

# Toward Cosmopolitan Sensibilities in US Curriculum Studies: A Synoptic Rendering of The Franciscan Tradition in Mexico

JAMES C. JUPP  
*Georgia Southern University*

IN THIS ESSAY, I articulate the notion of cosmopolitan sensibilities through a synoptic rendering of the Franciscan educational tradition in 16<sup>th</sup> century Mexico. By way of definition, *cosmopolitan sensibilities* refer to *the careful, creative, and reflective study of one's own and others' intellectual traditions as a means of leveraging subjectivity and creating non-determinist, critical, and ethical dispositions*. Following William Pinar (2013) and others' research on intellectual history (e.g., Connell, 2007; De Sousa Santos, 2009; Dussell, 2005) and recent curriculum history (e.g., Hendry, 2011, 2012; Baker, 2009; Paraskeva, 2011; Winfield, 2010, 2011), I render the Franciscan educational tradition as a means of articulating cosmopolitan sensibilities in a broader sense. Diminishing notions of "expertise" of which educational historians are so often covetous, the rendering of the Franciscan tradition seeks *not* a contribution to Mexican history or cultural criticism, but rather this essay takes up a modest yet pressing pedagogical task in relation to curriculum studies' internationalization: *an understanding of substantive and longstanding traditions of educational and cultural criticism unknown to Anglophone-centric and Statesian curriculum "discourses."* The Franciscan tradition, by way of synecdoche, suggests a broad constellation of educational and cultural traditions *heretofore* outside of, invisible to, or variously unknown to the curriculum studies' discourses or their refinements. Recognizing the present state of Anglophone-centric and Statesian curriculum discourses that historically "silo" scholars into safe career "homes" yet simultaneously seek to emphasize one ever newer discourse to "reverse," "correct," or variously "superordinate" another (Appelbaum, 2002), this essay articulates cosmopolitan sensibilities that move curriculum studies beyond discourses and short-live polemic reversals, corrections, or superordinations. Moreover, in articulating cosmopolitan sensibilities that go beyond discourses of the past, this essay also critiques discourses, refinements, and their proliferations as representative of an *unreflective* Anglophone-centric and Statesian globalization. From the purview of cosmopolitan sensibilities articulated here, discourses, refinements, and proliferations continue to understand

curriculum studies in the United States and Canada in uncomplicated ways as simply “the field.” In the place of discourses, refinements, and proliferations, cosmopolitan sensibilities turn away from a now *tired-and-ahistorical* polemics on the proliferation of new-and-better-refined discourses. Beyond understanding “the field” as discourses, refinements, and proliferations, cosmopolitan sensibilities suggest carefully historicized understanding, critical intercultural dialogue, heterogeneous internationalization, and most importantly, ethical dispositions based on intellectual modesty before what is *as-of-yet* unknown to an Anglophone-centric and Statesian curriculum field. These components of cosmopolitan sensibilities that I attempt to demonstrate below – historicized understandings, critical intercultural dialogue, and heterogeneous internationalization – all weigh heavily in the balance for creating ethical-democratic potentials in an era of imperialism (Appiah, 2006; Dussell, 2005; West, 2004; Sen, 2006).

As a map of what is to come, this essay explains and articulates cosmopolitan sensibilities by moving through the following contours: In this essay, I

1. Explain the notion of cosmopolitan sensibilities emphasizing the need for historicized research as necessary for intercultural and critical understanding and proposing the Franciscan educational tradition in 16<sup>th</sup> century Mexico *not* as exemplary of cosmopolitan sensibilities but *rather* as pedagogical means of *coming-to-know* traditions silenced or variously eclipsed in the field’s present “discourses”;
2. Provide a synoptic rendering<sup>1</sup> of the Franciscan tradition deployed by historians and intellectuals of the Mexican Revolution recognizing the tradition as co-constitutive of critical-liberal cultural hybridity or *mestizaje* that, though insurgent at the time of the Revolution, currently articulates the master narrative of *mestizo hegemony* in Mexican national identity;
3. Recognize five critical progressive through-lines present in the synoptic rendering of the Franciscan tradition that are relevant to an intercultural ethic of “transmodernity” (Dussell, 2005<sup>2</sup>, p. 18) yet simultaneously critique, challenge, and destabilize the “truths” of the Franciscan tradition by emphasizing on-going power asymmetries in postcolonial conditions.

In its conclusion, this essay returns to cosmopolitan sensibilities and makes the case for *on-going progressive-critical understanding* that extends an internationalized field toward recognition of work in multiple historical traditions with an emphasis on *understanding Hispanophone educational and cultural criticism*.

### **What are Cosmopolitan Sensibilities?**

Defined above, cosmopolitan sensibilities refer specifically to *sensibilities* and *not* to another “paradigm,” “framework,” “discourse,” or “discursive refinement.” In that direction, cosmopolitan sensibilities suggest the quality of being able to endure, appreciate, and respond to complexity without beating a path back to fundamentalist and reductionist “identities” or first “beliefs” that anchor curriculum studies discourses and their refinements. This enduring, appreciating, and responding to complexity, developed here in cosmopolitan sensibilities’

engagement in traditions, represents an increasingly important ethical disposition in curriculum studies and in education writ large. Cosmopolitan sensibilities, driving at ethical dispositions, seek to engage, challenge, and critique neoliberal hegemonic globalizations in ways that advance educational thinking beyond *a priori*<sup>3</sup> and variously reductionist right-left “identities” and “beliefs” or their associated “values” or “commitments” that characterize curricular, educational, and broader discourses or their “refinements” in the historical present. Cosmopolitan sensibilities, rejecting conversations that reduce themselves to fundamentalist and reductionist identity questions of *who-you-really-“are”* or epistemological questions of discovering *what you truly “believe”*, instead move discussions beyond identities and epistemologies toward the careful consideration of historical ideas, referential traditions of thought, and creative intercultural exchange that retrieve the past-in-the-present to triangulate understanding toward a sustainable and more just future. Cosmopolitan sensibilities, as I articulate through a rendering of the Mexican Franciscan tradition below, posit open-ended ethical dispositions focusing on *coming-to-know* rather than asserting apriorisms that *emphatically always-and-already know in the first place*.

Unfixing fundamentalist or reductionist *a priori* cul-de-sacs in curriculum studies, cosmopolitan sensibilities advance critical understanding and justice in dialogically-and-contextually informed ways that reflexively critique paternalism often hidden in such efforts (Ellsworth, 1989). Cosmopolitan sensibilities, in advancing notions of justice, seek to develop intellectual modesty and carefully coming-to-know as ethical disposition for understanding self and others. The rendering of the Franciscan tradition attempts to provide an enunciative performance (Macedo, 2011) of cosmopolitan sensibilities *in-text*. This enunciative performance seeks to represent a lived dialectic of reading, critical study, and understanding that leads to yet another set of inner/outer provisional judgments or “conclusions” (Dilthey, 1926/1992; Emerson, 1844/2000; Gadamer, 1960/2001; Leon-Portilla, 1961/1995; W. von Humboldt, 1836/1992). Cosmopolitan sensibilities, rather than polishing up and advancing a new discourse or discursive refinement, situate themselves within the specificities and challenges of intellectual history, curriculum studies, and specifically, curriculum history.

In relation to *intellectual history*, cosmopolitan sensibilities, seek *not* the humanist authoritative “reading,” *nor* a definitive critical-revisionist “correction,” *nor* a poststructuralist-decentered “magic lantern” from which to recall the past or think through the present. All three of these strategies, mirroring humanist, critical, and poststructural “discourses” and “refinements,” appear as tired and politically ineffective strategies in the present moment that urgently demands increased intercultural yet critical knowledges, analyses, and most importantly, *understanding*. Cosmopolitan sensibilities, as they relate to intellectual history, seek to articulate a sliding critical hermeneutic that, rather than synthesizing or transcending humanist, revisionist, or poststructuralist recountings of history, articulate instead an historically embedded-and-problematic yet pedagogical coming-to-know inside and outside of longstanding and historicized intellectual traditions (e.g., Connell, 2007; De Sousa Santos, 2008; Dussell, 2005; Pinar, 2013) from which the history of the present emerges. As Connell (2007) remarks on working in multiple intellectual traditions from various nationalities and continents, cosmopolitan sensibilities present “a major project” (p. 382) with new pedagogical challenges including: scholarship in multiple languages, understanding in specific historical context, synopses or works in translation, and conditioning intellectual habits that have previously bounded curriculum studies discussions. Nonetheless, parting ways with Connell (2007), cosmopolitan sensibilities do *not* imply simplistically swapping present curriculum studies

discourses by superordinating “subaltern” ones. Contrasting with Connell (2007), cosmopolitan sensibilities propose both/and thinking that *understand* historicized work for conditioning and limiting Anglophone-centric and Statesian discourses, refinements, and proliferations while simultaneously questioning these discourses’ tendencies to be understood as authoritative (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1995), state-of-the-field (Kashope Wright, 2000; Malewski, 2010), or in other “definitive” ways that suggest an oversimplified globalizing proliferation. Simultaneously, cosmopolitan sensibilities, advancing this both/and thinking, *also* require research and understanding in multiple subaltern *and* hegemonic intellectual traditions. Described as critical “transmodernity” (p. 18) by intellectual historian Enrique Dussell (2005) or as a utopian “destabilized...style of representation” (p. 131) by cultural critic Fernando Coronil (1998), cosmopolitan sensibilities refuse facile discursive superordination-subordination recipes and their refined proliferations characteristic in curriculum studies’ research. Instead, cosmopolitan sensibilities push toward greater critical and historicized understandings along with honest intercultural dialogue.

In relation to *curriculum studies*, cosmopolitan sensibilities seek *not* the now well-worn strategy of proposing *yet another* new discursively refined “term”<sup>4</sup> at the top of the bone pile typical of Anglophone-centric and Statesian “paradigm” one-upmanship (recounted, historically, in Jackson, 1992; Kashope Wright, 2000; Kliebard, 1995; Paraskeva, 2011; Pinar, *et al.*, 1995; Schubert, 2008). This one-upmanship, retrospectively, effectively, and therapeutically remediated as “complicated conversation” (Pinar *et al.*, 1995, p. 848), aggressively raced through discourses and their refinements<sup>5</sup> including power and ideology, phenomenology and autobiography, feminism and voice, poststructuralist and postmodern critiques, existentialism and psychoanalysis, and various other subsequent discursive identities. Malewski (2010), in his recent state-of-the-field compendium, modestly continues this strategy by representing new discursive refinements such as *post* reconceptualization, m/othering, post humanism, and others. From the purview of cosmopolitan sensibilities, he accurately perceives the *next moment* by providing historical through-lines in the field that couple contemporary scholars who reconfigure senior scholars’ research as helpful historicizing move. Notwithstanding, these state-of-the-field representations (e.g., Jackson, 1992; Kashope Wright, 2000; Malewski, 2010; Pinar, *et al.*, 1995; Schubert, 2008), despite including international “chapters” (Pinar *et al.*, 1995) or “perspectives” (Malewski, 2010), all clearly document the Anglophone-centric and Statesian assumptions of “the field.” Only recently have scholars attempted to push beyond this understanding of “the field” (e.g. Autio, 2007; Baker, 2009; Hendry, 2011, 2012; Moon, 2012; Paraskeva, 2011; Pinar, 2013), and historicized understandings provide the commonality. Paradoxically, historicized understandings of place (e.g. Hendry, 2012; Reynolds & Webber, 2009; Whitlock, 2010) combined with critical geography (Helfenbein, 2004, 2010) have simultaneously played prophetic roles in historically *naming* an Anglophone-centric and Statesian field *as such* rather than just assuming it as “center.”

In relation to recent work in *curriculum history* (Baker, 2009; Hendry, 2011, 2012; Paraskeva, 2011; Pinar, 2013; Winfield, 2011), cosmopolitan sensibilities seek an historically named and internationalized understanding of the field that comes to grips with the *grand historical error* of understanding an Anglophone-centric and Statesian field simply as “the field.” Cosmopolitan sensibilities, pausing to contemplate and recognize this grand historical error, then pursues internationalized historical research *difficult-and-still-in-the-making* (Paraskeva, 2011; Hendry, 2011, 2012; Moon, 2012) that zeroes in on historical “problem spaces” (Scott in Hendry, 2011, p. 5) and “enacted hybridity” (Winfield, 2011, p. 3) in ways that

condition and limit Anglophone-centric and Statesian discourses *without* presuming to write curriculum history from a privileged “epistemological standpoint” (Baker, 2009, xiii). Materially-and-discursively embedded and conscious of historical location, cosmopolitan sensibilities begin the difficult work of recognizing, reading in, and working with traditions of educational and cultural criticism. Cosmopolitan sensibilities’ that work in multiple traditions of educational and cultural criticism reject channeling understandings through the Tyler Rationale, Huebner or McDonald’s pre-Reconceptualist work, the Reconceptualization, curriculum discourses and refinements, or the proliferations of—predominantly—Statesian-based readings and concerns. Contrastingly, emphasizing an historically located and internationalized curriculum studies, cosmopolitan sensibilities *historically locates and conditions rather than proliferates* the Anglophone-centric and Statesian “field” as an important moment of intellectual honesty, restraint, and modesty recognizing the need for subaltern-*and*-dominant traditions of educational and cultural criticism. This historicizing move, implicit in cosmopolitan sensibilities, seeks to understand the Anglophone-centric and Statesian field’s own history as *but one among other national and continental traditions of educational and cultural criticism*. Cosmopolitan sensibilities, locating and conditioning a historicized honesty, modesty, and self-restraint, seek to limit, condition, and historically *de-proliferate* the present Anglophone-centric and Statesian field in order to recognize multiple national and continental traditions. Cosmopolitan sensibilities, limiting, conditioning, and historically de-proliferating, nonetheless do *not* seek to silence, muzzle, reverse, or otherwise simply subordinate Anglophone-centric and Statesian curriculum studies. Rather, cosmopolitan sensibilities seek carefully historicized curriculum research, critical intercultural dialogue, heterogeneous internationalization, and most importantly, ethical dispositions based on internationalized yet historically located work.

### The History of a History

#### Approaching the synoptic rendering

With cosmopolitan sensibilities in mind, I approach the task of rendering the Franciscan tradition in 16<sup>th</sup> century Mexico. It is important to further explain, as I undertake my provisional critical reading, that my purpose is *not* to create a humanist “authoritative” interpretation of Mexican educational history or cultural criticism (e.g., Ibargüengoitia, 1980/2000; Ricard, 1933/1966), *nor* is it to create “definitive” critical revision (e.g., Galeano, 1971/2009), and *neither* is it to advance a poststructuralist mapping of Mexican national identity (e.g. Lafaye, 1974/2002).<sup>6</sup> Rather than advancing the positions already taken by “expert” historians, cosmopolitan sensibilities take up a much more modest *pedagogical task* important for historicizing an Anglophone-centric and Statesian field. Emphatically, this pedagogical task lies *not* in the expertise of my rendering (which might be for “experts” to evaluate) *but* in clearly recognizing the existence of *substantive and longstanding traditions of educational and cultural criticism outside Anglophone-centric and Statesian curriculum discourses*.<sup>7</sup> Moreover, developing this line of thinking by rendering the Franciscan tradition, cosmopolitan sensibilities signal *not* that the Anglophone-centric and Statesian curriculum field has overlooked a single tradition that requires incorporation under “international perspectives.” Rather, through the careful consideration of *one* substantive and longstanding tradition, cosmopolitan sensibilities seek to destabilize the Anglophone-centric and Statesian field’s grip on curriculum studies, and



through this destabilization, cosmopolitan sensibilities aid the advancement of a reorganized field that does *not* just add another discourse or refinement but *rather* aids in advancing a field that works in multiple traditions of educational and cultural criticism regularly and simultaneously. Finally, neither does the rendering of the Franciscan tradition provide an emulative pedagogy describing what cosmopolitan sensibilities should be. Rather, the Franciscan tradition simply demonstrates but one example of a vast tradition of educational and cultural criticism that “the field’s” discourses and their refinements have successfully eclipsed. Having defined the task, I approach the Franciscan tradition as recovered and deployed by Mexican historians in the wake of the Mexican Revolution.

### History-recovered-in-history

The recovery of the Franciscan tradition makes no sense without an understanding of the trajectory and radicalism of the Mexican Revolution (1911-1924). Informing this understanding of history-recovered-in-history, the Franciscan tradition in 16<sup>th</sup> century Mexico emerged from the mendicant teachings and monastic reforms introduced by St. Francis de Assisi in 13<sup>th</sup> century Italy. Based on the teachings of St. Francis, the Franciscan order, along with other monastic orders, became among the first influential – in presentistic terms – “international organizations” for teaching, learning, and evangelization. Notably represented by Franciscan Ximénez de Cisneros, the Franciscan order had direct access to the Catholic Monarchs of Spain throughout their reign and played an influential role what Enrique Dussell (2005) has called the first world system of colonization. Franciscans, in their communal vows of poverty and celibacy, strived *not* for the Europeanization of the indigenous nations *but rather* for a New Christendom as a millennial return to the original Apostolic church. Like St. Francis who imitated the original “Twelve,” the Franciscans were to “...go *and* sell what thou hast, and give to the poor” (Mathew, 19:21). Franciscans, in approaching the evangelization of Mexico, understood the vanquished’s poverty (certainly noble savages) as a mirror to their own Apostolic vows and longings. In conceptualizing the evangelical communities, Franciscans strove *not* to Hispanicize the “new souls” of Christ and subjects of Carlos V *but rather* to create “Christian-Indian utopias” integrating Indian republics as they *could* correspond with Franciscan understandings of Christianity (d’Owler, 1956/1994; Lafaye, 1974/2002; Phelan, 1970). The Franciscan social experiments in the new world, it follows, condemned the violence of the Spanish military conquest as morally corrupt and instead embraced indigenous history, culture, and language as they might relate to Franciscan vows (Ricard, 1933/1966) in pursuing Apostolic social utopias. Nonetheless, with the advent of the administration of Felipe II, these understandings and related social experiments were abruptly and violently brought to an end as inquisitorial and castigatory means ascended in the late 16<sup>th</sup> century. Written documents detailing humanist understandings and exchanges were censored and left to collect dust in archives in Madrid and the Vatican (e.g. Mendieta, 1866/1973; Motolinía, 1866/2001; Sahagún, 1866/2006, 1920/1996) until recovered and published by Joaquín Icazbalceta (1866). By and large, the Franciscan social experiments of the 16<sup>th</sup> century were historically erased until the Mexican Revolution’s intellectual foment. Intellectuals, both preceding but especially in the wake of the Mexican Revolution, recovered this erased history of utopian social experiments in forging Mexican national identity emphasizing an ideology of mestizaje.

Intellectuals of the Mexican Revolution, emphasizing critical-liberal ideology of *mestizaje*, insurgently countered Spencerian White supremacy and Statesian imperialism by positing first a biological and then an historical-cultural blending or *mestizaje* (e.g., Enríquez-Molina, 1909, 1938; Martí, 1891/1971; Reyes, 1915/1983; Vasconcelos, 1925/1997). Retrospectively and historically understood as a key “claiming of consciousness” by an historically reviled and abjected yet majoritarian mestizo-indigenous caste (e.g., Anzuela, 1916/1990; Basave Benítez, 1992/2002; Fuentes, 1962/1992; Paz, 1948/1987; Vega & Vivas, 1987), Franciso Villa and Emiliano Zapata became emblematic of the mestizo-indigenous insurgency later administrated by Constitutionalists such as Venustiano Carranza. Immediately evaluated for both advancements and shortcomings (e.g., Paz, 1948; Fuentes, 1962/1992; Rulfo, 1953/1989), the Mexican Revolution became institutionalized in the Partido Revolucionario Institucional (PRI) that governed Mexico from 1929-2000. The apogee of the Mexican Revolution, which emphasized realignment of the federal government with a mestizo-indigenous “movement,” took place under the Presidency of Lázaro Cárdenas (1934-1940) who momentarily replaced oligarchic support with popular support of unions and agricultural laborers and also expropriated multinational oil companies in collectivizing the production of petroleum and related industries (Vega & Vivas, 1987). Importantly, Cárdenas’ administration advanced an agenda of agrarian reform that, though uneven in its successes (Paz, 1948/1987) and failures (Rulfo, 1953/1989), redistributed former haciendas for public use as *ejidos*<sup>8</sup> that Octavio Paz (1948/1987) recalled as an important recovery of the collective “Mexican intelligence” (p. 135). Despite the Mexican Revolution’s successes and failures, by the 1968 repression of popular movements, the PRI and its official ideology of *mestizaje* had historically consolidated its national-international historic bloc. As exemplified in the violent repression ordered by President Díaz Ordaz on the eve of the 1968 Olympics, the PRI had become a reactionary rather than a progressive force (Poniatowska, 1971/1997) variously designated as philanthropic ogre (Paz, 1979), technocratic oligarchy (Cosío Villegas, 1972), or complicitous traitor in Statesian oriented globalization<sup>9</sup>.

Understanding this trajectory of the Mexican Revolution is a prerequisite for understanding the “recovery” and ideological deployment of the Franciscan tradition in Mexican history along with its potentials and failures. As component of the ascendance of *mestizaje* as insurgent critical-liberal mestizo and later mestizo-indigenous ideology, Mexican historians and intellectuals engaged in a massive re-organization of the historical archive in the wake of the Revolution (e.g., Arriaga, 1938; Chavez, 1958; León Portilla, 1961/1995; O’ Gorman, 1966/1993; Mendez Plancarte, 1946/1994; Picón Salas, 1944/1994; Reyes, 1915/1983, 1920/1983; Zavala, 1941). This re-organization of the archive, already underway in 19<sup>th</sup> century Mexican historians’ research (demonstrated in Basave Benítez, 1992/2002), was greatly advanced by Joaquín García Icazbalceta’s (1866) multivolume archival and documentary work<sup>10</sup>. The Franciscan tradition, as *history-recovered-in-history*, requires an understanding of the Mexican Revolution and its ideology of *mestizaje* in order to read its potentials and failures.

*Mestizaje*, as an insurgent ideology of the Mexican Revolution, worked along a number of broad lines I can only characterize here. Besides recovering and deploying a broad re-evaluation of the Franciscan tradition described below, the ideology of *mestizaje* reclaimed, for example, the biography of ship-wrecked Spanish Conquistador Gonzalo Guerrero, who refused to be “rescued” by the Cortez expedition and instead stayed with his Mayan wife and children, as important mesticizing figure who later combatted the Spanish encroachment of the Yucatan Peninsula. Or, and perhaps more obvious, is the grand discourse that reconfigured the indigenous

goddess Tonantzintla or The Virgen of Guadalupe which was advanced by Franciscan mendicants and formalized by the Catholic Church as predating and equivalent manifestation of the Virgin Mary in Mexico. Or, moreover, there is the celebration of the Colegio de Tlatlelolco's intellectual work that attempted yet failed to create an indigenous priesthood but succeeded in establishing a generation of trilingual (Nahua, Latin, Spanish) indigenous and mestizo scholars who contributed to writing Mexican history from an indigenous point of view. Or, variously, retheorizing Quetzalcoatl emerged as pre-Columbian contact with St. Thomas that demonstrated differently enacted Christianity already predating Spanish contact. Or, additionally, a reinterpretation of Mexican architecture from the colonial era came forth that understood cathedrals, especially, but also other structures that emphasized these edifices *not* as an inferior copy of European "great architecture" but *rather* as *baroque-Mexican* representation of mestizo-indigenous artisanship and creativity. Without straining over the obvious, there are many, many other "recoveries" and deployments of the ideology of mestizaje from the 16<sup>th</sup> century onwards that were reorganized and *ascended in the wake of the Mexican Revolution*, but what is key in the historical context of the Revolution was an insurgent discursive contestation of 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century notions of miscegenation and Spencerian White supremacy (Benítez Basave, 1992/2002) *first* with a superordination of Mendelian genetic hybridity (e.g., Enríquez Molina, 1909; Vasconcelos, 1925/1997) and *later* with a Boasian cultural relativism (e.g., Enríquez Molina, 1938; Paz, 1948).

What is important is that an entire historical discourse was reorganized and ascended around a dialogic ideology of mestizaje that directly contested understandings of miscegenation and White supremacy. This reorganization of the archive eschewed battling the indigenous against the Spanish, and instead superordinated Mexican national identity that indigenized the Europeans and Europeanized the indigenous in superordinating historical *mestizaje*. In the wake of the Mexican Revolution, the ideology of *mestizaje* argued *not only* for its equality with *but insisted* on *mestizaje's* biological, cultural, and moral superiority over White supremacy (e.g., Benítez Basave 1991/2002; Enríquez Molina, 1938; Vasconcelos, 1925/1997). There are many, many "recoveries" and deployments that articulated Mexican identity as mestizaje that, though they antedated the Mexican Revolution, achieved ascendancy in its wake. The recovery and deployment of the Franciscan tradition in the wake of the Mexican Revolution is but one example, but even as one example, it was important because it provided an "origins of mestizaje" narrative that radically condemned the violence and ignorance of the Spanish conquest and advanced intersubjectivity and intercultural understandings emblematic of mestizaje.

It is within the context of the ascendance of the ideology of mestizaje after the Revolution that Mexican Secretary of Education José Vasconcelos (1925) circulated a national vision of education that embraced mestizaje as evolutionary historical process, and in doing so, directed attention to mendicant traditions as exemplary intercultural and intersubjective mediation process:

This [mesticizing] commandment begins to manifest itself in history in the abundance of love that permitted the Spanish to create a new race with the Indian and the Black races. Emerging from the White lineage through the soldier who raised an indigenous family and moral example of the missionaries who helped to provide living conditions for the Indian republics that allowed them to avoid genocide and enter into the modern era. (p. 57)



In Vasconcelos (1925), an Hispanicizing understanding of mestizaje is ascendant in educational and cultural criticism that, retrospectively, was critiqued (e.g., Enríquez Molina, 1938) and extended (e.g., Paz, 1948/1987), but of continuing importance was that mestizaje became official national educational policy in Mexico. Key in Vasconcelos (1925/1997) and others' engagement in the ideology of mestizaje (e.g., Chavez, 1958; Enríquez-Molina, 1909; 1938; León Portilla, 1961/1995; O' Gorman, 1966/1993; Mendez Plancarte, 1946/1994; Reyes, 1915/1983, 1920/1983; Paz, 1948/1987) was an implicit understanding that, though mestizaje began with and insisted on the Catholic *cosmovisión* in the 16<sup>th</sup> century, its important feature was a privileging of biological, historical, and cultural blending that, on a national scale, countered and rejected miscegenation and Spencerian White supremacy.

In the historical present that this essay seeks to illuminate, the prevailing injustices and racisms—clearly *unameliorated* inside the ideology of mestizaje in Mexico of the present—remain at the center of Mexican intellectual and ethical work. Important to understand in the history of the present is *that mestizo hegemony*, interlayered as it is with neoliberal globalization, *provides an important recognition required for critical discussion of justice in Mexican cultural criticism, educational or otherwise, of the present* (e.g., Castellaños, 1960/1997; Fuentes, 1981/2000; Hinojosa, 1977; Marcos, 2001; Poniatowska, 1980/1997). This essay will return to mestizo hegemony in its concluding remarks on the Franciscan tradition discussed below. Nonetheless, as this discussion already suggests, cosmopolitan sensibilities provide complex configurations of historicized and internationalized understanding to advance critical, intercultural, and educational elocutionary efforts of the present.

## The Franciscan Tradition in 16<sup>th</sup> Century Mexico

### Both/and

The Franciscan tradition, as one component of a grand reorganization of the Mexican archive, articulated the Revolution's ideology of mestizaje by “recovering” and deploying one example of *mestizaje's* “origins.” The synoptic rendering I provisionally advance here provides historical background and biographical sketches of Pedro de Gante, Toribio de Motolinía, and Vasco de Quiroga<sup>11</sup>. Recounting the “origins” of mestizaje narrative provided by Mexican historians in the wake of the Revolution, I provide a synoptic rendering of *both* the Franciscan traditions' dyed-in-the-wool “celebratory” tone (e.g., Chavez, 1952; 1958; Horta, 1997; Picón Salas, 1944/1994; Ramirez Lopez, 1948) *and* its critique for driving at historical *problem spaces* (Scott in Hendry, 2011), *enacted hybridity* (Winfield, 2011) and *destabilizing representation* (Coronil, 1998) as outlined above.

### Arrival of the Franciscans

Exactly two years after the siege and fall of Tenochtitlán on August 13<sup>th</sup> of 1523, the first Franciscans touched ground in what is now called Mexico. In posthumous legend called the “Three Irises,” Juan de Tecto, Juan de Aora, and Pedro de Gante received broad authority from Pope Leon X and Carlos V to evangelize on April 27<sup>th</sup> of 1522. The Three Irises left Flanders in early June of 1522 and began the three month journey to Mexico. Upon arrival in the Capitol, the

Three Irises took residence in Texcoco, a key historical site of Nahua intellectual production prior to the military Conquest. Pedro de Gante was the only one of the Three who practiced his vows and developed educational projects in the colonies. Both Juan de Tecto and Juan de Aora died in Cortés' Hibuera expedition.

Ten months later on May 12<sup>th</sup> of 1524, the second and most significant Franciscan mission, called "the Twelve," touched ground in Cempoal, Veracruz. Martin de Valencia led the mission and was invested with the title "Vicar of Christ." With this authority, Valencia selected eleven others including Toribio de Motolinía who receives attention below. Having obtained authorization from Pope Leon X before his death, Franciscan and other mendicant orders established missions to evangelize the continent. In successive waves, Pope Adrian VI, Leon X's successor, confirmed and amplified these missions providing papal authorization for large scale mendicant evangelization and related educational projects. The mendicant project, theorized through mendicants' scholastic philosophy, provided a broad and radical contestation to the violence of the Spanish military conquest that emphasized recognition of the Indian nations, cultures, and juridical rights of indigenous subjects.

Upon the Franciscans' arrival in the northeastern high plains, Cortés and his advisors greeted the Franciscans on the road passing through Texcoco nearing Tenochtitlán. As eye witness Bernal Diaz del Castillo (1632/1992) recounts:

And we found ourselves with the Franciscans, and the first to kneel before them was Cortés who tried to kiss Martín de Valencia's hand. But, since Valencia did not allow it, Cortés kissed his habit and those of the rest of the Franciscans. ...Cuatémoc and all of his dignitaries and other caciques were afraid when they saw all the Franciscans malnourished, barefoot, with frayed habits, and shaved heads...[and then] saw Cortés kneel before them. (p. 450)

The Franciscan mission in the colonies, which would have important influence from 1523 until 1572, had begun. From the beginning, Cortés (1522/1992) had requested the Franciscans as a matter of administrating the moral legitimacy of the colonial project before "his dignitaries and other caciques" (Díaz Castillo, 1632/1992). The Franciscans, whose mission would transgress Cortés and the Church's mission of "moral" legitimacy, moved instead toward an ethics of cultural recognition, legal status, and material well-being of indigenous subjects. Before providing the sketches, it is necessary to discuss the institutions of 16<sup>th</sup> century life in Mexico.

## **The Encomienda**

Concurrent with the arrival of the Franciscans, Cortés extended the encomienda system. Understanding recompense as the rights of Conquest, Spanish captains and soldiers expected to receive spoils. In the same way captains of previous military campaigns in the Antilles, Cortés' captains and soldiers expected gold, tributes, arable lands, and Indians to do the work. Having exhausted searches for gold, Spanish captains and soldiers imposed tributes from the caciques, the aristocratic representatives of the Indian republics. In the end, these tributes also proved scarce, and even though Queen Isabella and her successor Carlos V had prohibited the encomienda, Cortés violated this prohibition and instituted it anyway, explaining in an extra official letter to Carlos V (Izcabalceta, 1866) that it was necessary for governance. The

encomienda became a center of discursive political combat that included Franciscans and other mendicant orders.

The encomienda, as an institution, provided systems of tribute to Spanish captains, Cortés, and Carlos V. Superimposed on Aztec systems of tribute, the encomienda was distinct from slavery in that, administratively, its purpose was revenue collection. Distinct from slavery, the encomienda exacted forced labor in cases of non-payment (which were continuous), yet distinct from the encomienda of the Antilles, the encomienda in Mexico provided guarantees such as prohibitions against ownership, sale, and redistribution of Indian republics' subjects. The encomienda also articulated the expressed, though many times ignored, responsibility that Spanish provide for the temporal needs, Catholic indoctrination, and education, especially of children in their charge. Lives, projects, and pedagogies in the Franciscan tradition and other mendicant orders extended, amplified, and intensified the guarantees of the encomienda, yet simultaneously, worked to legally destroy it.

### **Royal Council**

The Royal Council of the Indies played a defining role in the encomienda. Established by Carlos V in 1524 (previously called the “Junta of the Indies” under Isabella and Fernando), the Royal Council included Carlos V, Bishop Juan Rodriguez de Fonseca, Diego Velasquez the Governor of Cuba, members of the Royal Court, and other changeable juridical and ecclesiastical figures. Notable in this last group of changeable juridical and ecclesiastical figures was observant Franciscan Ximénez de Cisneros who appointed Dominican Bartolomé de Las Casas as “Defender of the Indians.” The Royal Council studied geography, economy, population, trade, government, politics, and other related topics and then made recommendations to Carlos V regarding governance and administration of the colonial project. The Royal Council played a central role in the deliberations regarding the encomienda, and more specifically, the religious-juridical status of the Indian republics and their subjects.

### **Royal Courts**

The reform of the first Royal Court and its replacement by the second Court provided an important background for the lives, projects, and pedagogies in the Franciscan educational tradition. The first Royal Court, instituted on December 13<sup>th</sup> of 1527 and headed by the rapacious Nuño Guzman, consisted of men “without scruples or consciences” (Chavez, 1958, p. 32) who invariably supported abuses of Spanish soldiers and ignored the juridical status of Indian republics and their subjects. Bishop Juan Zumárraga and other Franciscans documented the first Royal Court’s abuses and carried out steps to destabilize and finally overthrow it. Pedro de Gante and Toribio de Motolinía, whose projects, lives, and pedagogies are narrated below, played important roles in overthrowing the first Royal Court, and Vasco de Quiroga, whose life, projects, and pedagogy is narrated below, began his work in reconstruction of the Indian republics as an original jurist on the Second Royal Court.

The second Royal Court, instituted on October 15<sup>th</sup> of 1530, was headed by Antonio de Mendoza. The second Royal Court, instituted by Empress Isabel of Portugal (then Governor of Spain) along with Cortés and the Royal Council of the Indies, authorized and legitimized the

Franciscan projects in México, and by doing so, it provided a structure in which mendicants and Indian republics could appeal as litigants against Spanish abuses. Most importantly, though, the second Royal Court reformed the first Royal Court whose disrespect and abuse made a mockery of justice and caused a multitude of suffering. As a testimony to its power, the second Royal Court captured Nuño Guzman, lead jurist in the First Royal Court, and delivered him to Spain in chains in 1537.

## **Indian Republics**

At the same time they instituted the *encomienda*, the Royal Council confronted the problem of governance and administration after the military Conquest. Searching for structures of governance, they recognized the Indian Republics. The Indian republics followed a logic developed during the Conquest in which caciques who formerly ruled principalities and localities were developed as officials for governing territories that previously constituted the Aztec Empire. Consistent with Cortés' use of Montezuma II during the Conquest and Cuauhtémoc afterward, Cortés and his captains superimposed themselves at the top of the existing Aztec Imperial hierarchy through recognizing, establishing, and supporting already existing Indian republics.

### **Friar Pedro de Gante**

Within this broad historical background, Pedro de Gante began teaching and evangelizing in 1523, and in celebrationist literatures published after the Revolution, he is often called the "first teacher." Gante, Carlos V's relative (probably cousin [Icazbalceta, 1998]), was offered the position "Bishop of Mexico" toward the end of his life. Nonetheless, Gante rejected worldly posts in accordance with his Franciscan vows. Instead, Gante taught Mexican children for forty-nine years until his death in 1572. Overall, his activities were prodigious: he learned Nahuatl (as posthumous legend has it the only language he spoke without a stutter); created pedagogical-evangelical methods and materials in Nahuatl, opened the first school-workshop in 1523; opened a second school-workshop in 1525 at the Chapel of San José; supervised the construction of the San José Hospital which housed between three and four hundred patients; and, oversaw the successive constructions of schools for children of lineage in 1531, 1534, and 1535. He was also involved in the religious-juridical defense of the indigenous as his name appeared in the roles of the First Royal court of 1528, and, as a friend of Bishop Zumarraga, Gante collaborated with him in his fight against abuses and worked toward the eventual discontinuation of the *encomienda*.

Though he worked on many projects, San José de Los Naturales, the first school received much of his attention. In his letter to Bishop Zumarraga, Gante (1529/1952) recounts:

My official function is to preach and teach day and night. During the day, I teach reading, writing, and singing. At night, I teach Christian doctrine and give sermons. Because the territory is so large and infinitely populated with people, and because the monks are too few to teach so many, we gather up in our houses the sons of the caciques and teach the Catholic faith, and then they teach their parents. (p. 16)

Gante's program, from the beginning, worked with children in Nahua, and Gante (1522), taking Nahua as central to the Franciscan Catholic project, produced the first Christian doctrine written in Nahua.

In Gante's San José there were two tiers. The "most talented" of caciques' children received an extensive religious education. The second tier, rather than receiving a religious education, focused on manual arts and crafts. Through the development of a cooperative workshop method, Gante integrated Mexican and Iberian ceramics, masonry, carpentry, weaving, painting, metallurgy, languages, music, and theatre arts for immediate economic exchange. By doing so, he provided social and economic reconstruction for an Indian and later mestizo class of craftsman, skilled-workers, masons, and other artisans. This Indian class of skilled laborers constructed schools, churches, and hospitals all over the continent. As 19<sup>th</sup> century Mexican historian Joaquín García Icazbalceta (1998) summarizes:

[A]nd it was in this way [cooperative workshops] that Pedro de Gante's school provided art and sculpture and mosaics to churches.... But also, the divine cult needed ornaments, sacred goblets, crosses, candle holders, and many other accessories, but overall, craftsmen with diverse skills for the construction of churches and temples. Pedro de Gante wanted to provide everything, and each day he provided a wider birth of services. (p. 120)

Integrating Nahua along with Mexican cultures in schools, Gante's pedagogical efforts provided for cultural-economic production that included Indian republics' and Spanish contributions, and his pedagogical workshops served as a model for other educators, notably Vasco de Quiroga (Ramirez Lopez, 1948), to emulate. Celebrated by historians in the wake of the Mexican Revolution (e.g., Chavez, 1952; Picón Salas, 1944/1994; Ramirez Lopez, 1948), Gante exemplified the intersubjective-intercultural identity superordinated in the ascendance of the ideology of mestizaje.

### **Toribio de Motolinía**

After "the Twelve" ascended to the high plains in 1524, the Tlaxcaltecas along the route hailed them "Motolinía, Motolinía..." which in Nahua means the poorest of the poor. Toribio de Benevente, who asked for translation of the word, changed his name to "Motolinía" at that moment as expression of his Franciscan vows in Nahua. Upon arrival in the Capitol, Motolinía learned Nahua, and he intervened against Spanish abuses of the encomienda. His name, along with Martin de Valencia's, appeared in Royal Court records of July 28<sup>th</sup> of 1525:

...because the temporary Governor, in the absence of Cortes, Gonzalo de Salazar, and other council members were alarmed by the conduct followed by Franciscans who excessively protected the Indians and directed grave accusations at the Spaniards... (in Horta, 1997, p. 138)

Notably, appointed as Guardian of Huejotzingo the following year, he provided asylum to Indians suffering abuses in the surrounding region, and when challenged by Spanish captains, he amplified his authority as "Visitor, Defender, and Judge of the Provinces of Huejotzingo,



Tepeaca, and Guacachula” (O’Gorman, 1969/2001; p. xxvi). Throughout his life, Motolinía served as Guardian of many convents and monasteries in Mexico City, Texcoco, Huejotzingo, Tlaxcala, Atlixco and other Indian Republics, and he also played a key role in founding the city of Puebla, administering the first mass on April 16<sup>th</sup>, 1531.

During Motolinía’s time as Guardian of the Convent of Tlaxcala, it became an important center of cultural production, especially in relation to the Christian calendar. As Motolinía (1866/2001) reported, Indigenous actors, scenery, and stage props entered in Christian allegorical theatre called “autos”:

The Tlaxcaltecas moved in procession with a display of the Saintly Sacrament and many crosses with saints; and the arms of the crosses and other dressings of the displays were of gold feathers. ...And in this display walked the Twelve Apostles of Christ dressed with insignias. ...All of the road was covered with juniper, palm leaves, and where the display passed, they threw even more roses and carnations. (p. 85)

The autos blended indigenous and Spanish understandings of theatre (Duverger, 1996) in integrating Christian and indigenous aesthetics and semiotics (Leon Portilla, 1961/1995). As Motolinía reported (1866/2001), the Twelve were followed by other autos that represented the Fall and John the Baptist.

During his life, Motolinía (1866/2001) walked, many times over, from Michoacán in the Northwest to Guatemala and Nicaragua in the South preaching, baptizing, and living in villages spanning the continent. During these travels, Franciscans taught, preached, and followed their messages with mass baptisms in attempting to realize a Franciscan-Indian utopia (d’ Owler, 1956/1996; Lafaye, 1974/2002). Nicolau d’Owler (1956/1996) explains,

In order to avoid in New Spain the destruction that occurred in the Antilles, the idea of the Franciscan utopia surged. Without a doubt, the Franciscans tried to realize here a political-religious utopia that was, like that of the reform of Florence, a true theocracy. (p. xiv)

Advancing this utopian project, Motolinía (1858/2001) wrote *History of the Indians of New Spain* sent to the Count of Benevente in 1541. Censored by the administration of Felipe II as heretical, this manuscript was locked away until Joaquín Icazbalceta rescued it from Spanish archives in Madrid and published it in 1866. *History of the Indians New Spain* (de Benevente, 1866/2001) pioneered linguistics, ethnology, anthropology, sociology that emerged and was used to document knowledge considered crucial to amplifying Indian republics and as part of evangelization. Through collaboration with Nahua priests and other officials, Motolinía developed and documented knowledges of Mexican history, mythology, tradition, social customs, and religious rituals that came from tutored understandings of Nahua codices. Like Gante who shared the utopian project, Motolinía exemplified the condemnation of the Spanish military conquest and superordinated an intersubjective and intercultural positions that in the wake of the Mexican Revolution provided the ideology of mestizaje.

### Vasco de Quiroga–pueblo-hospitals

Appointed by Carlos V to the second Royal Court in 1530, Vasco de Quiroga served as a judge who, with the help of Bishop Zumarraga and other Franciscans, overthrew the corrupt first Royal Court. Not a Franciscan friar, nonetheless Quiroga nonetheless worked as ally of the Franciscans and is often discussed together with them in historical accounts (e.g., Lafaye, 1974/2000; Ramirez Lopez, 1948; Picón Salas, 1944/1994).

Influenced by Thomas More's (1516/1964) *Utopia*<sup>12</sup>, which envisioned theocratic-communal social organization, Quiroga first proposed pueblo-hospitals to the Second Royal Court. In his proposal, Quiroga sought to establish utopian cities made of an extended family structure. This utopian format corresponded, in many ways, with indigenous social and communal organizations prior to the Conquest.

By imagining cities organized around hospitals, Quiroga amplified existing Indian republics in collaboration with a Spanish protectorate of priests and monks (Arriaga, 1938, 1978) in which they hoped to begin Lucian's new Arcadia (Zavala, 1941). In frustration before the second Royal Court's indifference toward his utopian cities, he spent his own capital to develop the first pueblo-hospital, Santa Fe de los Altos, in 1533 on the outskirts of Mexico City using the care of the sick as the Indian Republic's organizing principle. In Santa Fe de los Altos which grew to a population of 30,000 and later in Santa Fe de Pátzcuaro in 1537, he reconstructed indigenous industries and agriculture, taught new trades and farming techniques, opened free racially mixed schools, experimented with community property, instituted reciprocal cooperation among families, established the six hour work day, integrated men and women in work tasks, distributed the fruits of labor according to need, and insisted on the abandonment of luxury (Arriaga, 1938, 1978). Quiroga, taking his models from Thomas More and utopian Christian communities in *Acts*, integrated indigenous and European contributions in providing safety, prosperity, and a measure of justice in the wake of Nuño Guzman's deadly rampage through Michoacán.

As Mexican scholar Antonio Arriaga (1938, 1978) summarizes, Quiroga integrated indigenous contributions into his reconstruction efforts. As Arriaga (1978) writes of Quiroga's efforts in Michoacán:

Don Vasco de Quiroga, first bishop of Michoacán, had the virtue of knowing how to take advantage of the Tarascan culture and project it toward a new stage in its development...the Spaniard Don Vasco de Quiroga discovered in Michoacán the previously ignored artisan.(pp. 13-14)

Having received influence from Pedro de Gante's workshop methods (Ramirez Lopez, 1948), Quiroga included indigenous contributions in his projects. He did this by including the indigenous in the material production required to make the new schools, churches, and other products required for the Republics he sought to create.

As represented in Vasco de Quiroga's *Ordinances of the Hospitals* (1944/1994), Quiroga, utopian in his visions of human organization, sought equality through the fair production and distribution of wealth:

Item: As previously established, from the six hours of communal work [per day], and after the products are gathered together, one distributes them among everyone, and each one receives an equitable share, providing comfort and honesty, according to each one's needs and qualities, way of being and condition, exactly what is needed for each one and for each family. (p. 56)

From reading More's *Utopia*, Quiroga participated in and elaborated on humanist and Franciscan utopian understandings that re-inscribed the Gospel as radical communitarian message, exemplified, in particular in *Acts*.

### Potentials

Enrique Dussell (1998/2011), in working on an "ethics of liberation" (p. 11) that advances liberation theology in the present, emphasizes the mendicants' repressed-and-censored historical contributions in the following way:

The first Renaissance, humanist, and Hispanic modernity produced a theoretical and philosophical reflection of the utmost importance that has remained unrecognized by modern philosophy. ...The philosophical theoretical thinking of the 16<sup>th</sup> century is relevant today because it was the first to have lived and expressed the original speculation at the time the first "world system" was made. Through this thinking and from these intellectual resources (Muslim-Christian, Renaissance, scholastic), the ethical philosophical question was the following: *What right does Europe have to occupy, dominate, and "work through" the recently discovered and militarily conquered lands that are currently being colonized?* (p. 74)

Following Dussell's (1998/2011) transmodern ethical engagement in 16<sup>th</sup> century scholastic philosophy, I advance five progressive critical progressive through-lines present in the synoptic rendering of the Franciscan tradition. From the synoptic rendering, the following outline of Franciscan potentials emerges: *First*, utopian longings drove the Franciscan tradition in Mexico. The Franciscan tradition drew on the confluence of Franciscan longings and humanist utopias for an original return to the Apostolic church. Intervening on Spanish Conquistadors' violence and abuse, the utopian vision sought, with Indian republics of Mexico, a return to the communities of the original Twelve (Mendieta, 1866/1973; d'Owler, 1956/1996) in confluence with humanist utopian notions (Picón Salas, 1944/1994; Zavala, 1941). *Second*, the Franciscan tradition insisted on learning Nahua. Becoming adept in Nahua and other languages was key in Franciscans religious and educational projects emphasizing understanding. It was through mastery of Nahua that Franciscans achieved what was variously understood as "intimacy," (Picón Salas, 1944/1994) "moral sympathy," (Reyes, 1956, p. 84), and "fusion" (Brom, 1998, p. 96) in celebrationist understandings. *Third*, the Franciscan tradition combated oppression at hand. Gante, Motolinía, and Quiroga collaborated with Indian republics to overthrow the first Royal Court and fought other injustices in on-going ways in collaboration with the Second Royal Court (Brom, 1998; Chavez, 1958; d'Owler (1956/1996); Picón Salas, 1944/1994; Ramirez Lopez, 1948) against injustices of the Spanish captains and soldiers. *Fourth*, the Franciscan tradition showed a commitment to reconstruction. The Franciscan tradition, transcending moral

sympathy, insisted on reconstructing social relations (Arriaga, 1938; Arriaga, 1978; Horta, 1997; Icazbalceta, 1998; Ramirez Lopez, 1948). Exemplified in Gante's projects along with Quiroga's social experiments, the Franciscan tradition provided a vision that emphasized material worldliness in addition to spiritual salvation. *Finally*, the Franciscan tradition began to articulate an ethics of liberation (Dussell, 1998/2011) that required siding *with* oppressed (Arriaga, 1938; Chavez, 1958; Horta, 1997; Picón Salas, 1944/1994) and non-reproductive cultural creativity. The three sketches articulated living *with* through syncretic efforts that emphasized indigenous cultural contributions. It is precisely living *with* that resulted in historical mestizaje (Arriaga, 1938, 1978; Chavez, 1958; Picón Salas, 1944/1994) that rejected White supremacy (Enríquez Molina, 1909, 1938; Vasconcelos, 1925/1997), and embraced inter-racial marriage (Chavez, 1958; Picón Salas, 1944/1994; Uslar Pietri, 1986; Vasconcelos, 1925/1997) and other forms of social and cultural blending associated with the critical-liberal tradition in Mexican politics.

### Critique

Despite these five critical progressive through lines relevant to the present, nonetheless the Franciscan tradition paradoxically provides one of the bases for *mestizo hegemony* in the present, which requires on-going critique and engagement. The Franciscan tradition, despite its important yet unrecognized progressive-critical through lines, paradoxically operated in ways that extended power asymmetries *through* its praxis of *utopian vision, fusion of interests, combat against oppression, commitment to material well-being*. These power asymmetries, evident in Franciscan interlocutory activities, emerged in many places in Franciscan primary documents but most pointedly in Bernardino Sahagún's (1920<sup>13</sup>/1996) *Colloquia of the Twelve*. Sahagún and his collaborators, in rendering the dialogue arranged by Cortés between Nahua priests and Franciscans in 1522, emphasized God's universality in heaven and earth in arguing "It is God who gives powers, honors, and dignities" (p. 1920/1996, p. 67), and in driving at such a point before Nahua priests, the Franciscan Catholic *cosmovisión* required spiritual *and* worldly ascendance as a basis for any-and-all interlocutory efforts (Duverger, 1996). From the *Colloquia of the Twelve*, the Nahua *cosmovisión* is violently elided in Franciscan elocutionary-pedagogical efforts, and this violent elision requires critique of critical and difference pedagogies so reliant on "dialogue" as remediative interlocutory stance. Such a violent elision also requires increased attention on interlocutors who provide "voice" for the oppressed in critical "liberation." Whose *cosmovisión* is predominant in the ostensibly critical paradigm?

Despite progressive-critical through lines, the power asymmetries—clearly documented in the *Colloquia with the Twelve* and certainly extended in the mendicants' practices – are neatly summarized in plain language by Robert Ricard (1933/1966). Ricard, in the conclusion of his authoritative reading of mendicant work in Mexico, variously castigates and praises the Franciscans and other mendicants. In his castigation, Ricard explains that the mendicants loved the indigenous "as children, or as some parents love their children" (p. 292) clearly identifying the paternalism elided in pedagogical dialogue. Contrastingly, in his praise, Ricard (1933/1966) specifically praises the trilingual (Nahua, Latin, Spanish) educational efforts made by Franciscans who developed indigenous and mestizo scholars such as Hernando Alvarado Tezozómoc, Xitlilxóchitl, Chimalpain, and others' who, in turn, continued the study of the indigenous tradition of *flor y canto* still relevant today (León Portilla, 1961/1995). From Ricard's mixed evaluation of the Franciscan tradition, a both/and reading emerges in which the

Franciscan tradition is understood as a dynamic humanist tradition worthy of continued engagement (Dussell, 2005; 1998/2011) yet, paradoxically, the Franciscan tradition that Mexican historians recovered and deployed in the wake of the Mexican Revolution supports the mestizo hegemony of the present.

### **Cosmopolitan Sensibilities and an *Hispanophone Tradition***

Having rendered the Franciscan tradition as dynamic transmodern resource (Dussell, 2005; Dussell, 1998/2011) for further engagement and critique, I stop short of providing an “evaluation” of the tradition as that extends beyond my purpose here. The rendering of the Franciscan tradition, understood as synecdoche that signals the Anglophone-centric and Statesian field, does *not* pretend to be authoritative but rather invites others’ into a conversation on Mexican educational and cultural criticism that I in no way seek to control. Rather, in hopes of articulating cosmopolitan sensibilities, I draw attention *toward an Hispanophone tradition of educational and cultural criticism requiring further rendering and engagement in an internationalized field*, and certainly, a rendering is so vast that such a project would represent a shared project.

Even so, in developing the notion of cosmopolitan sensibilities through the rendering of the Franciscan tradition, I advance and historically expand a conversation that is already underway in the internationalization of curriculum studies (Pinar, 2011), and hopefully, this conversation will receive more attention and engagement. In Pinar’s (2011) recent edited volume *Curriculum Studies in Mexico*, he critiques the US field for “relentless recontextualization” (p. 1) of Mexican culture and identity around pedagogical interventions for “minorities” along with other popular deficitary understandings (that provide notable disclaimers that they are not deficitary). In discussing David Saldivar’s perspicacious statement *there are two Mexicos – one within the border and one within the United States*, Pinar (2011) correctly chides the Anglophone-centric and Statesian field by asking “How many US curriculum studies professors know either?” Pinar’s (2011) edited volume surveys Mexican curriculum studies researchers’ understandings of the contemporary curriculum field that, as Ashwani (2011) purports and other scholars in the volume concur, started in the 1970s. I understand Pinar’s volume that features important Mexican curriculum scholars – including Alicia de Alba, Frida Díaz Barriga Arceo, Alfredo Furlán, Raquel Glazman-Nowalski, and María Concepción Barrón Tirado – as an important first step in advancing an Hispanophone tradition of educational and cultural criticism for an internationalized field.

Nonetheless, cosmopolitan sensibilities in curriculum studies, as developed here suggest a more profound historicized turn along a dramatic radical reorganization of the curriculum studies field. Cosmopolitan sensibilities, as articulated through the rendering of the Franciscan tradition, hope to deepen this conversation by inviting an historicized view of educational and cultural criticism in Mexico and elsewhere. Stated simply, cosmopolitan sensibilities, as I seek to develop them here, ask not *how should we understand the development of “curriculum studies” in national and international traditions?* – as the term *curriculum studies* always-already historically privileges the Anglophone-centric and Statesian field and ignores other traditions of educational and cultural criticism. Rather, following intellectual historians (e.g., Connell, 2007; De Sousa Santos, 2008; Pinar, 2013) with particular emphasis on Dussell’s (2005) notion of “transmodernity” (p. 18), cosmopolitan sensibilities significantly deepen the historical



engagement in traditions by asking *how should we understand substantive and longstanding traditions of educational and cultural criticism?* – as the terms educational and cultural criticism allow, for example, the recognition of broad intellectual traditions and educational efforts relevant for intercultural understanding. Recognizing and inviting work in traditions of educational and cultural criticism in national and continental traditions, cosmopolitan sensibilities seek to profoundly deepen and critically reorganize curriculum studies’ internationalization in ways that enhance intercultural elocutionary exchanges that emphasize the implacable-yet-malleable-through-critique *history of the present that is made together.*

### Notes

<sup>1</sup> The term synoptic rendering draws on Pinar’s (2006) understandings of intellectual work that imply careful and hermeneutic understanding in studying of the historical archive. Synoptic rendering, as I interpret it from Pinar (2006), refers specifically to understandings in von Humbolt (1836/1992), Dilthey (1926/1992), Gadamer (1960), and others who situate critical understanding as linguistically-mediated-and-recursively-created through prolonged reading, especially, in historicized understandings of texts. Following Dilthey (1926/1992), the dialectical process of prolonged reading enacts a back-and-forth movement that amplifies, through study, the reader’s subjectivity and “widens our horizons of the possibilities of human existence” (p. 161). Updating Dilthey in the present moment, cosmopolitan sensibilities seek the similar pathway in the posthuman condition that understands reading and study as poetic and autobiographical act (Weaver, 2010) that takes place in a social historical moment in which the “individual” seems no longer the measure nor ethical boundary (Snaza, 2010; Weaver, 2010) of an internationalized globalization. This note is what stands in place of what is vulgarly understood as research “methodology” or historical “methods.”

<sup>2</sup> All quotes from books or articles with Spanish language titles in the references have been translated by the author.

<sup>3</sup> Defined in Flew’s (1984) *A Dictionary of Philosophy*, *a priori* refers to a fixity of ideas or beliefs that can seek *only confirmation* in experience. Under his entry *a priori*, Flew explains “An *a priori* position is one that can be known to be true, or false, without reference to experience, except in so far as experience is necessary for understanding its terms” (p. 16). Curriculum “discourses,” refinements, or their proliferations, frequently adhere to *a priori* understandings. Ostensibly “critical,” such adherences, nonetheless, work in profoundly *undialectical* ways. Cosmopolitan sensibilities, in rejecting apriorisms, advance utopian destabilizing dialectical work further explained in the next paragraphs.

<sup>4</sup> In this strategy, Deleuzian “contributions” to curriculum studies are still being defined for those who would strategize another “new” discourse. Even more recently, a Zizëkian discourse seems even more promising for this very well worn pathway in curriculum studies that “mines” cultural studies for “new” product in an Anglophone-centric and Statesian dominated field. It is time, I think, for asking the field if the continued ahistorical “*transplantamiento*” (Ibargüengoitia, 1980/2000, p. 53) of new product from cultural studies is really “radical.” See Jupp (2013) for a longer discussion on cultural studies’ waves in curriculum studies. João Paraskeva’s (2011) notion of epistemicides is an important starting point for describing curriculum discourses, discursive refinements, and proliferations.

<sup>5</sup> Jackson (1992), Pinar *et al.* (1995), Kashope Wright (2000), and Shubert (2008) all document the Anglophone-centric and Statesian field in their state-of-the-field descriptions. By the end of the 1990s, Appelbaum (2002), who narrated lived experience inside the “complicated conversation” (Pinar *et al.*, 1995, p. 848), describes the reconceptualized field as aggressively territorialized by discourses and in need of *diss*-conceptualization. This aggressive territorialization certainly refers to the abjected “back narratives” in the complicated conversation engendering, historically, much discord and division in the ranks. Appelbaum’s notion of *diss*-conceptualization seems an important notion in the present rather than “new” strategies to aggressively superordinate another new discourse or refinement.

<sup>6</sup> All of those historical tasks, important as they are, transcend the modest intentions of cosmopolitan sensibilities in curriculum studies in this essay.

<sup>7</sup> I bring forth my provisional rendering of the Franciscan tradition in Mexico with the intention of inviting an intercultural conversation on this topic that might eventually include “experts” as interventionists in my provisional rendering. Pedagogically speaking, the purpose of the synoptic rendering is to create space for intercultural conversation that seeks *not* consensus among experts but rather open-ended honest exchanges that look deeply at

intellectual history as a means of advancing curriculum studies' internationalization. Even so, within this pedagogical task which is directed primarily at an Anglophone-centric and Statesian field intent on proliferating its discourses, I am well aware of my privileged Statesian, multilingual, and expatriate identity.

<sup>8</sup> It is important not to merely romanticize the Mexican agrarian reform movement. *Ejidatarios*, in the present and since the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, represent the most historically marginalized. As Jesus Silva Herzog (1960/1990) noted, the *ejido* is and has been a ticket to poverty and misery.

<sup>9</sup> Celebrated in the United States as “democratic,” the “free election” of Vicente Fox and Felipe Calderón represented a move toward conservative and subordinate complicity in Statesian globalization. Fox, President of Coca-Cola in Mexico prior to becoming the Mexican President, is clearly a throwback to *criollismo* of the late colonial period, especially with his embodiment of *las buenas costumbres* and conservative Catholicism.

<sup>10</sup> Joaquín García Icazbalceta, son of a wealthy Spanish family, recovered documents from Madrid during the Napoleonic occupation of Spain and its resultant political chaos. Various cajoling, bribing and blackmailing archival officials, Icazbalceta rescued numerous documents from oblivion using his wealth as a means of extraction. Important in Icazbalceta's contribution is the historical censure in which many documents he recovered had remained for hundreds of years. The censure of the documents that he recovered, if placed in historical context, is one measure of their radical content that sought the production of Christianized indigenous collective and utopian social organizations. Of particular note among the massive volume of documents he recovered were Sahagún's (1866/2006) *Historia general de las cosas de Nueva España* and Fray Toribio de Motolinía's (1866/2001) *Historia de los indios de la nueva España*. Icazbalceta, an influential historian in his own right, nonetheless fueled the ideology of *mestizaje* by rescuing a host of documents from Spain and the Vatican. Robert Ricard (1938), who produced the most comprehensive synoptic rendering of primary documents on mendicant influences, dedicated his book “To the memory of Joaquín García Icazbalceta” (p. vi).

<sup>11</sup> I know that by focusing on Pedro de Gante, Toribio de Motolinía, and Vasco de Quiroga, I overlook important figures like Bernardino de Sahagún, for example. Or the significant work done by other mendicant orders such as Dominican Bartolomé de Las Casas' critical oeuvre. To counter, I can only respond that the present work represents, as I have said, a pedagogical task in the making. Even so, towering figures like Sahagún or Las Casas will require separate treatment in the future.

<sup>12</sup> The influence of Thomas More on Vasco Quiroga has been notably studied by Silvio Zavala (1941). Zavala's (1941) examines the Bishop of Mexico Juan Zumárraga's copy of More's *Utopia* located in the Franciscan Convent's library at the time the Quiroga served on the Royal Court and currently located in the University of Texas' Latin American collection. Zavala (1941) clearly identifies the availability of this text for Quiroga's study.

<sup>13</sup> Due to its radical recognition of Nahua and related cultures, the Colloquia of the Twelve was also officially censured by the administration of Felipe II, and it remained the Vatican files until 1920.

## References

- Anzuela, M. (1990). *Los de abajo*. Mexico, D.F.: Fondo de Cultura Económica. (Original work published 1916)
- Appiah, K.A. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a world of strangers*. New York, NY: Norton.
- Appelbaum, P. (2002). *Dissconceptualizing curriculum: Is there a next in the generational text?* *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing* 18(1), 7-19.
- Arriaga, A. (1938). *Organización social de los Tarascos*. Morelia, Michoacán: Publicaciones del Departamento de Extensión Universitaria.
- Arriaga, A. (1978). *Don Vasco de Quiroga: Biografías de grandes personajes*. Mexico, DF: Tipos Futura.
- Ashwani, K. (2011). *Curriculum studies in Mexico: An Overview*. In W.F. Pinar (Ed.) *Curriculum studies in Mexico: Intellectual histories, present circumstances*. New York, NY: Palgrave.

- Autio, T. (2007). Towards European Curriculum Studies: Reconsidering some basic tenets of Bildung and Didaktik. *Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies* 3(1), 1-11
- Baker, B. (2009). Borders, belonging, beyond: New curriculum history. In B. Baker (Ed.) *New curriculum history* (pp. ix-xxxv). Sense: Rotterdam.
- Benítez Basave, A. (2002). *México Mestizo: Análisis del nacionalismo mexicana en torno a la mestizofilia de Andrés Molina Enríquez* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Mexico, D.F.: Fondo de Cultura Económica. (Original work published 1992)
- Brom, J. (1998). *Esbozo de la historia de México*. México, DF: Grijalbo.
- Castellanos, R. (1997). *Ciudad real*. Mexico, D.F.: Alfaguara. (Original work published 1960)
- Chavez, E. (1952). *Pedro de Gante*. Mexico, D.F: Editorial Jus, SA.
- Chavez, E. (1958). *Apuntes sobre la colonia*. México, DF: Editorial Jus, SA.
- Connell, R. (2007). The northern theory of globalization. *Sociological Theory* 25(4), 368-385.
- Coronil, F. (1998). Más allá del occidentalismo: Hacia categorías geohistóricas no-imperialistas. In E. Mendieta's *Teorías sin disciplina: Latinoamericanismo, poscolonialidad, y globalización en debate* (pp. 121-196). Mexico, D.F.: Editorial Porrúa.
- Cortés, H. (1992). *Cartas de relación*. Mexico, D.F. Porrúa. (Original work written 1522)
- Cosío Villegas, D. (1982). El intelectual mexicano y la política. In G. Careaga *Intelectuales, poder, y revolución* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Mexico, D.F.: Océano.
- d'Owler, N. (1994). Introducción. *Fray Toribio de Motolinía: Relaciones de La Nueva España*. Mexico, DF: UNAM. (Original work published 1956)
- de Motolinía, T. (1866/2001). *Historia de los indios de la Nueva España*. Mexico, DF: Porrúa.
- de Motolinía, T. (1956/1994). *Relaciones de la Nueva España* (Ed. N. d'Owler, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). México, DF: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
- de Quiroga, V. (1994). Reglas y ordenanzas. In G. M. Plancarte *Humanistas Mexicanos del siglo XVI*. México, DF: Universidad Autónoma de México.
- De Sousa Santos, B. (2009). A non-occidental West? Learned ignorance and ecology of knowledge. *Theory, Culture, & Society* 26(7-8), 103-125.
- Díaz del Castillo, B. (1992) *Historia verdadera de la conquista de la Nueva España* (15<sup>th</sup> ed.). México, Distrito Federal: Editorial Porrúa, S.A. (Original work published 1632)
- Dilthey, W. (1992). The hermeneutics of the human sciences. In K. Mueller-Volmer *The hermeneutics reader* (pp. 148-152). New York, NY: Continuum. (Original work published 1926)
- Dussell, E. (2011). *Ética de la liberación en la edad de la globalización y de la exclusión*. Madrid: Editorial Trotta. (Original work published 1998)
- Dussell, E. (2005). 13 Transmodernidad e interculturalidad (Interpretación desde la filosofía de la liberación). <http://www.afyl.org/transmodernidadeinterculturalidad.pdf>. (Retrieved January, 2013)
- Duverger, C. (1996). *La conversión de los indios de Nueva España*. Fondo de cultura económica: México, DF.
- Ellsworth, E. (1989). Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review* 59(3), 297-324.
- Emerson, R.W. (2000). *Circles*. In M. Oliver (Ed.) *The essential writings of Ralph Waldo Emerson* (pp. 252-263). New York, NY: Modern Library.
- Enríquez Molina, A. (1909). *Los grandes problemas nacionales*. Mexico, D.F.: Imprenta de A. Carranza e Hijos.

- Enríquez Molina, A. (1938). *La reforma agraria*. Mexico, D.F.: Imprenta de A. Carranza e Hijos.
- Flew, A. Dictionary Entry: *A priori* and *a posteriori*. A. Flew *A dictionary of philosophy* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) (p 16). New York, NY: St. Martins.
- Fuentes, C. (2000). *Agua quemada*. Mexico, D.F.: Punto de Lectura. (Original work published 1981)
- Fuentes, C. (1992). *La muerte de Artemio Cruz*. Mexico, D.F.: Fondo de Cultura Económica. (Original work published 1962)
- Gadamer, H.G. (2001). *Truth and method*. New York, NY: Continuum. (Original work published 1960).
- Galeano, E. (2009). *Las venas abiertas de América Latina*. Madrid: Siglo XXI.
- Gante, P. (1952). Cartas de Fr. Pedro de Gante, OFM (Ed. F. de J. Chauvet, OFM). Mexico, DF: Junipero Serra. (Works originally written 1529)
- Hendry, P. (2011, April). Bringing history back: Curriculum theory's lost memory. Paper presentation at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies in New Orleans, LA.
- Hendry, P. (2012, October). Creating a New Eden: The Ursuline Mission of spiritual universalism in French colonial Louisiana. Paper presentation at the annual meeting of the Curriculum & Pedagogy Group in New Orleans, LA.
- Helfenbein, R.J. (2004). New times, new stakes: Moments of transit, accountability, and classroom practice. *The Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies* 26, 91-109.
- Helfenbein, R.J. (2010). Thinking through scale: Critical geography and curriculum spaces. In E. Malewski *Curriculum studies handbook: The next moment* (pp. 304-318). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hinojosa, R. (1977). *Generaciones y semblanzas*. Berkley, CA: Justa Publications, Inc.
- Horta, R. (1997). *El humanism en el Nuevo Mundo*. México, DF: Miguel Angel Porrúa.
- Ibargüengoitia, A. (2000). *Suma filosófica mexicana*. México, DF: Editorial Porrúa.
- Icazbalceta, J. (1998). *Biografías y estudios*. México, DF: Editorial Porrúa.
- Icazbalceta, J. (1866). *Collección de documentos para la historia Mexicana, Tomo segundo*. México, DF: Antigua Librería, Portal de Augustinos No. 3.
- Jackson, P. (1992). Conceptions of curriculum and curriculum specialists. In P. Jackson (Ed.) *Handbook of research on curriculum*. New York, NY: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Jupp, J. (2013). *Undoing* double binds in curriculum: On cosmopolitan sensibilities in US curriculum studies. *The Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies* 9(1), 54-72
- Kashope Wright, H. (2000). Nailing jello to the Wall: Pinpointing aspects of state-of-the-art curriculum theorizing. *Educational Researcher* 29(5), 4-13.
- Lafaye, J. (2002). El indio: problema espiritual (pp. 71-95). *Quetzalcoatl y Guadalupe: La formación de la consciencia nacional*. Mexico, DF: Fondo de Cultura Económica. (Original work published 1974)
- León-Portilla, M. (1995). *Los antiguos mexicanos*. Mexico, D.F.: Fondo de Cultura Económica. (Original work published 1961)
- Marcos, S. (2001). *Nuestra arma es nuestra palabra: Escritos selectos*. New York, NY: Sieto Cuentos Editorial.



- Macedo, E. (2011). Identity as the organizing principle of curriculum. Personal email communication.
- Martí, J. (1971). Nuestra América. In J. Ortega (Ed.) *Antología José Martí* (pp. 17-26). Madrid: Salvat Editores. (Original work published 1891)
- Malewski, E. (2010). Introduction: Proliferating curriculum. In E. Malewski *Curriculum studies handbook: The next moment* (pp. 1-40). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Mendieta, J. (1973). *Historia eclesiástica indiana*. Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Españoles. (Original work published 1866)
- Mendez Plancarte, G. (Ed.) (1994). *Humanistas mexicanos del siglo XVI*. Mexico, D.F.: Universidad Autónoma de México.
- Moon, S. (2012, April). Tasan Chong Yag-yong: Practical Learning School in Korea & Neo-Confucianism. Paper presentation at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies in Vancouver, British Columbia.
- More, T. (1964). *Utopia*. New York, NY: Penguin Classics. (Original work published 1516)
- O’Gorman, E. (1992). Hacia una nueva imagen de P. Las Casas. In O’Gorman (Ed.) *Los indios de México y Nueva España*. Mexico, D.F. Porrúa. (Original work published 1966)
- O’Gorman, E. (2001). Estudio crítico y notas. *Historia de los indios de Nueva España* (Ed. E. O’Gorman). Mexico, DF: Porrúa.
- Paraskeva, J. (2011). *Conflicts in curriculum theory: Challenging hegemonic epistemologies*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan
- Paz, O. (1987). *El laberinto de la soledad*. México, DF: El Fondo de Cultura Económica. (Original work published 1948)
- Paz, O. (1979). *El ogro filantrópico*. Mexico, D.F.: Joaquín Mortíz.
- Picón Salas, M. (1994). *De la Conquista a la Independencia* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). México, Distrito Federal: Fondo de Cultura Económica. (Original work published 1944)
- Phelan, J.L. (1970). *The millennial kingdom of the Franciscans in the New World*. Berkley, CA: University of California Press.
- Pinar, W. (2006). The synoptic text today. In W. Pinar’s *The synoptic text today and other essays* (pp. 1-15). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Pinar, W. (2011). *Curriculum Studies in Mexico: Intellectual histories, present circumstances*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pinar, W. (2013). *Curriculum studies in the United States: Present circumstances, intellectual histories*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan
- Pinar, W.; Reynolds, W.; Slattery, P. & Taubman, P. (1995). *Understanding curriculum: An introduction to the study of historical and contemporary curriculum discourses*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Poniatowska, E. (1997). *Fuerte es el silencio*. Mexico, D.F. Biblioteca Era. (Original work published 1980)
- Poniatowska, E. (1997). *La noche de Tlatelolco*. Mexico, D.F.: Biblioteca Era. (Original work published 1971)
- Sahagún, B. (2006). *Historia general de las cosas de nueva España*. México, D.F.: Editorial Porrúa. (Original work published 1866)
- Sahagún, B. (1996). Los coloquios de Los Doce. In C. Duverger *La conversión de los indios de Nueva España* (pp. 35-102). Mexico. D.F.: Fondo de Cultura Económica. (Original work published 1920)



- Schubert, W. (2008). Curriculum inquiry. In F.M. Connelly, M.F. He, and J. Phillion *The Sage handbook of curriculum and instruction* (pp. 399-420). London: Sage.
- Silva Herzog, J. (1990). *Breve historia de la Revolución Mexicana*. México, D.F.: Fondo de Cultura Mexicana. (Original work published 1960)
- Ramirez Lopez, I. (1948). *Tres biografías*. México, D.F.: SEP.
- Reyes, A. (1983). Fray Servando Teresa de Mier. In *Visión de Anáhuac y otros ensayos* (pp. 31-40). México, D.F.: Fondo de Cultura Económica. (Original work published 1920)
- Reyes, A. (1956). Notas sobre la inteligencia americana. In *Obras completas IV*. México, D.F.: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Reyes, A. (1983). Visión de Anáhuac. In *Visión de Anáhuac y otros ensayos* (pp. 8-30). México, DF: Fondo de Cultura Económica. (Original work published 1915)
- Ricard, R. (1966). *The spiritual Conquest of Mexico*. Berkley, CA: University of California Press. (Original work published 1933)
- Reynolds, W. & Webber, J. (2009). Chapter 5: The significance of place. In W. Reynolds and J. Webber *The civic gospel: A political cartography of Christianity* (pp. 109-121). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Rulfo, J. (1989). *El llano en llamas*. Mexico, D.F.: Fondo de Cultura Económica. (Original work published 1954)
- Sen, A. *Identity & violence: The illusion of destiny*. New York, NY: Penguin.
- Snaza, N. (2010). Thirteen theses on the question of state in curriculum studies. In E. Malewski *Curriculum studies handbook: The next moment* (pp. 43-56). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Uslar Pietri, A. (1974). El mestizaje creador. In *La otra América* (pp. 21-27). Madrid: Alianza Editorial.
- Vasconcelos (1997). *The cosmic race/La raza cósmica*. Baltimore, MA: Johns Hopkins University Press. (Original work published 1925)
- Vega, J. & Vives, P.A. (1987). *Lázaro Cárdenas*. Madrid: Quorum.
- von Humboldt, W. (1992). Foundations: language, understanding, and the historical world. In K. Mueller-Vollmer *The hermeneutic reader* (pp. 98-105). (Original work published 1836)
- Weaver, J. (2010). Theorizing the posthuman. *Educating the posthuman* (pp. 9-35). Sense Publishers: Rotterdam.
- West, C. (2004). *Democracy matters: Winning the fight against imperialism*. New York, NY: Penguin.
- Whitlock, U.R. (2010). Jesus died for NASCAR fans: The significance of rural formations of queerness to curriculum studies. In E. Malewski (Ed.) *Curriculum studies handbook: The next moment*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Winfield, A. (2011). Bringing history back: Curriculum theory's lost memory. Paper presentation at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies in New Orleans, LA.
- Winfield, A. (2010). Eugenic ideology and historical osmosis. In E. Malewski's *Curriculum studies handbook: The next moment* (pp. 142-158). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Zavala, S. (1941). *Ideario de Vasco de Quiroga*. México, DF: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

