendering decoloniality an academic enterprise based on identifying colonialism's exteriorities. Rather, a wider focus must include praxis projects and actions that seek to refuture through constructive unsettlement. As editors, we realize that no system of theory or meaning-making framework can thoroughly account for or be interpreted as fully accounting for the specificities of place and particularities of experiences. Thus, decolonial projects necessarily rely on a plurality of voices, rendered with multiple sign tools and streams of evidence, from intersectional experiences and standpoints.

In another example of decoloniality's limitations, María Lugones (2006) calls for further analyses of gender as a colonial construct within a modern/colonial gender system. This gender system, Lugones (2007, 206) argues, "is heterosexist, as heterosexuality permeates racialized patriarchal control over production, including knowledge production, and over collective authority." As conquest and the transatlantic slave trade made Western colonial expansion possible, so did a heterosexist gender system, along with the meaning-making practices that sustained and continue to sustain such power structures (Ahmed 2017). Modernity/coloniality, as Quijano and Mignolo approach it, must be reread to reveal what is hidden: the colonial impositions of gender, race, and sexuality.² Elsewhere, Laura Pérez (2010) critiques Enrique Dussel and other Latin American theorists for lack of attention to the struggle of US women of color and queer-centered coalitions as central to the work of decolonization. We recognize the indispensable contributions of literacy scholars who have long addressed racism, gender, sexuality, and social

change in rhetoric and writing, Carmen Kynard (2014), Rhea Lathan (2015), Mark McBeth (2019), Beverly Moss (2003, 2010), Eric Darnell Pritchard (2016), Elaine Richardson (2003), Geneva Smitherman (1977), and many more have advanced creative responses to dominant structures of power, and their influences continue to inform our struggles today. We remain critical yet attentive to the aims of decoloniality in the face of the haunting circumstances of the modern/colonial world and its power differentials. The goal, at least as we understand a decolonial option, is to provide choices, options, and responsibilities for imagining and practicing pluriversality.

WORLDS AND FUTURES OTHERWISE

Readers can engage this collection through the same type of pluriversal approaches to meaning making with the various tools of representation that each author takes up as always being indicative of body, place, and epistemic. Thus, chapters can be read thematically by tracing the instrumental, historical, and place-based implications of the representational tools at the center of each chapter. Chapters can also be read from various loci of enunciations of knowledge while tracing the relations of the authors to their place-based understandings. Readers can also trace the variety of sign tools, such as language, literacy, film, maps, and cultural artifacts, as these pertain to the creation of difference. We have arranged chapters to signpost these paths through the analytics for perseverance and prospectives for livable futures from around the globe.

In chapter 1, “Winking at His Readers from the Gaps: Guamán Poma de Ayala’s Silent Texts,” Rocío Quispe-Agnoli examines gaps, omissions, errors, and inconsistencies in the work of sixteenth-century Andean writer Guamán Poma. These gaps, Quispe-Agnoli argues, provide glimpses into the place of enunciation of Indigenous peoples under the colonial regime and their alternate ways of conceptualizing their own history and place under a new, foreign rule. They constitute an example of dwelling in the border, a place of entanglement of different cosmologies that for an unexpected turn of events are connected, a place where border thinking is enacted. Border thinking happens within and across specific geospatial locations, as the next two chapters also illustrate. In chapter 2, “Gaining Indigenous Ground in a European Museum? Colonial Logics and Decolonial Possibilities at the Humboldt Forum,” Lisa King studies the controversy and response surrounding the opening of the Humboldt Forum in Germany. She reveals how the forum, as a representation of German national identity and a repository for collections of Indigenous artifacts, manifests colonial logics of representation and erasure, even as Indigenous peoples strive to intervene in those logics to create decolonial representations in that museum space. Demonstrating the epistemic violence of museums, King draws connections between place, knowledge, and repre-

sentation as contested terrains of knowledge making and being in which national and Indigenous identities unfold.

Rachel C. Jackson looks to the coalescing of Choctaw and African identities in Muscogee Creek territory in chapter 3, “Decolonizing Black and Indigenous Dispossession: Interculturality, Transrhetoricity, and Otherwise Re-storying Race.” Here, Jackson advances transrhetorical recovery to reclaim “history” as a dynamic decolonial story that foregrounds local intersections of histories and identities rather than colonial narratives, across which cultural change occurs. Transrhetorical recovery allows us to understand how the settler-colonial concept, practice, and rhetorical tool of dispossession resonates across cultural locations, thereby enabling us to repossess what we both historically and rhetorically share in common and to theorize mechanisms of decolonization. Transrhetorical recovery helps decolonial scholars make visible the border thinking and positioning in pluriversal literacies, especially insofar as it also can potentially make visible what is not said or what is said in ways of speaking and being otherwise.

The next three chapters situate enunciations of knowledge in language, education, and bodies. In chapter 4, “Competing Epistemologies, Contested Modernities: Hu Shi in Chinese Rhetorical Studies,” Xiaoye You examines the work of renowned philosopher Hu Shi’s contribution to Chinese language studies. You proposes that Hu was long marginalized in Chinese rhetorical scholarship largely because of his idealistic, anticommunist position, which ran counter to the positivist epistemology shared by the majority of Chinese rhetoricians. Hu’s rise and fall in Chinese rhetorical studies reveals the competing ideologies and epistemologies unsettling literary reforms in China.

In chapter 5, “Beyond a Native Clearing: Translanguaging and Decolonial Potential at the American Colonial Schoolhouse,” Florianne Jimenez examines Filipino student writing samples that “fail” on colonial terms yet remain purposeful and resonant as decolonial gestures. Drawing on translanguaging studies, decoloniality, and Philippine studies, this examination demonstrates the viability of Filipino literacies as rich sites for decolonial analysis and related fields of inquiry. As Kelsey Dayle John demonstrates in chapter 6, representation has always been an embodied praxis. In “When I Run, I’m Not ‘Half,’ I’m Diné: The Pluriverse in Connectedness of Movement,” John explores land-based relationalities embodied in intentional movements as a Diné runner and horse companion. These meaning-making relationalities narrate routes through entanglements of blood quantum, Native American self-determination, survivance, and settler colonialism. John embodies running and horse riding through writing to further examine sovereignty for Diné people as it relates to intentional movement across land. The instrumentality of meaning making, in addition to being a profoundly embodied practice, is also, importantly, land based, as King’s chapter reminds us. Each

of the chapters in the first half of the collection suggests important models of scholarship that oppose coloniality because they illustrate ways of reading and writing from within and against the workings of colonialism.

The next chapters focus on developing livable futures through languaging as a decolonial praxis in global and local contexts. The chapters return us again to the embodied practices of representational tools, with important caveats. In chapter 7, “The Language of Imitation: A Pedagogy of Representations,” Resa Crane Bizzaro and Patrick Bizzaro advocate for the teaching of culturally rich Indigenous literatures alongside the study of contemporaneous records of the peoples represented. Building on the decolonial theories of Mignolo and Quijano, as well as cultural studies by Jean Baudrillard and Gerald Vizenor, the authors offer strategies for how educators can more accurately portray historical and contemporary Indigenous peoples in research and classroom contexts. Multiple tools of representation are necessary if a plurality of literacies is to exist. Each of these next chapters draws on decolonial practices of knowledge making to make visible the tools of representation at the heart of these practices.

In chapter 8, Kate Vieira explores pluriliteracies vis-à-vis three international collaborations on writing and peace building. In “Cross-Border Collaborations for Peace: Writing from a Common Heart,” Vieira defines pluriliteracies as a critical set of adaptations and conversations, a promise to listen and to learn as people reach their hands across the pluriverse at the moment the gesture is necessary. The chapter reflects on the challenges and opportunities presented by collaborative work in publication and event planning along complex axes of power and history, highlighting love, listening, and reciprocity.

Anna Kaiper-Marquez and Sinfree B. Makoni examine the geographic and geopolitical connotations of the expression “Global South” in chapter 9. In “Conflicts within the Global South and Southern Epistemologies: A South African Case Study of Language and Domestic Work,” the authors invoke a hybridity of methodologies, including autoethnography, ethnography, narratives, and self-reflexivity. The chapter compares the research of Anna Kaiper-Marquez, a white female American researcher who conducted research in South Africa, with the lived experiences and research of Sinfree Makoni, a Zimbabwean-born man who lived many years in South Africa and whose work is situated in both “Northern” and “Southern” spaces. Kaiper-Marquez and Makoni model the ways in which research from Southern and Northern spaces is rife with diverse and often contradictory practices and understandings. This chapter exemplifies how processes of delinking from North/South and colonial/decolonial can exist not only outside the boundaries of the academy but within the walls and experiences of the academics pushing for and simultaneously hindering notions of decoloniality.

Tamara Issak and Lana Oweidat examine *amanah* as a guiding principle for moral conduct and personal responsibility in chapter 10, “Fulfilling Allah’s Trust: Rhetorics of *Amanah* as a Foundation for Social Change.” Isaak and Oweidat draw from Quranic exegesis, prophetic teachings, and current cultural and political events. The authors present *amanah* as a valuable rhetorical framework for challenging US imperialism, advancing social justice, and widening the scope of pluriversal literacies by introducing epistemologies from Arab-Islamic rhetorical traditions that challenge the universality of Eurocentric ways of knowing while disrupting stereotypical representations of Islam and Muslims.

In chapter 11, “Semicolonial Viscerality: *Gharbzadegi* and the Geopolitics of Sensing,” Maryam Ahmadi turns to Jalal Al-e Ahmad’s book *Gharbzadegi* for further examination of the relationship between interiority and exteriority within the context of Iran’s encounter with colonial modernity. More specifically, Ahmadi argues that the visceral dynamics of *Gharbzadegi* instantiate a differential movement between the body/body politic’s interior and exterior without invoking the topos of skin/border as a space exterior to Euro-modernity. This semicolonial locus of enunciation equips the body/body politic with a cosmopolitan geography of resistance that moves beyond the purview of cultural identity.

In chapter 12, “*I* is for *Isla*: (Pre/Ap)Positioning the Decolonial Rhetorics of Filipinos on Guåhan,” Tabitha Espina explores how the literacies of young Filipinos enunciate the complexities of decolonial positionalities through opinion editorials, podcasts, and public performances. A rhetorical analysis across these various sites reveals productions not as inert texts but as possibilities for enunciation and mobilization—manifestations of a political consciousness, a collective subjectivity on the island called home, and a discursive formation that bears out the contemporary concerns of Filipino communities in material, relevant ways.

The concluding chapter, Mary Louise Pratt’s “Lessons for Losing,” returns to the focus of our collection: representational tools, language, knowledge making, and perseverance as people seeking livable futures. She compares two knowledge makers who take up the importance of languages for enabling multiple ways of being and doing in this world as we inhabit and reimagine livable futures. She reminds us that the “matter of how to live the losing, and perhaps how to live loss beyond losing, becomes a central social, moral, imaginative, physical, and aesthetic challenge.” We agree.

The chapters in this collection help us to imagine alternatives to the imperial legacy of thought by extending critical interventions into decolonial inquiry and offering models of praxis from elsewhere and otherwise. Inviting transglobal readings and knowledge-making practices, particularly as these might center on and stem from highly localized and embodied tools of rep-

resentation, *Pluriversal Literacies* provides a diverse array of perspectives on decolonial thinking and doing. Pluriversality as a practice of knowledge creation rests in being flexibly structured to reflect both the local and transglobal, the creation of difference and the revaluation of knowledge, and the historical, cultural, and political practices of border thinking and doing. This book offers readers a long overdue treatment of decolonizing literacies and opens the way to new interpretations of pluriversal meaning-making practices.

NOTES

1. Theopolitics, or works of God, and egopolitics, or works of reason, reflect a *displacement* rather than a *replacement* of ideas and ends. Together they constitute a system theologically and secularly structured (see Mignolo 2011; and Dussel 1995).

2. For a critique of decolonial feminism, see the article by K. B. Thomas (2020).

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, Sara. 2017. *Living a Feminist Life*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Alcoff, Linda Martín. 2011. "An Epistemology for the Next Revolution." *Transmodernity* 1 (2): 67–78.
- Alvarez, Steven. 2016. "Literacy." In *Decolonizing Rhetoric and Composition Studies: New Latinx Keywords for Theory and Pedagogy*, 17–29. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Baca, Damián. 2008. *Mestiz@ Scripts, Digital Migrations, and the Territories of Writing*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Baca, Damián. 2009. "Rethinking Composition, 500 Years Later." *jac* 29 (1–2): 229–42.
- Baca, Damián, and Victor Villanueva, eds. 2010. *Rhetorics of the Americas: 3114 BCE to 2012 CE*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Baca, Damián, Ellen Cushman, and Jonathan Osborne, eds. 2019. *Landmark Essays on Rhetorics of Difference*. New York: Routledge.
- Baker-Bell, April. 2020. *Linguistic Justice: Black Language, Literacy, Identity, and Pedagogy*. New York: Routledge.
- Boone, Elizabeth Hill, and Walter Mignolo, eds. 1994. *Writing without Words: Alternative Literacies in Mesoamerica and the Andes*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Castro-Gómez, Santiago. 2007. "The Missing Chapter of Empire." *Cultural Studies* 21 (2): 428–48.
- Césaire, Aimé. (1972) 2000. *Discourse on Colonialism*. Translated by Joan Pinkham and with a new introduction by Robin D. G. Kelley. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Cintrón, Ralph, Casey Corcoran, and David Bleeden. 2021. "Thinking with/Not with Theories of Decolonization." *College English* 84 (1): 138–58.

- Cushman, Ellen, Damián Baca, and Romeo García. 2021. "Delinking; Toward Pluriversal Rhetorics." Introduction to special issue, *College English* 84 (1): 7–32.
- Daniel, James Rushing, Katie Malcolm, and Candice Rai, eds. 2021. *Writing across Difference: Theory and Intervention*. Logan: Utah State University Press.
- Dotson, Kristie. 2018. "On the Way to Decolonization in a Settler Colony: Re-introducing Black Feminist Identity Politics." *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples* 14 (3): 190–99.
- Dussel, Enrique. 1995. *The Invention of the Americas: Eclipse of "the Other" and the Myth of Modernity*. New York: Continuum.
- Dussel, Enrique. 2019. "Epistemological Decolonization of Theology." In *Decolonial Christianities: Latinx and Latin American Perspectives*, edited by Raimundo Barreto and Roberto Sirvent, 25–42. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Escobar, Arturo. 2007. "Worlds and Knowledges Otherwise: The Latin American Modernity/Coloniality Research Program." *Cultural Studies*, no. 2–3, 179–210.
- Jones, Cherice Escobar, and Genesis Barco Medina. 2021. "Teaching Racial Literacy through Language, Health, and the Body: Introducing Bio-racial Rhetorics in the Writing Classroom." *College English* 84 (1): 58–77.
- Fanon, Frantz. (1963) 2004. *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Grove.
- Fanon, Frantz. 1986. *Black Skin, White Masks*. Translated by Charles Lam Markmann. London: Pluto, 1986.
- García, Romeo, and Damián Baca, eds. 2019. *Rhetorics Elsewhere and Otherwise: Contested Modernities, Decolonial Visions*. Urbana, IL: Conference on College Composition and Communication and National Council of Teachers of English.
- Ginés de Sepúlveda, Juan. (1892) 1987. *Tratado: Sobre las justas causas de la guerra contra los indios*. Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Gordon, Lewis. 2007. "Problematic People and Epistemic Decolonization: Toward the Postcolonial in Africana Political Thought." In *Postcolonialism and Political Theory*, edited by Nalini Persram, 121–41. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Grosfoguel, Ramón. 2007. "The Epistemic Decolonial Turn: Beyond Political-Economy Paradigms." *Cultural Studies* 21 (2–3): 211–23.
- Hernandez-Zamora, Gregorio. 2010. *Decolonizing Literacy: Mexican Lives in the Era of Global Capitalism*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Kynard, Carmen. 2014. *Vernacular Insurrections: Race, Black Protest, and the New Century in Composition-Literacies Studies*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Lathan, Rhea Estelle. 2015. *Freedom Writing: African American Civil Rights Literacy Activism, 1955–1967*. Urbana, IL: Conference on College Composition and Communication and National Council of Teachers of English.
- Lugones, María. 1987. "Playfulness, 'World'-Travelling, and Loving Perception." *Hypatia* 2 (2): 3–19.
- Lugones, María. 2006. "On Complex Communication." *Hypatia* 21 (3): 75–85.

- Lugones, María. 2007. "Heterosexualism and the Colonial/Modern Gender System." *Hypatia* 22 (1): 186–209.
- Lugones, María. 2010. "Toward a Decolonial Feminism." *Hypatia* 25 (4): 742–59.
- Lyons, Scott. 2000. "Rhetorical Sovereignty: What Do American Indians Want from Writing?" *CCC: College Composition and Communication* 51 (3): 447–68.
- Maldonado-Torres, Nelson. 2007. "On the Coloniality of Being." *Cultural Studies* 21 (2): 240–70.
- Mbembe, Achille. 2019. *Out of the Dark Night: Essays on Decolonization*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- McBeth, Mark. 2019. *Queer Literacies: Discourses and Discontents*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Mendieta, Gerónimo de. 1870. *Historia eclesiástica indiana: Obra escrita á fines del siglo XVI*. Mexico City: Antigua Librería.
- Mignolo, Walter D. 1992. "On the Colonization of Amerindian Languages and Memories: Renaissance Theories of Writing and the Discontinuity of the Classical Tradition." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 34 (2): 301–30.
- Mignolo, Walter D. 1999. "I Am Where I Think: Epistemology and the Colonial Difference." *Journal of Latin American Cultural Studies* 8 (2): 235–45.
- Mignolo, Walter D. 2002. "The Geopolitics of Knowledge and the Colonial Difference." *South Atlantic Quarterly* 101 (1): 57–96.
- Mignolo, Walter D. 2003. *The Darker Side of the Renaissance: Literacy, Territoriality, and Colonization*. 2nd ed. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Mignolo, Walter D. 2005. *The Idea of Latin America*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Mignolo, Walter D. 2007. "Delinking: The Rhetoric of Modernity, the Logic of Coloniality and the Grammar of De-coloniality." *Cultural Studies* 21 (2–3): 449–514.
- Mignolo, Walter D. 2009. "Epistemic Disobedience, Independent Thought and De-colonial Freedom." *Theory, Culture, and Society* 26 (7–8): 1–23.
- Mignolo, Walter D. 2011. *The Darker Side of Western Modernity: Global Futures, Decolonial Options*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Mignolo, Walter D. 2012. *Local Histories/Global Designs: Coloniality, Subaltern Knowledges, and Border Thinking*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Mignolo, Walter D. 2013. "Geopolitics of Sensing and Knowing: On (de)Coloniality, Border Thinking, and Epistemic Disobedience." *Confero: Essays on Education, Philosophy and Politics* 1 (1): 129–50.
- Mignolo, Walter D., and Catherine E. Walsh. 2018. *On Decoloniality: Concepts, Analytics, Praxis*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Moss, Beverly. 2003. *A Community Text Arises: A Literate Text and a Literate Tradition in African-American Churches*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.
- Moss, Beverly. 2010. "'Phenomenal Women,' Collaborative Literacies, and Community Texts in Alternative 'Sista' Spaces." *Community Literacy Journal* 5 (1): 1–24.

- Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o. (1986) 1992. *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*. Nairobi: East African Educational Publishers.
- Patel, Leigh. 2021. *No Study without Struggle: Confronting Settler Colonialism in Higher Education*. Boston: Beacon.
- Pérez, Laura. 2010. "Enrique Dussel's *Ética de la liberación*, U.S. Women of Color Decolonizing Practices, and Coalitionary Politics amidst Difference." *Qui Parle: Critical Humanities and Social Sciences* 18 (2): 121–46.
- Pritchard, Eric Darnell. 2016. *Fashioning Lives: Black Queers and the Politics of Literacy*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Quijano, Aníbal. 2000. "Coloniality of Power and Eurocentrism in Latin America." *International Sociology* 15 (2): 215–32.
- Quijano, Aníbal. 2007. "Coloniality and Modernity/Rationality." *Cultural Studies* 21 (2–3): 168–78.
- Quijano, Anibal, and Immanuel Wallerstein. 1992. "Americanness as a Concept, or the Americas in the Modern World-System." *International Social Science* 134:549–57.
- Richardson, Elaine. 2003. *African American Literacies*. London: Routledge.
- Smitherman, Geneva. 1977. *Talkin and Testifyin: The Language of Black America*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Taussig, Michael. 1991. *Shamanism, Colonialism, and the Wild Man: A Study in Terror and Healing*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Thomas, K. Bailey. 2020. "Intersectionality and Epistemic Erasure: A Caution to Decolonial Feminism." *Hypatia* 35 (3): 509–23.
- Tlostanova, Madina. 2015. "Can the Post-Soviet Think? On Coloniality of Knowledge, External Imperial and Double Colonial Difference." *Intersections* 1, no. 2 (2017): 38–58.
- Tlostanova, Madina. 2020. "Of Birds and Trees: Rethinking Decoloniality through Unsettling as a Pluriversal Human Condition." *Echo*, no. 2, 16–27.
- Tlostanova, Madina, and Walter Mignolo. 2012. *Learning to Unlearn: Decolonial Reflections from Eurasia and the Americas*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.
- Villanueva, Victor. 2006. "Blind: Talking about the New Racism." *Writing Center Journal* 26 (1): 3–19.
- Vuola, Elina. 2000. "Thinking Otherwise: Dussel, Liberation Theology, and Feminism." In *Thinking from the Underside of History: Enrique Dussel's Philosophy of Liberation*, edited by Linda Martín Alcoff and Eduardo Mendieta, 149–80. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Zhang-Wu, Qianqian. 2023. "Rethinking Translingualism in College Composition Classrooms: A Digital Ethnographic Study of Multilingual Students' Written Communication across Contexts." *Written Communication* 40 (1): 145–74. <https://doi.org/10.1177/07410883221127208>.