If one of the imperatives of thinking post-globally is to extricate us from the “one-becoming pulsion” of the globe (Elias/Moraru 2015: xi–xii), then surely post-globality will have to come in many forms and different permutations. One such variant of an emerging post-global paradigm, I first suggested in an article in 2019, is a peculiar cultural constellation to which I gave the name of “ethnoplanetarity” (Radisoglou 2019). What this notion sought to encapsulate, in brief, was what I identified as a notable tendency in works of art of the 21st century, namely the close conjunction of a national thematics or field of representation with a planetary perspective that extends itself to the vast spatiotemporalities of terrestrial life in the long durée of cosmological history. If the article – a close analysis of Patricio Guzmán’s films Nostalgia de la luz (2010) and El botón de nácar (2015) – was rather tentative or even speculative in its delineation of the term, I would like to take the opportunity of the present essay to bring into sharper relief what I mean by ethnoplanetarity, and how I conceive of the conceptual and epistemological gains the term entails. I will be concerned here, then, not so much with a close reading of individual works as with a programmatic outline of the ways in which ethnoplanetarity can help instantiate a properly “post-global aesthetics”1. My contention is, as the following four theses and a postscript demonstrate, that ethnoplanetarity is here; that it is a post-global, contemporary, and decolonial constellation; and that it forms part of the broader domain of epistemologies of the South.

Thesis One: Ethnoplanetarity is here

One need only look to contemporary cultural production from Chile to conclude that ethnoplanetarity is, indeed, a thing. Guzmán’s two films, along with 2019’s
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1 In my reflections on the post-global, I will also be drawing here on my introduction, with Christoph Schaub, to a special issue of The Germanic Review [journal name in italics] on ‘Post-Global Perspectives on German Literature’. See Radisoglou/Schaub 2022.
La cordillera de los sueños, form part of a cinematic triptych that articulates the dictatorial and colonial histories of the Chilean nation with contemplations of the origins of the cosmos, the role of the element of water on “blue planet” Earth, and the geo-history of the Andean Mountains. In a body of work that strongly resonates with that of Guzmán and that includes the poetic documentary Kon Kon (2010), the poet, artist and filmmaker Cecilia Vicuña constellates the violence of the Pinochet regime and the forceful marginalization of Chile’s indigenous populations within a wider reflection on the fragility of planetary life under conditions of neoliberal hegemony and ecological crisis. The Berlin-based visual artist Michelle-Marie Letelier, finally, time and again situates her projects in the Atacama Desert, which also served Guzmán as the setting of Nostalgia de la luz, exploring the complex imbrication of planetary materialities and geological formations with the political, economic and environmental histories of Chile in the global context of an extractivist economy.

On a first level, then, ethnoplanetarity operates as a descriptive category. To say that it is here is to give a name to a conspicuously prominent feature of contemporary cultural production, and to ask scholars in various fields and areas to keep an eye for and engage with it. In this sense – and this is an important caveat to make here at the very outset – my mobilization of the prefix ethno- has nothing to do with a valorization of this term on a normative level; nor, more crucially still, is it meant to suggest anything like the culturalism, biologism, or outright racism that a term like “ethno-nationalism” would imply. While ethno- in this latter sense – and rightly so – has profoundly negative connotations, my use of it seeks, perhaps somewhat infelicitously, to denote no more than something pertaining to a nation state – an attendance, that is, to the contingent but particular historical formation (and analytic category) of a political entity like “Chile”. It is entirely consistent, in this respect, that the national, in works like Guzmán’s, Vicuña’s, and Letelier’s, appears almost exclusively as trauma.

**Thesis Two: Ethnoplanetarity is Post-Global**

What interests me about the works of Guzmán, Vicuña, and Letelier is not simply their articulation of a national with a planetary level. More crucial to me is

2 For an analysis of Kon Kon explicitly within the framework of “planetarity”, see Amich (2013).

3 A comprehensive overview of Letelier’s work can be found on her website (http://michelle-marieletelier.net). For a detailed discussion of some of her recent projects, see Page (2021).
that what seems to be at stake in this conjunction is, in fact, a third dimension: that of the *global*. In each of these artistic projects – less explicitly in Guzmán, more pronouncedly in Vicuña and Letelier – an ethnoplanetary perspective effectuates an interrogation of the condition of globality. Or, more emphatically still: Ethnoplanetarity seeks to supplant the discourse of the global. How to conceive, then, of the entanglements and tensions between the national, the global, and the planetary? Why this double lever of *ethno-* and planetarity to unhinge the order of the global? And what to make of the recurrence of the national if it is to be more than atavism or regression? Is ethnoplanetarity a matter of dialectics, a constellation akin to that of the “glocal” – only that glocality’s suspension or bracketing of the national (a moment proper to the era of globalization) is replaced here, or indeed sublated into, ethnoplanetarity’s bracketing or suspension of the global (the moment proper to an emerging *post-*global paradigm)?

The critical discourse of planetarity has, of course, for a considerable period of time now been one of the main contenders for the instantiation of such a post-global paradigm. In its contemporary form, one can trace it from essays by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak and Masao Miyoshi to more recent work by scholars such as Emily Apter, Susan Stanford Friedman, Amy Elias, Christian Moraru, and Dipesh Chakrabarty, with Elias and Moraru having gone as far as positing a wholesale “planetary turn” in the humanities (Spivak 1999; Miyoshi 2001; Apter 2013; Elias/Moraru 2015; Moraru 2017; Chakrabarty 2021). Different accentuations notwithstanding, what unites such work is its promotion of the planet as a politico-epistemological counter-figure to the globe – a shared endeavor, in Spivak’s influential phrase, for planetarity to “overwrite the globe” (Spivak 1999: 44). While the globe, thereby, appears as a figure of one-ness – of systemic integration, cultural and economic homogenization, and frictionless flows and movements in standardized time – the planet, as “concurrently symbiotic and oppositional” to the globe, comes imbued with an altogether different “form of relationality” (Elias/Moraru 2015: xiii; vii). Moraru, in a programmatic essay that also cites the work of Apter, has spoken of globality’s “fashioning [of] the polymorphic world into a sphere-like totality whose ‘smooth surface allow[s] the unimpeded flow of capital, information[,] and language’” (Moraru 2017: 126) – a material and discursive operation that finds its radical counterpart in Elias and Moraru’s sense of planetarity as “a multicentric and pluralizing […] structure of relatedness critically keyed to non-totalist, non-homogenizing, and anti-hegemonic operations typically and polemically subtended by an eco-logic” (Elias/Moraru 2015: xiii). What is at stake, in other words, in this turn to planetarity, is a shift “from *globe* as financial-technocratic system toward *planet* as world-ecology” (Elias/Moraru 2015: xvi).
Planetarity, then, is post-global. Its post-ness, however, is not to be understood in the sense of a temporal succession, but as a radical interrogation and performative reinscription of a given framework, namely the historically contingent formation of neoliberal globality. This is precisely one of the nuances of Spivak’s term: To have the planet “overwrite” the globe is a process of *worlding otherwise*. It is predicated on a “new episteme” that is, however, “heuristic rather than deterministic”, and “cautiously exploratory” (Elias/Moraru: xxv). It is a fitting conjuncture, in this context, that the very etymology of the word “planet” – from Ancient Greek πλανάω (to wander, to roam, to err) – eschews the instrumental and fully circumscribed trajectories of global integration.

The planetary apertures in works like Guzmán’s, Vicuña’s and Letelier’s, I contend, must be seen as an aesthetic instantiation of such a post-global imaginary. What characterizes each of these works is a capaciousness in form and content that seeks to do justice to the multiple, and multiply differentiated, modes of *being-in-time-and-space* of which earthly belonging is comprised. Crucial to this is what I have called a form of “heteroscalarity” (Radisoglou 2019: 196–200) – a kaleidoscopic shifting between or interweaving of various temporal and spatial layers which is achieved, in each case, through specific aesthetic and articulatory practices. My sense of heteroscalarity here resonates profoundly with Susan Stanford Friedman’s programmatic statement, in her *Planetary Modernisms*, that

> we need a fluid approach to spatio/temporal scale, one that can move flexibly back and forth between large and small, between large-scale structural patterns that distance helps us see and the small-scale particularities that nearness brings into visibility. Fluid, moving scales create bird’s-eye and ground-level views that can inform and complement each other (Friedman 2015: 94).

For Friedman, thereby, “[sca]lar thinking [...] in both temporal and spatial terms allows for the flexibility to zoom in, zoom out – back and forth from big to small, from the *longue durée* across the globe, to the particularities of distinctive periods and places, to the variations within localized periods, and to the ‘worlds’ created in forms of expressive/symbolic culture” (Friedman 2015: 96). Guzmán and Letelier’s multi-perspectival approaches to the Atacama – at once a geological formation, a center of cosmological research, a site of extractivist activity, a trade route, home to indigenous peoples, location of a political prison, and burial site of Chile’s murdered *desaparecidos* – are paradigmatic cases for a form of “scalar literacy” (Clark 2019: 38–56) that eschews the one-dimensionality and temporal myopia of the global. The coastal landscape of Concón in Vicuña’s near-eponymous film similarly, as Candice Amich has demonstrated, is “a site where economics, history, ecology, bodies, art and memory
converge through a formal engagement with place” (Amich 2013: 135). And so, importantly for my argument here, each of these works also mediate between – or refract through each other – artistic individuality, collective experience, national history, global interconnections, and the history of the cosmos.

But why, then, ethno-? It is through this dimension, I contend, that planetarity gains contour as a properly post-global paradigm. Two aspects, in my view, are at play here: Firstly, there is the risk of planetarity’s devolving into a form of cosmological a-politicism or mere aesthetic transcendence. This would bring with it a dissolution of the particularities and differential parameters of earthly existence – even an evacuation of historicity as such – that would threaten to undermine the political force and transformative potential of planetarity as a specifically post-global paradigm. Nothing is gained, politically or epistemologically, if the master narrative of the globe-as-one is supplanted by a revelling in the even grander still sublimity of cosmic belonging. Bluntly put, if *Nostalgia de la luz*, for instance, were only about the awe-inspiring galaxies brought close by the gigantic telescopes stationed in the Atacama, the film would amount to little more than elevated kitsch.

Ethnoplanetarity, then, on this first level, is about the persistence of the national as a “really existing” container for political processes, collective experience, and memorial practices. If Friedman calls for a new paradigm that is “cosmic and grounded at the same time” (Friedman 2015: 8), then the national in ethnoplanetarity also performs that task of *grounding*. The ground, however, must not be mistaken for a foundation or a root. Ethnoplanetarity is not, as I emphasized at the very outset of this essay, about a return to or an affirmation of the national as a positive and regulating principle of being-in-the-world. On the contrary, what is at stake here is an insistence on the pains and traumas inflicted through the framework of the nation – a reminder that the *concrete*, grounded histories and memories of this still-virulent formation cannot simply be overcome through the terrifugal motions of a cosmological imaginary. If the nation is no answer to the problematic of the globe, post-globality will still have to reckon with its legacies.

This brings me to a second, perhaps more salient point, which will also bring into sharper relief why the domain of the national has a stake in a specifically *post-global* project of ethnoplanetarity. It is an established argument today in the field of Latin American Studies that an inextricable nexus exists between the continent’s military dictatorships of the mid and late 20th century and the full transition of several of its countries to the conditions of a global market under neoliberal hegemony. Idelber Avelar, in his influential study *The Untimely Present*, has spoken of a “new present ushered in by the military regimes: a global market in which every corner of social life has been commodified” (Avelar 1999:
1). Referring, variously, to a “global market”, a “market logic”, “neoliberalism”, “the free market”, and “global capital”, Avelar argues that the very “raison d’être” of these dictatorships “was the physical and symbolic elimination of all resistance to the implementation” of such a regime of neoliberal globality (Avelar 1999: 1; 2; 13).

Guzmán, Vicuña and Letelier’s Chile is, of course, a – perhaps the – paradigmatic case for this kind of process. And so the close attendance in their works to the brutal legacies of Chile’s recent national history must also be read as an antidote to a form of historical obsolescence on which the country’s very insertion into the condition of globality is predicated in the first place. Avelar has argued that “the neoliberalism implemented in the aftermath of the dictatorships is founded upon the passive forgetting of its barbaric origin”, that the “free market established by the [...] dictatorships”, indeed, “must [...] impose forgetting not only because it needs to erase the reminiscence of its barbaric origins but also because it is proper to the market to live in a perpetual present” (Avelar 1999: 2). Juan Poblete, similarly, speaks of “the implementation of [a] neoliberal memory apparatus” specifically in Chile, emphasizing “the difficulty of national collective memory under current global conditions”, and the “forgetfulness and presentism” inherent in a “predatory capitalism whose only horizon is the short-term” (Poblete 2015: 92; 93; 98; 99). Crucially, thereby, for Poblete “under neoliberal globalization, the national becomes, to a significant degree, [...] a memory counterpoint” (Poblete 2015: 94; my emphasis). It is in this sense precisely that the national in ethnoplanetarity comes to function to post-global effect. And so, yes, post-globality will ultimately have to follow a planetary trajectory, but to reach this novel plane, it will also have to pass through the dimension of the national. This is the ethno- of ethnoplanetarity: not stable root, nor foundation or even a firm ground, but a stepping-stone towards something new – the paradigm of post-globality.

**Thesis Three: Ethnoplanetarity is Contemporary**

To say that ethnoplanetarity is contemporary is more than to assert the fact that it inhabits, temporally, the now of the formation of globality. While
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4 On the question of Memory Art in the Contemporary World in the specific context of the Global South, see Andreas Huyssen’s eponymous recent monograph (Huyssen 2022).
5 One is reminded here, perhaps, of Édouard Glissant’s notion, in his outline of a “poetics of relation”, of a “root [that] begins to act like a rhizome” (Glissant 1997: 21).
ethnoplantarity’s contemporaneity does comprise this more conventional understanding – the contemporary as an alignment or synchronicity with the today – my own use of the term is animated by its composite or hyphenated nature⁶. What interests me, in other words, is the heterochronicity of ethnoplantarity – its refraction or dispersal into a series of differentiated co-temporalities. The “con-temporaneity” of works like Guzmán’s, Vicuña’s, and Letelier’s, then, resides in pitting the homogenizing temporal regime of neoliberal globality against a variety of other temporal orders, including those of cosmological time, geological processes, national memory, and, importantly, indigenous cosmogonies and world-ecologies. As a result, time itself is brought into a critical constellation.

In his much-cited essay “What is the Contemporary?”, Giorgio Agamben advances a similar understanding of what it means to be contemporary. “Contemporariness”, he writes, is

a singular relationship with one’s own time, which adheres to it and, at the same time, keeps a distance from it. More precisely, it is that relationship with time that adheres to it through a disjunction and an anachronism. Those who coincide too well with the epoch, those who are perfectly tied to it in every respect, are not contemporaries, precisely because they do not manage to see it; they are not able to firmly hold their gaze onto it (Agamben 2009: 41; emphasis in the original).

Contemporaneity, then, for Agamben is also a matter of un-timeliness, of “disconnection and out-of-jointness”: “Those who are truly contemporary”, he argues, “who truly belong to their time, are those who neither perfectly coincide with it nor adjust themselves to its demands. [. . .] But precisely because of this condition, precisely through this disconnection and this anachronism, they are more capable than others of perceiving and grasping their own time” (Agamben 2009: 40).

A con-temporary constellation in precisely this sense, ethnoplantarity stands in what I have previously called a relationship of “disjunctive affiliation” with the hegemonic temporality of neoliberal globality (Radisoglou 2019: 201). What is at stake here is what Jonathan Crary has described as globality’s “time without time” (Crary 2013: 29), the flat presentism of digital instantaneity, ceaseless consumption, and techno-capitalistic mass synchronization. The “24/7” logic of such a temporal regime, as Crary has argued in his eponymous book, “in its peremptory reductiveness, [. . .] celebrates a hallucination of presence, of an unalterable permanence composed of incessant, frictionless operations. It belongs to the aftermath of a common life made into the object of technics” (Crary
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⁶ In what follows, I draw heavily on the section on “Contemporaneity” in my previous essay on ethnoplantarity (Radisoglou 2019: 200–207).
2013: 29). As such, it is also predicated on a form of historical erasure: In a suggestive passage that powerfully resonates with works such as Guzmán’s, Vicuña’s and Letelier’s, Crary notes that

[a] 24/7 world is a disenchanted one in its eradication of shadows and obscurity and of alternative temporalities. It is a world identical to itself, a world with the shallowest of pasts, and thus in principle without specters. But the homogeneity of the present is an effect of the fraudulent brightness that presumes to extend everywhere [. . .]. A 24/7 world produces an apparent equivalence between what is immediately available, accessible, or utilizable and what exists. The spectral is, in some way, the intrusion or disruption of the present by something out of time and by the ghosts of what has not been deleted by modernity, of victims who will not be forgotten, of unfulfilled emancipation (Crary 2013: 19–20).

The (un)timelines, or (a)synchronicity, inherent in ethnoplanetarity’s contemporaneity, I would argue, constitutes precisely such an intrusion or disruption of the selfsameness of global time. The “dissensual” (Rancière 2010) effect of the time of ethnoplanetarity, thereby, has its roots in the artistic production of an ästhetische Eigenzeit, or the differential specificity of a peculiarly aesthetic temporality. The very form of such an aesthetic temporality – to draw here on an Adornian register – can, in turn, be understood as a determinate negation of the social-historical content of global time. This explains, incidentally, why ethnoplanetarity is legible as a post-global constellation even if, as in the case of Guzmán, the question of globality is not explicitly part of the content of a work of art.

Equally crucially, however, it is once again the articulation of the planetary with the national that brings the contours of post-globality into sharper relief. For what distinguishes the temporal heteroscalarity peculiar to ethnoplanetarity – a temporality both “cosmic and grounded” (Friedman 2015: 8) – is that it eschews at once the narrow parameters of homogenous global time and the historical forgetting which the latter is predicated on. In other words: Ethnoplanetarity both extends itself to other times beyond the global and critically attends to the national histories that are constitutively part of globality’s very genealogy. It encompasses, that is, both the planetarians’ attention to scales that render the planet “in the species of alterity” (Spivak 1999: 44) – including the time of cosmic history, non-human life, and inorganic matter – and what Poblete calls the “memory counterpoint” of the national or indeed “the national as memory” itself (Poblete 2015: 94; 93) – a “memory value”, in Avelar’s formulation, that transcends the all-pervasive logic of exchange which structures the system of
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7 For the notion of determinate negation, or bestimmte Negation, as deployed here, see Adorno (2013) and Menke (1999).
neoliberal globality (Avelar 1999: 5). The champion of ethnoplanetarity, then, must be a figure closely akin to that of Agamben’s contemporary, “the one who, dividing and interpolating time, is capable of transforming it and putting it in relation with other times [. . .] able to read history in unforeseen ways” (Agamben 2009: 53) – to read it, as one may venture to say here, in ways that are post-global.

**Thesis Four: Ethnoplanetarity is Decolonial**

To read history in unforeseen ways means both to unveil the logic that governs dominant conceptions of historical events and time, and to instantiate new modes of historicizing and of historicity as such. To conceive of ethnoplanetarity in such a way is to suggest that what is at stake here is a critical analysis, interrogation, and – importantly – performative constitution of epistemes of being-in-the-world. It is in this sense precisely that ethnoplanetarity can also be subsumed under the larger project of decoloniality. Ethnoplanetarity’s politico-epistemological investment, I contend, lies simultaneously with an unravelling of what Catherine E. Walsh and Walter Mignolo, in their programmatic work *On Decoloniality*, have called “the colonial matrix of power”, and with the delineation and instantiation of Walsh and Mignolo’s “otherwise that is the decolonial for” (Walsh/Mignolo 2018: 4; 10). Once again, thereby, it is the articulation of the national with the planetary that plays a crucial role in bringing about this form of twofold criticality.

The discourse of planetarity, of course, has from its very outset been directed not simply against the figure of the globe-as-one but also against the very epistemologies underwriting this globalizing thrust – a Western rationality, that is, whose “darker side” (Walsh/Mignolo 2018: 112), whether dialectically conceived or not, has always been complicit in grasping the world as something to be measured, totalized, and mastered. Planetarity, in contrast, is imbued with a different form of relationality which, in disjoining itself from the universality to which the colonial matrix of power lays claim, seeks to attend to the pluriversality of earthly belonging. Walsh and Mignolo, much in the same vein, speak of the decolonial project’s “creating and illuminating pluriversal [. . .] paths that disturb the totality from which the universal and the global are most often perceived” (Walsh/ Mignolo 2018: 2). And so the strong insistence by the champions of a planetary paradigm on relationality and “being-in-relation”, on a “thickening [. . .] web of relations” (Elias/Moraru 2015: xxi; xii), and “our common bonds to the planet” (Miyoshi 2001: 296); on planetarity as “bioconnective” and “eco-cosmological”;
and on “stewardship”, an “ethics of care”, and the relatedness of “[the] human [. . .] the nonhuman, the organic, and the inorganic in all of their richness” (Elias/Moraru 2015: xxiv; xvi; xxiii; xxiv; xiii) is also strikingly concordant with what Walsh and Mignolo refer to as vincularidad. Invoking the work of indigenous thinkers such as Nina Pacari, Fernando Huanacuni Mamani, and Félix Patzi Paco, they define vincularidad – an alternative term, precisely, for “relationality” – as “the awareness of the integral relation and interdependence amongst all living organisms (in which humans are only a part) with territory or land and the cosmos. It is a relation and interdependence in search of balance and harmony of life in the planet” (Walsh/Mignolo 2018: 1).

What I have called above the planetary apertures in Guzmán, Vicuña, and Letelier constitute elements precisely of such vincularidad or relationality. The macroscopic projections into cosmic time and space are as much part of this as is the microscopic attention to organic and inorganic matter. It encompasses the interest in the elements as well as the engagement with the textures of the sea, the mountains, and the desert. And it entails, of course, the strong ecological – indeed: ecocritical – dimension that animates the work of Vicuña and Letelier in particular. What manifests itself here is a radical rejoinder not only of the homogenizing trajectory of global integration but also, and more fundamentally, of the subjection of the world to instrumental rationality, extractivist activity, the will to mastery, and the violent taxonomies of Eurocentric modes of thought.

Crucially, thereby, this planetary or decolonial vincularidad is closely tied, in the works of all three artists mentioned here, to forms of a specifically indigenous world-ecology. This is evident, for instance, in Guzmán’s careful attention to the ways of living and the language of the Selk’nam and Kawésqar; in Vicuña’s documentation of the indigenous fishermen’s bailes chinos in the coastal landscape of Concón; and in Letelier’s exploration of the figure of the Giant of Tarapacá, a massive anthropomorphic geoglyph in the Atacama Desert whose origins date back to pre-Columbian times. The dialogue with indigenous cultures, then, is significant in two ways in the broader context of an emergent post-global aesthetics: For what manifests itself here is, firstly, an attendance to the connection between coloniality and globality and, secondly, an invocation of the altogether different nexus between indigeneity, decoloniality and post-

8 The baile chino is etymologically linked not to the Spanish term denoting ethnicity or race but to the Quechua word for “to serve”. As Amich writes: “‘Chino’ is a Quechua word that means ‘to serve’ and thus is a label that designates function – as in ‘to serve’ the sea – and not ethnicity; the majority of chino fishermen in central Chile today are most likely of Diaguita or Mapuche background” (Amich 2013: 135).
globality. In other words: These works are cognizant of the fact that the political and epistemological colonization of Latin America is of constitutive – indeed originary – importance for both the unfolding of the process of capitalist globalization and the parallel institution of the colonial matrix of power. If, however, as Anibal Quijano has argued, “the model of power that is globally hegemonic today presupposes an element of coloniality” (Quijano 2000: 533), then it is precisely – so Guzmán, Vicuña and Letelier seem to suggest – in an indigenous decoloniality, or decolonial indigeneity, that the possibility of unlocking a post-global order resides. To say this, importantly, is also to stress that such invocations of indigenous life have nothing to do with a “return” to a primordial harmony or the redemption of a past innocence, but belong with a futural order. Amich, in her discussion of Kon Kon, speaks of “the way in which indigenous epistemology harnesses ‘claims to a different historicity’ that makes it efficacious in the face of neoliberal assaults” (Amich 2013: 145). Channeling the work of Arif Dirlik, she suggests that “the potential of an indigenous alternative relies on ‘indigenous ideals as they have been reworked by a contemporary consciousness, where indigenism appears not merely as a reproduction of the past, but as a project to be realized’” (Amich 2013: 145). In my own terms, then, post-globality, what I have called above a particular form of con-temporaneity, and decoloniality are inextricably intertwined here. Amich concludes by saying that

[in] her negation of the epistemic violence done to colonized peoples, Vicuña’s intimations of planetarity unleash both new and old relationships to time, history, and place. It follows that two requirements of a poetics of planetarity are, first, that it register the sensory violence of globalization, and, second, that it retreat from the desire to dominate time and space and embrace instead the alterity of the planet (Amich 2013: 149).

It is in this sense precisely that Vicuña’s work – like Guzmán’s and Letelier’s, too – becomes a paradigmatic case for a post-global cultural production that seeks at once to offer a critique of the colonial matrix of power and to instantiate a decolonial otherwise.

What, then, of ethnoplanetarity? If planetarity as such already has a decolonial kernel, it is perhaps not intuitively obvious why one would want to stress

9 One interesting question in this context, in fact, is that about ethnoplanetarity as a potential force in the arena of contemporary Latin American nationhood. To what extent, that is, can recent attempts, in countries such as Ecuador or Bolivia, to include elements of an indigenous world-ecology in the official constitution of the nation be considered an effort at instituting a form of ethnoplanetarity in the properly political sphere? In the Chilean context, the ongoing work by the Constitutional Convention that has been tasked with drafting a new constitution for the country will be of interest in this framework too, as will be the policies of the newly sworn-in president Gabriel Boric.
here its conjunction with the national – a conceptual domain, after all, that arguably is itself deeply entrenched in the *episteme* of colonial modernity. And yet, not least *because of* this entrenchment, I insist here on the usefulness – the possible epistemological gains – of such a constellation. Three aspects, to me, stand out here, each one of them related to the role of the nation as a contingent, imaginary, but nevertheless “really existing” institution that has historically functioned as a contested terrain in (de)colonial struggles and as a testing ground for (post-)global trajectories.

The first aspect has to do, in a more general way, with what I have stated above about the national as a form of *grounding* of the planetary – not in the sense of a root or a foundation, but as a counterpoise to what I called the “terrifugal” intimations of a planetary imaginary. Crucially, this has nothing to do with the regressive valorization of the nation or *ethnos* as an antidote – to echo Marx here – to globality’s supposed logic of *all that is solid melting into air* (Marx/Engels 2008). Though they are coeval as elements of a symptomatology of globalization and its discontents, the anti-global and the post-global come with radically opposite political valences. What is at stake here, rather, is a sort of referral of planetarity to what Elias and Moraru call an “anthropologically pertinent scalarity” (Elias/Moraru 2015: xvii). It is not desirable, I have argued in my previous essay, to “resolve the historical particularities” that have occurred in the framework of specific national situations – including “political conflict, violence and trauma” – in a “new master narrative of cosmic belonging that, instead of departing from the false homogeneity of the global, would simply reiterate it on an even grander scale”. In other words: Political history cannot be “subsumed [. . .] under, or absorbed by, a natural history that transcends – or, indeed, is alien to – the modes and vicissitudes of human praxis” (Radisoglou 2019: 205). The persistence of the national in works such as Guzmán’s, Vicuña’s and Letelier’s – one that manifests itself predominantly in the form of a memory of the military dictatorship – can, accordingly, also be read as a reminder of what I have called “the irrefutable weight attached to that which cannot simply be alleviated in a cosmological re-scaling” (Radisoglou 2019: 205). In this sense, then, my insistence here on the national – not in itself, but as a relational element in the heteroscalar constellation of ethnoplanetarity – also resonates with Walsh and Mignolo’s imperative for any decolonial project “to interrupt the idea of dislocated, disembodied, and disengaged abstraction” (Walsh/Mignolo 2018: 3).
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10 On the constitution and functioning of the nation state in a specifically Latin American context, see Quijano (2000).
This brings me to a second aspect: In the context of Walsh and Mignolo’s call for an engagement with concrete and specific histories, the interrogation of the legacies of the Pinochet regime – something particularly pronounced in the work of Guzmán – takes on an important role. If the national situation of Chile during that period also represented, as David Harvey has argued, the “first experiment with neoliberal state formation” (Harvey 2005: 7), then the dictatorship marked both the transition to Chile’s insertion into the orbit of neoliberal globality and the violent erasure of previous paths and possible alternative trajectories. Poblete argues that in the course of this momentous shift towards what he calls the “postsocial” world of global neoliberal hegemony, “the social becomes [. . .] the object of national memory” (Poblete 2015: 97) – or, in the suggestive phrase of the title of his essay, of “The Memory of the National and the National as Memory”. It is this conception of the nation as a “time/space for which memory processes are fundamental and constitutive, even in the midst of the neoliberal postsocial tabula rasa” (Poblete 2015: 104) that resonates with my employment of the national for the paradigm of ethnoplanetarity. But while for Poblete, the “social national” (Poblete 2015: 101) has to do, primarily, with certain forms of collectivity and the structures of a welfare state, I conceive of this sphere in a more performative sense as a field of contestation and contingent historical struggles. And so the memory of the dictatorship, as a particular instance of the memory of the national, is also a memory, in Avelar’s register, “of everything that was left unaccomplished and mournful in the past” (Avelar 1999: 2) – a memory, that is, of the regime’s brutal vanquishing of a historical movement that was not in thrall with neoliberal globality, and that arguably was also propelled by a decolonial undercurrent.

Most importantly, however – and this is the third aspect of the national’s significance for a decolonial undertaking – ethnoplanetarity is able to bring into relief the constitutive role of the national itself in the perpetuation of colonial violence against indigenous populations. Quijano has argued that “[after] independence, the dominants in the countries of the Southern Cone [. . .] considered the conquest of the territories that the indigenous peoples populated, as well as the extermination of these inhabitants, necessary as an expeditious form of homogenizing the national population and facilitating the process of

---

Poblete defines the postsocial as “a social configuration that results from the transformation of the welfare state, with the end of its ethos of the social as a solidarity-based commitment administered by the state and its replacement by a competitive state whose rationality derives from the neoliberal version of the economy and whose ethos, instead of socializing and distributing risk in solidarity, individualizes and privatizes it. Obviously, the postsocial does not imply the disappearance of society, but it does involve its radical restructuring” (Poblete 2015: 97).
constituting a modern nation-state ‘a la europea’” (Quijano 2000: 562). Amich, similarly, in the more specific context of the dictatorship in Chile, contends that “the neoliberal nation signifies the erasure of an alternative indigenous ethos that spans the Andean region” (Amich 2013: 147). Her insistence, thereby, on “ecological damage and political violence as the twin offspring of neoliberal state formation” (Amich 2013: 137) – an argument powerfully present in both Vicuña’s and Letelier’s work in particular – underlines the inextricable entwinement of the national in a colonial-global nexus from which indigenous populations have suffered most harshly. Ethnoplanetarity as a decolonial constellation both acknowledges and seeks to extricate itself from this very nexus.

Postscript: Ethnoplanetarity is an Epistemology of the South

I want to conclude here, by way of a postscript, with a fifth and final thesis, one that emerges quite naturally from – and indeed suffuses – each of the previous four. That I opened this essay with the invocation of the “hereness” of ethnoplanetarity in a specific place – the Chile of Guzmán’s, Vicuña’s and Letelier’s artistic work – is no coincidence. Nor is the fact that Chilean cultural production then became emblematic of what one could call a broader *topicality* that comprises other places, an expansive now-time, and the pressing issue of decolonial inquiry. It is precisely this amalgamation of specific spatiotemporalities with more expansive trajectories of transformation that also characterizes the critical project of *epistemologies of the South*. Boaventura de Sousa Santos, in his programmatic text on *The Coming Age of the Epistemologies of the South*, has argued that the geographical signifier here is modified into “an epistemological, nongeographical South, composed of many epistemological souths having in common the fact that they are all knowledges born in struggles” against what I have called above the colonial-global nexus (Santos 2018: 1). What is at stake in such epistemologies, for Santos, is an “alternative thinking of alternatives” (Santos 2018: 6). “Dominant politics”, he writes, “becomes epistemological when it is able to make a credible claim that the only valid knowledge available is the one that ratifies its own dominance (Santos 2018: 6). In such an epochal *Zeitgeist*, it seems to me that the way out of this impasse is premised upon the emergence of a new epistemology that is explicitly political” (Santos 2018: vii). This notion is echoed in Russell West-Pavlov’s more searching question whether the concept of the “Global South” is “a term whose polyvalence offers a multitude of possible frameworks for posing new questions
and searching for new answers – in other words, for the production of innovative knowledge based in a non-Euro-Atlantic epistemological matrix (or better, network of matrices)” (West-Pavlov 2018: 3). West-Pavlov conjectures that the South denoted here is a “relational sign” or a “shifter not merely because it is a mobile term with variously inflected meanings but because it works like a deictic marker, linking discourses, places, and speakers in such a way as to generate new subject positions, fields of agency, and possibilities of action” that keep “multiplying without homogenizing or totalizing the relationships which they sketch out” (West-Pavlov 2018: 2; 11).

What is at play here, once again, is the very vincularidad or relationality that also marks the constellation of ethnoplanetarity. And indeed, the affinities between the forms the latter takes – culturally, aesthetically – and the range of meanings carried by the notion of epistemologies of the South are striking. They fully coincide not only in their relational trajectories and broader politico-epistemological directionality, but also in specific aspects such as the insistence on “pluriversality” rather than “abstract universality”, the critique of the “coloniality of knowledge (as of power)” (Santos 2018: 8), the foregrounding of indigenous experience, and the promotion of what Santos calls an “ecology of knowledges, that is, the recognition of the copresence of different ways of knowing and the need to study the affinities, divergences, complementarities, and contradictions among them in order to maximize the effectiveness of the struggles of resistance against oppression” (Santos 2018: 8). It is not, of course, a tautology to say that ethnoplanetarity is an epistemology of the South – not all epistemologies of the South are ethnoplanetary – but in each of the parameters I have sketched out in the preceding theses, it is without a doubt a paradigmatic cultural expression of such an epistemology of the South. What remains is the question about the scope and efficacy of ethnoplanetarity – the role it has to play in the encounter not only with the global North but also, as a cultural constellation or indeed aesthetics, with the dominant national philologies of Western Europe. It is perhaps in this encounter that the true measure of ethnoplanetarity’s post-global force will fully be determined.
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