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ABSTRACT: The Caribbean Philosophical Association’s project of shifting the geography of reason requires five specific commitments of attunement: (1) to the languages we use, (2) to our expressive and perceptive capacities, (3) to the communities in which we are engaged and the ones we aspire to engage within, (4) to building culture through political struggle, and (5) to our situatedness and irreducible interconnectedness. Each of these commitments is developed toward identifying the mutually constructive relationship between communicology and creolization.
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Responsibilities of Leading the Caribbean Philosophical Association

Taking on the presidency of a scholarly organization calls on one to consider the scope and depth of the activities to which one has agreed in that official role. It calls on one to consider their purpose and, one hopes, develop clarity of thought that will inform one’s priorities, practices, and styles of engagement that will be deployed over the course of their leadership. It also requires a deep understanding of the scholarly organization itself, its history, the scholars who have defined its intellectual scope, and the hopes, dreams, and desires for the future carried by its membership. For the Caribbean Philosophical Association, the hopes, dreams, and desires of its members for the future are nothing
less than the creation of a radically human presence that fundamentally upends the systems of knowledge produced under European legacies that take themselves to be the only, or at least primary, sites of intellectual achievement.

It might seem odd, at first, to consider the hopes, dreams, and desires of members as a concern for the leading of a scholarly organization. After all, for many of us who make our living as professional academics, scholarly organizations are mechanisms or vehicles through which we establish our intellectual bona fides. Although secondary to our publishing record, which is the most easily recognized legitimator of our professional standing, our membership in professional organizations nonetheless contribute a certain recognizability to our scholarly identity. Moreover, unlike one’s publication record, our memberships in organizations are often the very ground upon which we become socialized into a scholarly field of study. Members want events to happen and systems to function effectively because it is often the case that the relationships we develop through our engagement with our professional organizations are critical to the development of thought that eventually results in our formally published work. A good organizational leader is responsible for making the system run well so that connections can be made.

This circumstance through which professional academics establish legitimacy is essential in developing communities through which knowledge and understanding is developed. Yet, there is a flip side to this description of the normal progress of professional legitimization—and that is that we can come to create rather insular communities wherein orthodoxies of practice and thinking take hold and rather than push thought beyond its previous limits, we have something closer to a continuous repetition of the same. Because the presidents of academic or scholarly organizations typically serve for limited periods of time, this tendency to maintain the status quo and effective function often dominates. It is custom in many scholarly organizations for the president to give a presidential address in which their scholarship stands as an exemplar of achievement in the field or suggests directions for future scholarship. Rarely, however, do new presidents take on the task of leading an organization that has defined itself through a project of cultivating radical change in the very way the culture of scholarship is lived. This is my interpretation of the purpose of the and the meaning of “shifting the geography of reason.” Taking on the presidency of this scholarly organization therefore requires more than a simple commitment to making sure things function well (although this remains a crucial responsibility). It requires a careful consideration of the specific ranges of peoples, cultures, perspectives, and practices that the organization can bring together in mutual support and growth.
The Intellectual Scope of the Caribbean Philosophical Association

As an organization, the Caribbean Philosophical Association (CPA) is dedicated to engaging thought that emerges in the Caribbean and promoting dialogue across the global south. Although we are a “philosophical” association, we are not limited to ideas that emerge only within disciplinary philosophy. Rather, we recognize that thought itself is an embodied human activity that is predicated on a sociality that, for the CPA, challenges Euro-modernity’s deeply individualistic orientation toward thought and action. Or, as Paget Henry puts it, “from the Afro-Caribbean perspective, philosophy is an intertextually embedded discursive practice, and not an isolated or absolutely autonomous one” (2000, 2). As an organization we recognize that the possibility of thought always emerges from our situatedness within and across communities. We recognize that thought itself—as that which becomes present to us in consciousness—emerges through our communicative engagements. Our capacity to study the terms and conditions through which consciousness appears as such in the immediacy of our communicative experience constitutes an essential practice in our effort to cultivate communities that can recognize and value the rich cultural histories of the people of the Caribbean, Abya Yala, and across the global south. It is through these practices that we counter the racist and colonialist erasures created when the epistemologies of Euro-modernity dominate.

This means that our philosophical and intellectual training in and of itself is often insufficient for the radical displacement of Euro-modern thought precisely because of and to the extent that it is “overidentified with its European heritage and underidentified with its African [and Indigenous] inheritance” (Henry, 2000, 8). This means that we must dedicate our intellectual projects to a praxis that foregrounds local, African, and Indigenous North and South American and Southern Pacific epistemologies as we build communities and develop institutions that thrive within our own conditions of existence. This means that we recognize the many ways in which Euro-modern thought is governed by colonialist logics that sustain antiblack racism and white supremacy. As we recognize these colonialist logics in our disciplinary training and institutional structures, we simultaneously create alternative possibilities. Our commitment to engaging thought that emerges in the Caribbean, Abya Yala, and across the global south generates the possibilities of usurping the antiblack racism and white supremacist legacies that constitute conditions of our own existence within Euromodernity. The decolonial project excavates the ground of anti-African and anti-Indigenous traditions that have constituted our philosophical traditions across the Caribbean, Abya Yala and the global south. And it does so by recognizing and interrogating the terms and conditions through
which the “communicative inequality that characterize our intellectual tradition[s] derive from the colonial nature of the cultural system that institutionalized it” (Henry, 2000, 9).

The thematic orientation of the Caribbean Philosophical Association is “shifting the geography of reason.” This was the theme of our first conference held in May 2004 in Barbados, West Indies. But, as Lewis Gordon often explains, after that first conference everyone quickly realized that “shifting the geography of reason” is a project that requires a movement, a momentum, a sustained and attentive effort across decades. And so, “Shifting the Geography of Reason” has become the enduring purpose of our existence as the Caribbean Philosophical Association.

As a thematic orientation, “shifting the geography of reason” is, in one sense, fairly straightforward. We shift our focus from foregrounding work produced and rooted in European traditions, to excavating and studying the traditions of African, Caribbean and Abya Yala cultures to create new discursive communities that legitimate the systems of thought and cultural practice that have been delegitimized under the rule of Euromodern thought. In another sense, however, shifting the geography of reason is not so straightforward because we are embodied human beings with varying capacities for consciousness and varying capacities to engage the existential responsibility of transcending our own limits of understanding. However incisive our intellectual analyses might be, unless our intellectual practices themselves expand our capacity, not just for consciousness, but for consciousness of consciousness at the level of praxis, we will be destined to replicate Euromodern modalities of thought even as we shift our focus to non-European traditions.

Shifting the geography of reason requires at least five specific commitments of attunement: (1) to the languages we use, (2) to our expressive and perceptive capacities, (3) to the communities in which we are engaged and the ones we aspire to engage within, (4) to building culture through political struggle, and (5) to our situatedness and irreducible interconnectedness. I shall consider each in turn.

A Commitment of Attunement to the Languages We Use

The CPA has always been commitment to decentering English as the lingua franca of intellectual exchange. The dominance of English functions as an exclusionary tool that sustains cultural parochialism. Under the leadership of Hanétha Vété-Congolo, our immediate past president, the CPA has created space for the inclusion of several languages, including not only Spanish and French, but also languages unique to the Caribbean and the African Continent—Creole, Mooré,
Tsonga, Chivanhu. The CPA understands that language is essential for expanding cultural understanding, and it is crucial that we continue to include the fullest possible range of linguistic communities in our work.

It is important to recognize how the formality of one language or another structures possibilities for meaning and understanding, and how the breaking of any one linguistic formality with another enhances our capacity to grasp the world differently and connect with people and communities that otherwise would not exist within the reality of our consciousness. The embrace of languages and speech beyond one’s first language creates an orientation of openness toward possibilities of communication and understanding that is not possible within a monolingualistic world.

Yet, we also have a paradoxical situation with regard to proficiency in a language that is not one’s first language. The paradox lies in the fact that while all language is communication, not all communication is language. We can, in other words, employ a language expertly and still not communicate effectively. Even more, it is possible that one can master the language of another culture in order to appropriate and dominate that culture and its people. This was Edward Said’s thesis in his famous work, *Orientalism*.

It is also possible to communicate very effectively without sharing a linguistic system. Musicians, dancers, artists, and athletes often communicate in deeply powerful ways without sharing a common linguistic system. Feelings codified in music, dance, art, and athletics often generate a kind of human contact and understanding that transcends linguistic expression. Our bodily comportment carries a communicative capacity that can function separately from a linguistic system. Of course, when we can engage meaning as it emerges within a wholistic and embodied space of communicative engagement that includes linguistic representation, we create the fullest possibilities for developing new formations of consciousness. Here we see echoes of Merleau-Ponty’s famous distinction between speech speaking and speech spoken (2012, 204). Speech speaking is what happens when “my spoken words surprise me and teach me my thought” (1964, 88). A moment like this illustrates a point of access to the praxial level of communicative experience. Speech spoken, in contrast, is the more common replaying and recreation of sedimented meanings as they have been habituated in our thought and behavior. Antiracist and decolonial epistemologies require that we learn to attune ourselves more fully to communicative experiences through which speech speaking can emerge more freely.

Therefore, our commitment to multilingualism must also include a commitment to a learned and learning embodiment in which our highest intellectual achievements are always contextualized by our engagements with the
practices of communities and a concomitant reflection on our varying capacities to understand across difference. This learned and learning embodiment includes our capacity for varied linguistic representation. This means actively studying the relationship between language as a formal system, and the whole range of semiotic systems in which our communicative embodiment emerges. Ultimately, here is where we can usurp what Paget Henry refers to as the “imperial communicative framework” (2000, 3) that has, since the moment of the so-called “discovery of the new world,” set the rules of intelligibility and relevance through which those communities whose ways of life and traditions have been subsumed under coloniality must struggle to find place and recognition. Here is where we can find the capacity for communication to become a meeting of minds and bodies that can actualize our deepest sense of a shared humanity. This leads me to my second point concerning expressive and perceptive capacities.

A Commitment of Attunement to our Perceptive and Expressive Capacities

Without diminishing the importance of linguistic specificity, nor lessening our commitment to multilingualism, we should also take a communicological turn toward communicative experience as an essential ground upon which we can test our capacity to engage the points of contact among ourselves and others that are created in the project of decolonizing thought rooted in Euromodernity. There is both a semiotic and phenomenological aspect to this work. The semiotic aspect most obviously includes language as a formal sign-system. But not just that, because our human relationality includes mutually interdependent relations across multiple sign-systems—for example, linguistic, spatial, temporal, existential. Moreover, within any given sign-system, other sign-systems emerge—for example, dialect, styles of dress, and an endless array of unique signs and sub-systems that are created among groups and in interpersonal relationships. Structuralism, at its best, attunes us to our inescapable situatedness within multiple levels of semiotic systems. A structuralist orientation in our intellectual projects can provide brilliant analyses of cultural artifacts—including art, literature, custom, ritual, etc., and in doing so reveal their “intrinsic and internal relationships” (Foucault, 301). Structuralism can serve the decolonial project by revealing the structural aspects of the coloniality of knowledge. We can come to recognize these intrinsic and internal relationships that sustain the mythologies of Euromodernity—mythologies such as the “discovery” of a “new world,” the superiority of European cultures against the so called “primitive,” the white supremacy that informs our extremist right
wing nationalist movements today. But a structuralist orientation, or any single intellectual orientation for that matter, can also assert itself in deeply arrogant ways and create an intellectual class whose investment in its analytic or critical work functions as a tacitly presumed superiority of understanding. In such cases, one’s intellectual authority becomes intellectually authoritarian. Structuralist orientations in intellectual projects have tremendous merit and often provide important cultural insights, but when our capacity for expression and perception are narrowly structuralist—that is, they forget the human being as participant, and the fact that our engagement with structure is never determinative but always contingent—we can slide into an intellectual authoritarianism.

We should also heed Foucault’s (1997) caution regarding the illusion of individual authorship (that is, the “author function”) and Lewis Gordon’s caution regarding disciplinary decadence. I make this link between Foucault and Gordon to highlight the link between what Foucault calls “the awesome materiality of discourse,” and Lewis Gordon’s caution about taking our disciplinary orientations as a totalizing intellectual project (2006). This is to say that both in Foucault and Gordon we have a warning about thinking that our thought can somehow stand outside of itself, that it can represent itself transparently and without being suffused within a discursive semiotics that includes investments in power and the will to know. Or, as Gordon reminds us, “To think, really to think, is to engage the frightening evidence of our own conceptual limitations and to realize, in such limits, the magnitude of all that transcends us” (2006, 33). This is a warning about thinking that we can know more than it is possible to know and forgetting that as a human being I can never step outside of my situatedness socially, culturally, historically. As we assert what we know—because there is a “what” that we do know—it is important that we assess how it is that we know what we know. And this how of knowing must be connected to the communities through which we aspire to build our future. It must be connected to the terms of possibility—terms that are never knowable in advance and never teleologically transparent—as they emerge in the dynamic interrelations that constitute our communicative experience. It is important that we accurately assess not just knowledge as knowledge, but also the relations through which our capacity to know is cultivated. It is important that we direct our work toward what we might call the relationality of relations.

This leads me to the phenomenological aspect of the communicological project. When we turn our attention to lived experience as it emerges in the immediacy of our communicative engagements, we are not asserting some essential truth of our experience of communication, or some kind of ultimate
knowing. Rather, we turn our attention to lived experience because we recognize that lived experience is the only direct access we have to the sociality that predicates the emergence of an individual and existential sense of self. We recognize that lived experience is the only direct access we have to the intersubjective conditions through which subjectivity itself emerges.

Our ability to assess accurately the terms and conditions through which consciousness becomes manifest as lived experience requires a multileveled sensitivity that locates itself within our communicative relationality. Our ability to cultivate this multileveled sensitivity requires an ongoing commitment to the suspension of presuppositions. In phenomenological terms, we must be fully committed to the invoking the epochē. Yet, even in making such a commitment, we do not free ourselves from our natural tendency to reproduce what we already know in consciousness, or at worst, from the possibilities of self-delusion. When done well, however, the invocation of the epochē serves as an existential commitment to the communicative reality in which we are immersed. When done well, the invocation of the epochē is realized as something that happens to me as I am attending to lived-experience. Rather than invoking the epochē I find that the epochē invokes me and suddenly, without an explicit effort to do so, I see and understand something in a way that I never had before.

Phenomenology’s attention to the complexities of lived experience aids us greatly in expanding our perceptive and expressive capacities. The phenomenological distinction between the Order of Experience and the Order of Analysis provides a basic orientation through which we can cultivate a multileveled sensitivity that adequately locates itself within our communicative relationality. We begin by recognizing that experience emerges in a three-part relationship of (1) experiencer, (2) experiencing, and (3) the experienced.

**POSITIVIST PARADIGM**

[Experience = that which is *given* in analysis: *Data*]

{experiencer → experiencing → experienced}

Order of Experience

{experiencer → experiencing → experienced}

Order of Analysis

**PHENOMENOLOGICAL PARADIGM**

[Experience = that which is *taken* in analysis: *Cata*]

{experiencer → experiencing → experienced}

Order of Experience

{experiencer ← experiencing ← experienced}

Order of Analysis
As I go through my everyday life, I am a person or experiencer who is experiencing and who then comes to recognize things I have experienced and represent them to myself. To develop an understanding of the sociality that predicates the emergence of what I can come to recognize as “what I experienced,” we must reverse the order of experience and apply the order of analysis. We begin with what we have been able to represent to ourselves as something experienced. Then, we turn to experiencing, in which we loosen the grip of our presumptions or the hierarchy of realities that enable us to come to represent our experience to ourselves as we did. This is the invocation of the epochè. The third step is to turn to the experiencer. But we must be very cautious about how we conceptualize the “experiencer” and avoid the desire to recognize ourselves as the complete author of our own world. For those of us who come from cultures or work within traditions where the individual author and their achievements are valorized as autonomous or self-sovereign, we must learn to recognize how our capacity for experiencing the world and discerning a reality is predicated a social and discursive semiotic in which we are inescapably situated. When we take this third step in the phenomenological paradigm, we are challenged to comprehend more deeply the social and cultural conditions in which communicative experience emerges as such. The greater the differences among interlocutors, the greater the existential challenge of our communicative engagements, and the greater the possibilities for creating new forms of intelligibility rooted in the localities and specificities of our engagements. We can actualize these enhanced possibilities only if we assume an existential commitment to seeing realities beyond our own.

Taking this basic phenomenological orientation to our work is, I think, an important step in expanding our perceptive and expressive capacities toward creating communicative realities that are less dominated by the “imperial communicative framework” that is Euro-modernity. This phenomenological orientation is also, I think, deeply consistent with the praxis of creolization as detailed in Jane Anna Gordon’s truly outstanding work, *Creolizing Political Theory* (2014).

**Commitment of Attunement to Communities of Engaged and Aspiration—Creolization**

Historically, creolization is a communicative phenomenon that emerges when unintelligibility is imposed upon one cultural group by another cultural group that seeks to make its own culture dominate and controlling. The imposition of unintelligibility upon a cultural group is always violent and culturally genocidal. This imposition of unintelligibility describes the logic through which the
European colonizers enslaved indigenous populations and sought to control their land and resources for economic gain. The transatlantic slave trade and the so-called “Conquest of America” created a centuries-long condition of violence, genocide, and ethnocide that targeted the peoples of the Caribbean and the Americas. Yet, this imposition of unintelligibility is also always resisted. And here we are, some five centuries later and the descendants of those who were targeted for ethnocide have survived through tremendous struggle and ongoing rearticulations of their own cultural traditions.

It is precisely from within these conditions of survival that creolization is taken up as a theoretical and methodological movement that is fundamentally decolonial and anti-racist. Following the thinking of Jane Anna Gordon, we can say that our contemporary embrace of creolization transforms it from a “descriptive social science” that falls within the positivist paradigm and seeks retrospectively to capture creolization as if it is a fait accompli (2014, 174), into projects that recognize the impossibility “transcend[ing] the field of struggle in which intersubjective relations are crafted” (167). I am suggesting that creolization, conceived of in this way, is well served by a communicological approach to the degree that it strengthens our attunement to the praxial level of communication.

As a theoretical and methodological practice, creolization requires communities of engagement, with an emphasis on communities in the plural. This is because our natural human tendency is to seek out and connect with those with whom we share a common worldview, a common language, a common understanding. As human beings, we naturally find comfort within communities where we feel understood, recognized, and valued. It is ironic, then, that this natural human tendency also fosters conditions in which our humanity can be diminished. When we seek out the comfort of the familiar to the exclusion of encountering difference, we come to live in a deeply restricted world. And this is why I articulate an attunement to communities of engagement and aspiration as a commitment required to shift the geography of reason. First, we must understand the communities through which we find our humanity affirmed and recognize the limits of self-knowledge and self-understanding thusly engendered. Then we can pose the question about our human aspirations and begin to identify the communities through which we seek to pursue the expansion of our capacities for communicative engagement. This kind of commitment to shifting the geography of reason through our engagement with communities applies equally across the narrowest academic communities, to the broadest cultural communities.
A Commitment of Attunement to Building Culture Through Political Struggle

Culture is an ongoing achievement that is built through communicative and political struggle. To think about culture this way is to think of it as alive and concrete, as something that we inherit, not as a finished product, but as a situatedness in human relations the totality of which we can never know completely. We engage culture in every communicative interaction, from our most mundane activities of our everyday lives to moments of collective crisis, to our highest intellectual or artistic achievements. These inescapably cultural aspects of our communicative engagements constitute the sites from which cultural change occurs—although, it is important to remember that cultural change is anti-predicative in that we can never know in advance what nuance of communicative practice will come to be recognized years or centuries later as leading to a definitive moment in which new possibilities of our shared humanity became actualized.

This predicament of being participants in cultural change in ways we cannot know or fully anticipate, should heighten our commitment to engaging political struggles that are deeply attuned and committed to processes of creolization. As Jane Anna Gordon puts it, it’s helpful to recognize that our engagement in political processes “involves rearticulating the shared world that is the condition of possibility” (J. Gordon, 2014, 4).

In a world where we actively recognize our shared world as a condition of possibility in need of rearticulation, what sort of possibilities can we imagine? How do we conceive of the communicative relations among us within the worlds that we currently inhabit, and within realm of what we imagine is possible? These questions require responses, but not final answers. This is because our answers to these questions will always be based in our past and the presuppositions the constitute our habituated world at the level of praxis. What our responses or tentative answers to these questions can provide, however, is material for testing of our communicative capacities in the present. I think there is a connection to be made here between creolization as a process that leads inevitably to unanticipated outcomes, and the cultivation of our most fundamental communicative capacities.

Commitment of Attunement to Our Situatedness and Irreducible Interconnectedness

My fifth and final commitment of attunement can be understood in phenomenological terms as a revelatory phrase—that is, a phrase that marks an
essence of the phenomenon under consideration. The phenomenon I have been considering is the shifting of the geography of reason. My previous points regarding the languages we use, our expressive and perceptive capacities, our communities of engagement and aspiration, and the building of culture through political struggle, all point us to the inescapability of our situatedness and irreducible interconnectedness. Upon recognizing this basic point, we are obligated to engage in thought, action, and communicative practices that retain and recreate our deepest sense of our shared humanity. And we must learn to test the reality of the degree to which we achieve this in the immediacy of our communicative engagements. The efficacy of this testing requires engagements across difference, engagements with others and communities with whom we disagree or have contrasting worldviews. This is because, whether we like or not, we are all, as Jane Anna Gordon reminds us “resituated in [this] global age” (2014, 168). We can try to deny the saliency of this fact in the conduct of our lives, but we cannot escape it.

Over the past two decades the CPA has created communities of engagement that are more fully capable of comprehending this global age in ways that are decidedly decolonial and anti-racist. It has done so in the production of scholarship, in fostering the development intellectual communities, and in building institutions that enact and sustain our deepest sense of humanity. Our commitment to promoting dialogue across the global south is essential in this project.

Conclusion

The thinking I have laid out here is the orientation I bring as the president of the Caribbean Philosophical Association. The communicological perspective is, I believe, deeply compatible with the theory and methodology of creolization as laid out by Jane Anna Gordon. As she puts it, “Creolization offers a model of how it is that people have constructed collective worlds out of necessity. It is not through tiny unassociated parts coexisting in mutual hostility but by recognizing, exploring, and enunciating complex interdependencies in ways that transcode and incorporate so that each is understood in and through the terms of each other—so that the conditions of mutual indelibility and sociality can emerge” (2014, 196). Communicology can be a genuine partner in this project.

The connection between our deepest embrace of our shared humanity and our intellectual projects establishes a specialized communicative field upon which we can deploy thought that directs us toward projects that excavate the ground of African and Indigenous traditions that Euromodern traditions have sought to delegitimate, and thereby elevate the space for those African and In-
digienous traditions to be seen and engaged. This is the enduring promise of the Caribbean Philosophical Association, and it requires that we nurture and extend the spirit of love and struggle that has always defined the essence of the Caribbean Philosophical Association. I am honored to serve in a capacity that demands living up to this promise.
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**NOTES**

1. Originally presented at the Coloquio Internacional “Antirracismo y descolonización en el Caribe” at the Universidad Nacional Autonoma De Mexico, 17 August 2023.


3. Credit here to Lewis Gordon for making this distinction at the CPA Summer School at Rochester University, June 2023.

4. For further discussion regarding the semiotics of the relationality of relations see Colapietro (2012) and Pelkey (2012).

5. Here I make a nod to Ernst Cassirer’s notion of “symbolic forms” as used by J. Gordon in *Creolizing Political Theory* (2014), and also as a basis for a cultural phenomenology, Martinez (2017). See also Cornell and Panfilio *Symbolic Forms for a New Humanity: Cultural and Racial Reconfiguration of Critical Theory* (2010).

6. This is entirely in keeping with Maria Lugones’ important work on coalition building. See especially *Pilgrimages/Peregrinajes: Theorizing Coalition Against Multiple Oppressions* (2003). Michael J. Monahan’s most recent work, *Creolizing Practices of Freedom* (2023), deploys Lugones’ work as part of a creolizing project.
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