

Decolonial-Hispanophone Curriculum: A Preliminary Sketch and Invitation to a South-South Dialogue

James C. Jupp¹

University of Texas, Rio Grande Valley, United States

Micaela González Delgado²

National Autonomous University of Mexico, Acatlán, Mexico

Freyca Calderón Berumen³

Pennsylvania State University, Altoona, United States

Caroline Hesse⁴

University of Texas, Rio Grande Valley, United States

In this essay, we present a preliminary sketch of decolonial-Hispanophone curriculum and extend the invitation for a South-South dialogue between students, teachers, or activist-educators of the geo-regions denominated “the Americas.”⁵ *Decolonial-Hispanophone curriculum*, as definition, refers to Spanish-language, anti-racist, curricular-pedagogical resources that emphasize indigenous, brown, and black geo-regional traditions of Latin America. To better historicize decolonial Latin American work, we provide a genealogical sketch of decolonial-Hispanophone curriculum from the 16th century Conquest through the beginning of the 20th century. With the sketch, we demonstrate that decolonial thought is manifested in historically specific and contextualized ways as an oppositional *cyclical counter-current* inside the historical arc of coloniality. Working through the sketch, we articulate three historicized concepts. We finish our essay with an invitation to a South-South decolonial-cosmopolite dialogue.

Two cautionary notes and our intellectual foundations

We begin our essay with two cautionary notes and a description of our intellectual foundations. As our first cautionary note, we present our work as emergent, incomplete, and subjunctive. Inherent in the phrase “preliminary sketch,” the purpose of our essay is not to define nor to conclude the topic of decolonial curriculum, but rather, our purpose is to initiate a South-South dialogue on curricular-pedagogical resources for students, teachers, or activist educators. For this reason, we recognize that the resources offered here are not complete. We do not try to offer a complete intellectual history of Latin America, nor do we speak of all the decolonial projects throughout the world. We merely offer a preliminary sketch of curricular-pedagogical resources for further discussion and research. As a second precaution, we understand that our identities and histories are reflexively implicit in the production of this essay⁶. As Global South intellectuals influenced by the North *and* Global North intellectuals influenced by the South, we recognize our borderland linguistic-ideational identities and idiosyncrasies. For us, we emphasize that our identities and idiosyncrasies create the



TO CITE THIS ARTICLE PLEASE INCLUDE ALL OF THE FOLLOWING DETAILS:

Jupp, James; González Delgado, Micaela; Calderón Berumen, Freyca &; Hesse, Caroline (2020). Decolonial-hispanophone curriculum: a preliminary sketch and an invitation to a South-South Dialogue *Transnational Curriculum Inquiry* 17(1), 72-94 <http://nitinat.library.ubc.ca/ojs/index.php/tci> <access date>

sensibilities necessary for the production of this essay and the project we initiate here. On our positionalities, it is necessary to emphasize that our intertwined identities and idiosyncrasies have made for the personal vulnerability and intellectual generosity required to collaborate, and in this way, we exemplify the necessary dispositions to realize this transnational project. Taking the two notes into account, we propose our work as a contribution to the area of curriculum developed by Paraskeva (2011, 2015, 2016, 2018, 2020) called itinerant curriculum theory.

Itinerant curriculum theory (ICT), by definition, refers to the elaborated practice of critical theory by students, teachers, or activist educators in diverse contexts of the distinct geo-regions of the world. Although it represents an emergent area (Jupp, 2017), ICT has four dimensions. ICT (a) emphasizes historicized work through colonial relations of the past that continue into the present, and therefore, advances Freire's reconceptualization of curricular-pedagogical work from this revolutions of the 60s and 70s; (b) understands the practice of curriculum as inherently political-conflictive, and therefore, curricular-pedagogical work provides an ideal area for subversive, activist, and ideological interventions; (c) seeks ways to conjugate transnational critical theory with historical-local realities, and therefore, emphasizes local critical-activist work as much as theoretical-intellectual work; and, (d) proposes a geo-regional dialectic of critical theory, and therefore, amplifies contextualized Latin American critical theory, not static-bureaucratic "theoretical frameworks," but rather a sliding critical hermeneutic. These four dimensions of ICT are important for decolonizing Latin American curriculum theory from critical and poststructuralist theories of the Global North while also maintaining its ties to leftist-critical world movements.

Following ICT's fourth dimension, we describe the intellectual foundations of our preliminary sketch. Our hermeneutic includes Marxian world systems analysis (e.g., Gill, 1986, 1995, 2003; Hall, 2004; Jaramillo & McLaren, 2008; Wallerstein, 1991/2007, 2004), historical counter-narratives (e.g., Galeano, 1971; Giroux, 1992; Lyotard, 1979; Rivera Cusicanqui, 1984/2010; Zinn, 2003), insurgent cosmopolitanism (e.g., Amin, 2008; Jupp, 2013a, 2013b, 2017, Jupp, Calderón Berumen, O'Donald, 2017; Paraskeva, 2011, 2016; Sousa Santos, 2007, 2009; Sousa Santos, Nunes, Meneses, 2007), Chicana borderland thinking (e.g., Acuña, 1972; Anzaldúa, 1987; Delgado Bernal, 1998; González, 1967; Hinojosa, 1977; Kanellos, 2002; Paredes, 1976; Saavedra y Nymark, 2008), decolonial alternatives (e.g., Andreotti 2011, 2015; Andreotti et al., 2018; Aquino Moreschi, 2013; Díaz Gómez, 2004; Grosfoguel, 2010; Maldonado-Torres, 2007; Martínez Luna, 2004; Mignolo, 2008, 2009; Mignolo, Guilano, & Berisso, 2014; Mignolo & Walsh, 2018; Quijano, 1992, 2000), contemporary notions of pedagogical intervention (e.g., González Delgado, 2009, 2012, 2014), decolonial pedagogies (e.g., Jaramillo & McLaren, 2008; Walsh, 2008, 2012, 2013), and the ethics of liberation (e.g., Dussel, 2005, 1977/2011; Freire, 1970/1998, 1992/2002; Maldonado-Torres, 2007). In conjugating ICT, we seek sympathies, coherences, and affinities that might create a transnational Spanish-speaking community to advance the necessary curricular and pedagogical work in the present moment.

Questions and contours of the essay

With the intention of creating emergent transnational communities, our essay responds to three questions: How do we historically frame curricular-pedagogical work in the Americas? Which intellectual and historical resources might inform our educational work within present-day coloniality? And, which historicized concepts emerge from the intellectual resources that can inform our South-South decolonial dialogue? Organized by these three questions, we present the following contours. *First*, we provide some provisional definitions to terms used throughout the trajectory of the essay. *Second*, we plant the



historical problem of curricular-pedagogical work inside the historical colonies and present-day coloniality. *Third*, we arrive at the principal section, the section that provides our preliminary and genealogical sketch of decolonial-Hispanophone curriculum. *Fourth*, based on the sketch, we develop three historicized concepts that we consider key to our present-day decolonial transnational project: (a) the historicity of Latin American decolonial thought, (b) mestizx conceptualization, and (c) communality/pluriversality. For each concept, we provide an example from the curricular-pedagogical practice from Jim and Mica, first and second authors, respectively. We conclude our essay with an invitation to a South-South decolonial-cosmopolite dialogue.

Provisional definitions

To proceed with clarity, we provide definitions to specific terms we use throughout the essay. These terms are: historical colonies, coloniality, social-historical *re-signification*, mestizx conceptualization, and communality/pluriversality. *Historical colonies*, by definition, refer to the proto-capitalist and capitalist “first world system” dominant between the 16th and 20th centuries that was founded on the occupation, administration, and extraction of natural resources and surplus value from territories conquered by Europe. *Coloniality*, by definition, refers to the industrial and late-capitalist “second world system” dominant in the twentieth century that extends colonial currents and related supremacist, occidentalist, elite criollx, and Anglo-Saxon structures. *Social-historical re-signification*, by definition, refers to the re-appropriation and recirculation of dominant symbols with resistant uses and meanings. *Mestizx conceptualization*, by definition, refers to “thinking the world” through various critical, historical, and hybrid perspectives (race, class, gender, and others) that combat, interrupt, and subvert the hegemonic and capitalist matrix of power. *Communality/pluriversality*, by definition, refers to curricular-pedagogical work that begins with the geo-region (the communal, the cultural, the economic) and, simultaneously, extends its connections toward a transregional practice. Having concluded the preliminary definitions, we now move to the three framing questions that structure this essay.

How do we historically frame curricular-pedagogical work in the Americas?

We emphasize the need to begin with two historical concepts related to the Americas: historical colonies and present-day coloniality. *The historical colonies* were the model of historical-geographic domination from the sixteenth century until the beginning of the twentieth century. The historical colonies were based on occupation and bureaucratic administration of the conquered via military means. As “first world system”, the historical colonies emphasized economic relations of exploitation that culminated in the historical period called industrialization. By definition, the historical colonies were founded on military and spiritual conquests that formed the first, supremacist, occidentalist, criollx and European world system.

Tied historically to Europe and subsequently to US imperialism, the historical colonies imposed racist cosmovisions to justify the sacking of natural resources and the extraction of working-class surplus value. Differing from European social organization that established social class privileges, in the Americas domination emphasized racialization, especially in relation to enslaved, exploited, or as referred to today, “cheap” labor. Of course, racialization was tied to other nexuses that included gender, sexuality, culture, language, and these ties accommodated Europeans, criollxs, and Anglo Saxons at the top as the directive and salary-earning class while assigning indigenous, mestizx, and Black peoples as a changeable, itinerant, and domestic-service classes. In this way, the nineteenth-century, Malthusian,



political body assumed Europeans and Anglo Saxons as always “heading up” leadership and, at the same time, racialized subjects were assumed to be the directed social “appendages.”

Undoubtedly, racial links to exploited labor adapted differently across geo-regions in historically specific ways. In Latin America, these racial links are particular to each nation and differ between indigenous genocide, racial-cultural mestizaje, and the promotion of the transatlantic slave trade in the creation of “modern” nations (Benítez Basave, 2002; Galeano/2008, 1971; Graham, 1990; Quijano, 2000; Rivera Cusicanqui, 1984/2010). Within differing national trajectories, racial nexuses with labor created an ongoing and persistent inequality that has a strong and undeniable presence in the present. For that reason, any historical-social analysis that diminishes race fails to comprehend racialized reality and its continuity in the present moment. Because it recognizes these links, our sketch of decolonial-Hispanophone curriculum emphasizes and advances intellectual work that recognizes the historical colonies as fundamental bases for the critical reading of reality.

Coloniality represents the continuation of the historical colonies via processes of epistemological enunciation in the present moment. As “second world system,” coloniality continues colonial relations in the present in the production of disciplinary knowledges related to the financial, administrative, political, and military knowing and doing. Inseparable from the production of knowledges, coloniality advances a program of official educational-cultural knowledge production through the matrix of power⁷ (e.g., Mignolo, 2009; Mignolo & Walsh, 2018; Grosfoguel, 2011). This program of official educational-cultural knowledge production provides one key dimension of present-day coloniality.

Through the matrix of power, coloniality organizes its changing, complicated, geopolitical hegemony. In the ascendance of this global hegemony, coloniality extends “the first world system” toward “the second” in non-linear but persistent form. In his extension, coloniality advances the historical colonies, not through the means of direct invasion, occupation, and administration, but rather through varied strategies that include economic incentives, “favorable” trade agreements, educational-curricular “reforms,” pastoral guides like “free” markets, and simultaneously, violent official and extra-official military invasions for “anti-democratic” countries.

As part of this supremacy, coloniality also presents itself as “first world” inside the “third” as a spectacle of “progress” while this progress serves to destabilize regional economies and degrade world environmental conditions. Following historical White, Anglo Saxon, Eurocentric supremacy, coloniality presents the “third world” inside the “first” as a social problem. All the while, these “problems” are results of necessary labor migration that is caused by the same destabilized economies.

More recently and with the political astuteness of Donald Trump, coloniality advances a US internal politics and foreign policy that is openly anti-immigrant, racist, and fascist to maintain a status quo of racialized, systemic, international, economic White privilege and advantage while labeling immigrants as “criminals,” “drug dealers,” “rapists,” and “murders.” What is dangerous about present-day coloniality is that it has created an irrational, mythomaniac, xenophobic, racist, and eugenic “common sense.”

Inseparable from the matrix of power, coloniality advances a program of educational-cultural reproduction. Differing from historical colonies, coloniality does not occupy or administrate faraway territories, but rather, predominantly works through educands-students through a program of reproduction or “reproductive curriculum” directed toward the production of conformist, accepting, consumer identities that comply with capitalist inevitability. This curriculum is manifest via various strategies including educative centers, competencies or standards, museums with official messages, and other means that extend the supremacist, occidentalist, criollo, and Anglo Saxon cosmopolitanism.



Here we note a clear example of coloniality and the reproductive curriculum in the standardized testing and its proliferation from the United States and the Global North toward Latin America (Díaz López & Osuna Lever, 2016; Internacional de la Educación para América Latina [IEAL]; 2015; Ravela et al., 2008). Part of a neoliberal, instrumental, and financial logic that emerged since the 80s (Gill, 1986, 1995, 2003), the IEAL (2015) laments the omnipresent proliferation of standardized curricula and global competencies tied closely to “national and international evaluation (much standardized and centralized evaluation), ... school rankings, and competition between schools” (p. 7). In fact, while some debate their applications (Díaz López & Osuna Lever, 2016) y others dream of evaluations adapted to Latin America (Ravela et al., 2008), it is impossible to deny the resounding effects of the reproductive curriculum in Latin America via global competencies and standardized testing.

Within these strategies, the reproductive curriculum eliminates or devalues mestiza, brown, and Black traditions and languages. As an “educational” process, reproductive curriculum imposes modes of modern, new, accepted ways of thinking with stamps of approval from university centers of the Global North metropolises. Moreover, reproductive curriculum sends another selection of “quaint” yet “outdated” knowledges to occidentalist museums as representations of a folkloric past heritage. Through the means of reproductive curriculum, coloniality reproduces an abyssal line between the “inevitable” of supremacist, occidentalist, criollo, and Anglo Saxon traditions and mestizo, brown, indigenous, and Black traditions that, through the abyssal line, are made non-existent (Paraskeva, 2011, 2016; Santos, 2007, 2009). Paradoxically and importantly, reproductive curriculum has not invented a way to extinguish human dreams nor to determine identities.

Additionally, before the same reproductive curriculum, there are different patterns of resistance and re-existent identities. Nonetheless, the great majority of these patterns reflect the same a-historical, nihilistic, and opportunistic directions inherent in hegemonic consumer capitalism. Notable and implicit in reproductive curriculum, coloniality operates through binaries of “civilization/barbarism,” “savage/modern,” “backwards/advanced,” “underdeveloped/developed,” and “tradition/progress.” As the most general way of managing this binary, coloniality uses the duality of “problem/solution” in order to characterize “un-modern” historical conditions it understands as barbarism, primitive, backwards, underdeveloped, or traditional. In this recent characterization, coloniality understand any and all disagreements with the matrix of power as a “problem” that needs to be solved or, better said, eradicated.

Implicitly, the critical use of the term coloniality emphasizes a *de*-linking with this supremacist cosmovision outlined above. This *de*-linking refers to various strategies of resistance and re-existence, but it also takes place under the historical conditions enunciated by the matrix of power. Because it takes place within these conditions, *de*-linking does not represent an autonomous and individualized autonomy as framed by the false freedom of consumer capitalism. Rather, *de*-linking represents the search for structural, laboral, geo-regional, ecological, and historical alternatives. These alternatives emphasize social justice, racial conscientization, localized knowledges, sustainable economies, and the reorganization of historical regional knowledge production.

Our sketch of decolonial-Hispanophone curriculum recognizes, and super-ordinates the understanding of historical colonies and coloniality as decolonial analytic concepts. In the next section, we attempt to provide historicized resources that can advance the processes of *de*-linking.

Which intellectual and historical resources might inform our curricular-pedagogical work?

Decolonial-Hispanophone curriculum values, studies, conditions, and above all *historicizes* mestizx, brown, indigenous, and Black Spanish language traditions particular to Latin America. Far from desiring to control the transmission of knowledges, we provide the following paragraphs as a heuristic-bibliographic outline of resources and possible directions that might advance a South-South cosmopolitan dialogue in the future.

Such a dialogue supposes more profound, elaborated, and contextualized research toward a decolonial archive adaptable for particular engagements and local activism. Each region needs its own resources and decolonial histories, but also, we emphasize transnational-shared intellectual resources that can create social movements of the same scale as the monstrosity of neoliberal (now fascist) capitalism. Knowing that we work within existing historical curricular-pedagogical traditions, we understand our work here as continuation and critique of intellectual work that came before us⁸. To begin the dialogue, we offer the following subsections: Indigenous intellectual production, Brown and mestizx humanisms of the 16th century, Re-significations of the Baroque Period, and the Continued fight from dependence toward independence.

Indigenous intellectual production

Decolonial-Hispanophone curriculum values and conditions indigenous intellectual production, both historical and present-day. Integral to decolonial-Hispanophone curriculum, we repudiate the multitude of times that the Spanish or Europeans destroyed indigenous codices and other indigenous expressions (e.g., Díaz del Castillo, 1632/1992; De Landa, 1566/1978), and we recognize the instances in which indigenous intellectuals hid their codices (e.g., Recinos, 1947/1995), translated them for resistance and conservation (e.g., De Alva Ixtlilxochitl, 1608/1891; Poma, 1615/2013; Tezozómoc, 1598/1994), or *re-produced* them in present-day memory for future generations (Díaz Gómez, 2004; Menchú y Burgos, 1985; Posas, 1952/2012). We recognize existing collective indigenous intellectual production (e.g., Recinos, 1947/1995; De Alva Ixtlilxóchitl, 1608/1891; Poma, 1615/2013; Tezozómoc, 1598/1994), re-readings and contemporary oral histories from the indigenous archives (e.g., Caso, 1953/2014; Duverger, 2007; Garibay, 1954/2007; León-Portilla, 1961/1995; Rivera Cusicanqui, 1984/2010), and present-day contributions (e.g., Aquino Moreschi, 2013; Díaz Gómez, 2004, Marcos, 2001) as key to South-South cosmopolite dialogue.

We emphasize indigenous intellectual production, not to give it a better chamber in the occidentalist anthropology museum, but rather, to include it in contemporary, present-day, critical readings. Simply stated, we understand its study as inseparable from historical self-knowledge and self-determination (Andreotti, 2011, 2015; Andreotti et al., 2018; Paraskeva, 2011, 2016, 2020). Our purpose in reading the indigenous archives is not celebrationist or folkloric like many of the national-consensual historians of the 20th century, but rather, we approach these archives with the intention of informing our historical-contemporary understandings with understandings of indigenous resistance and presence in both the past and present. In approaching the indigenous archive in this way, we repudiate the US historical common-sense position that “real Indians” no longer exist. Rather, we understand the example of indigenous proletarian resistance as a dialectic archive that requires an understanding of the past in the present and the present of the past (Marcos, 2001; Martínez, 1976/1991).

Brown and mestizx humanisms of the 16th century

Tied to our understanding of indigenous intellectual production, we value, but also simultaneously condition, brown and mestizx humanisms of the 16th century (e.g., De las Casas, 1552/2011; De la Vega, 1590/1967; De Ercilla y Zúñiga, 1569/1997; Motolinía, 1866/2001; Sahagún, 1585/2006) that pushed, not for the extermination of indigenous peoples, but rather for their humanization. Besides pushing for humanization, brown and mestizx humanisms narrated clear instances of indigenous resistance and pride before unjust forces of the historical colonies. Overall, brown and mestizx humanisms of the 16th century represented a nascent, problematic, incomplete, actual, and still potent process that might be called transmodern (e.g., Coroníl, 1998, Dussel, 2005; Walsh, 2008).

This mestizaje continues to be important in the present moment because it opens a third space of dialogue between occidental and indigenous cultures. Always needing to confront the historical paternalism of the Catholic cosmovision, nonetheless, brown and mestizx humanisms with their social-educative experiments created distinct, Mendelian, syncretic, intercultural, and transcultural historical conditions of Latin America that are very distinct from historical Anglophone conditions. These social experiments of brown and mestizx humanisms contrasted with the genocide, extermination, apartheid, and exclusion of Spencerian White supremacy of the United States. We theorize the historical problematics of historical mestizaje in the final section of this essay.

The College of Santa Cruz de Tlatelolco is emblematic of the brown and mestizx humanism of the 16th century. The College represented the utopic aspirations, limits, contradictions, and sudden closure of social experiments deemed heretical and indigenizing by the Catholic Church and Phillip II's authoritarianism at the end of the 16th century (Duverger, 1987/1996; Ricard, 1933/1974). Founded by Franciscans in 1536, the original purpose of the College was to provide a trilingual education in Nahuatl, Spanish, and Latin to cement a New Hispanic-Christian utopia based on an indigenous priesthood. With all the dangers and contradictions of the utopianism of Thomas More, the Franciscans and Bernardino de Sahagún underscored the teaching of language, culture, and history in Nahuatl-Spanish inter-linguistic and intercultural production. With this group of intellectuals that included Nahuatl trilingual students Antonio Valeriano, Alonso Vegerano, Martín Jacobita, and other collaborators, Sahagún (1578/2006) produced his monumental work *General History of New Spain* and many other documents.

The collaborative work of the group attempted to render the Nahuatl cosmovision of the world in an inter-linguistic and intercultural way that gave rise to a body of Nahuatl-Spanish double-translation work that has not since been equaled in ambition or result. What the College represented for our reading of decolonial-Hispanophone curriculum is a model of radical intercultural dialogue inside which languages and knowledges are respected as educational-identitarian resources of the past toward a better future. Moreover, this intellectual production also supports the findings of Mica, second author of this essay, who works in Hñähñu communities today. Through this work, we emphasize the importance of recovering ancestral traditions that can be leveraged toward alternative *re-creations* of the world through distinct historical heritages and traditions. In this way, the College of Santa Cruz de Tlatelolco represents a goal of inter-linguistic and intercultural education, not as celebrationist history of national historians, but rather a resource with present-day critical relevance to our South-South cosmopolite dialogue.

With this link to present-day relevance, we emphasize that brown and mestizx humanisms represented by the College of Santa Cruz de Tlatelolco ended up suddenly terminated by the anti-indigenous politics of the reign of Phillip II that started in 1571.



Because of this reactionary politics, Sahagún's manuscripts and many other documents remained buried in the archives of Madrid or the Vatican because of their heretical content. It was Joaquín Icazbalceta (1866) who rescued these documents and published them in his *Collection of Documents for the Study of Mexican History* and, therefore, promoted the radical mestizx ideologies of the Mexican Revolution, the Chicano Movement in the Southwest US, and other uprisings and decolonial movements in Latin America. In the end, brown and mestizx humanism, tied to social-educational experiments presented future alternative avenues that were never realized in the 16th and 17th centuries because of the oppression of the Spanish Crown and the Catholic Church. Nonetheless, here we recognize brown and mestizx humanisms as key decolonial resources that emphasize one dimension of our preliminary study.

Re-significations of the Baroque Period

In continuation, we also recognize curricular-pedagogical resources of the Baroque period in Latin America. Overall, we repudiate the re-instatement of anti-indigenous and anti-mestizx politics, the Catholic Inquisition, and the oppressive Counter-Reform. Importantly, we recognize the burlesque, historical, and social violence and cruelty of this period that had material consequences in indigenous and mestizx communities (LaFaye, 1972; Phelan, 1970; Picón Salas, 1944/1994).

Following the readings of Mariano Picón Salas (1944/1994), we emphasize the intellectual ineptitude of the Baroque Period and the disconnection between the colonial leadership and the indigenous and mestizx masses. Regarding this ineptitude, the Baroque Period officially abolished the inter-linguistic and intercultural impulses of brown and mestizx humanisms of the previous period outlined above. Again, with educator Picón Salas (1944/1994), we emphasize:

The general tone of the culture [of the Baroque Period] that the metropolises imposed was that of the complex of transplant. There was the privilege of an erudite elite that lacked any understanding of the indigenous and mestizx masses. Official intellectual work of the period had an exclusive and cryptic character. (p. 131)

Nonetheless, confronting this official epistemicide (Paraskeva, 2011, 2016), the Baroque Period offered patterns of historical-social resignification that are not yet concluded but are important for future decolonial projects, especially regarding the reterritorialization of the US by indigenous and mestizx populations from the Global South.

Among several examples of Baroque re-signification, we note two instances that exemplify decolonial-Hispanophone curriculum: (i) The Baroque cathedrals of Latin America and (ii) the indigenous uprisings of the 19th century. Part of indigenous-mestizx sensibilities, Baroque Latinamerican architecture provides an instance of social-historical re-signification of hegemonic symbols that became relevant to subsequent liberation movements. In Latin American terrains, Baroque architecture transformed itself into a Latin American ultra-Baroque style with strong esthetic influence from indigenous ornamentation.

Specifically, in ultra-Baroque architecture, the indigenous and mestizx crafters, masons, and sculptors elaborated churches, monasteries, sanctuaries, and shrines for an entire continent. Paradoxically, while Catholic authorities tried to proliferate orthodoxy for all, indigenous and mestizx esthetics and sensibilities were codified in stone, for the future, displaying a different unofficial meaning to the constructions. With contradictions similar to the sanctification of the Virgen of Guadalupe/Tonantzintla in the 16th century, ultra-Baroque cathedrals integrated indigenous traditions and content, but, also, at the same time,



indigenized and re-signified the religious, Spanish, and criollx structures by leaving an indigenous imprint on icons, symbols, and esthetics from the hands of the workers who made them.

Several examples of the Baroque architecture are the Sacred Cathedral of Mexico, the College of Jesuits in Tepotzotlán, the Cathedral of Santa Maria de Tonantzintla, and the Cathedral of San Francisco de Acatepéc among others. Here, we emphasize the importance of taking ownership, re-interpreting, and giving other meanings to official-hegemonic messages as symbol of resistance and re-existence before colonial extermination and epistemicide. These notions of resistance and re-existence exemplified in the Latin American, ultra-Baroque style are key to decolonial praxis in the present. These are key notions in the present moment because decolonial praxis does not represent a return to an idealized pre-Columbian past but rather a popular re-signification of historical knowledges and practices in the present. Resignification, exemplified in the ultra-Baroque cathedrals, represents a social, psychic, historical process of re-taking official symbols that is a type of border-thinking (Anzaldúa, 1987; Mignolo, 2008, 2009; Mignolo & Walsh, 2018).

Apart from the architecture of the period but more radical, the indigenous uprisings of the Latin American Baroque period also help us understand the processes of indigenous resignification. The uprisings of Jacinto Canék (1761), Túpac Amaru II (1780-1782), Juan Santos Atau Huallpa (1742-1755), and Ambrosio Pisco (1781) provide examples of social-historical resignification of previously deprecated indigenous symbols of the colonial period. Jacinto Canék, manifesting the continued autonomy of the Itzá-Maya in Yucatán, organized an army of five hundred Indians, declared himself King of the Itzá-Maya, and tried to restore Mayan reign to the Yucatan. Túpac Amaru II, fighting against economic suffering in the Andes mountains, executed Spanish officials, organized an army of between forty- and sixty-thousand, and took over the South of Perú for several years. Juan Santos Atau Huallpa, looking for a return to Incan reign and cosmovision, rejected his Christian education, threw out Spanish and mestizx collaborators with the Spanish Crown, and took over the Tarma and Jauja regions, which remained autonomous regions until his death. Ambrosio Pisco, farmer and successful businessman in territories close to what is today called Bogotá, Columbia, directed indigenous independent troops and negotiated for control of indigenous mining rights in the region. Against the interpretation of indigenous inferiority, indigenous uprisings provide a permanent, symbolic, undeniable, and important turn of consciousness that emphasized indigenous presence and protagonism in the history of the continent.

This turn of consciousness is manifest in the autonomy of indigenous communities, the rejection of Spanish and European leadership, and a re-circulation of indigenous cosmovisions. Far from repudiating, denigrating, or omitting the past, the uprisings presented a massive indigenous front organized by the representatives of the ancient Mayan and Incan lineages. These lineages recognized, integrated, and actualized the indigenous struggle of their time. Similar to the Haitian Revolution of the 19th century on the Island of Santo Domingo, those uprisings were identified with much seriousness and fear in the governmental and metropolitan centers as possible permanent rebellions of the indigenous, mestizx, and Black popular masses against the criollx and European centers of power in the capitals.

This turn of consciousness informs present-day indigenous sovereignty movements (e.g., Aquino Moreschi, 2013; Díaz Gómez, 2004; Marcos, 2001, Luna Martínez, 2004; Rivera Cusicanqui, 1984/2010) and also movements of autonomy exemplified by sanctuary cities in the US that have defied the federal government in housing thousands of refugees from the Global South. The vision of the indigenous uprisings provides us with an historical framing of the necessary de-linking that is part of decolonial praxis. Drawing on historical

indigenous uprisings, helps envision social, historical, and economic alternatives to the neoliberal fascist-supremacy that we see today.

The continued fight from dependence toward independence

With the Independence Period, decolonial-Hispanophone curriculum understands the historical dialectic arc of mestizx ascendance and vindication as always incomplete that requires continued intellectual work and projects for the future. We understand that Latin American independence movements had in their very foundations the social, historical, and economic contradiction of a governmental, Europeanized, Spanish, criollx, and White minority. As much before as in the present-day, this contradiction of a governmental minority has degraded the Latin American social contract and made political promises of the elite into a cruel joke. Because of these past and present-day contradictions, we understand that the fight for independence is urgent, as much then as it is now.

Historically, this minority lived on the backs of mestizx and indigenous masses with special reference to mestizx illegitimacy-bastardy (Enríquez Molina, 1906; Fuentes, 1962/1992; Paz, 1950/1987; Picón Salas, 1944/1994). Within these decolonial-Hispanophone resources, we recognize the revolutionaries' intellectual production as always partial, problematic, and contradictory as they advanced the cause of independence. At the same time, we repudiate the occidentalist, Spanish, criollxs, royalists, and other traitors to the people who worked to block the historical mestizx identities of independence and instead wished for a return to Europeanized and criollx social structures and thinking that protected their privileges.

Key in the case of Latin America, we recognize that the assumed "Independence Period of Latin America" was not a brief period of a single revolutionary war like the case of the US in North America but rather an historical-social process with relevance to present-day coloniality. Latin American independence is still coming and it has lasted two centuries of revolts, uprisings, and counter-revolutions. While Latin American countries became "independent," the specter of Yankee and European imperialism continued with the new faces of coloniality. Between the particular and contradictory instances that we can represent inside decolonial-Hispanophone curriculum, we very briefly emphasize the intellectual production of Simón Bolívar, Jose Martí, Manuel González Prada, and Andrés Enríquez Molina as exemplary of decolonial-Hispanophone curriculum.

Anticipated in the curriculum offered by his teacher Simón Rodríguez and the action of other revolutionaries, Bolívar (1815/1997) understood the historical process of governance as distinct from European or Anglo Saxon models when he emphasized "the difficulty of prophesizing the natural type of government that should be adopted" (p. 92). Demonstrating similar thinking, Martí (1891/1972) emphasized an independent Latin American politics that warned against the imperialist "giant who measured seven leagues in his boots" (p. 17), and he also underscored that "good government in the Americas is not made by the one who knows how to govern in Germany or France, but rather, one who understands what elements make up his own country" (p. 19). Resonant with present-day indigenous circumstances, González Prada (1895/1997) recognized the historical conditions of the proletarian, diverse, racialized indigenous populations in writing "one shouldn't preach humility and resignation to the indigenous, but rather pride and rebellion" (p. 166).

These four thinkers referenced in this section are representatives of decolonial-Hispanophone curriculum because they advanced the same turn of consciousness that begins to emphasize the importance of a Latin American cosmovision, both regional and transnational. Before this oppressed, historical, and material reality, these four thinkers begin to elaborate a social-political vision that served as primary resources for critical-Marxian



intellectuals of the 20th century such as José Carlos Mariátegui (1928/2007), Domitila Barrios de Chungara (1978), and Subcomandante Marcos (2001) of our time.

If we understand the Mexican Revolution as a second war for independence, the mestizx-indigenous thinking of Andres Molina Enríquez is emblematic of the four thinkers. Molina Enríquez provided a trajectory that recognized the Revolution as the material expression of the mestizx, brown, indigenous, and Black masses. Studied notably by Agustín Basave Benítez, the thinking of Molina Enríquez is fundamental to the Mexican Revolution. Student in the Scientific and Literary Institute of Toluca founded by Ignacio Ramirez (“el Nigromante”) in 1846, Molina Enríquez advanced critical and redistributive liberalism that founded the mestizx-indigenous turn of consciousness in both rural and metropolitan areas.

Molinista intellectual production served to advance the need for the Mexican Revolution as the incomplete historical social justice trajectory that later brought about Agrarian Reform and Cardenista unionism after the Revolution. After having served in numerous governmental positions in post-Revolutionary administrations, the same Molina Enríquez woke up thirty years later to declare that the Revolution he helped create had failed. Molina Enríquez makes direct reference to Spanish-criollx coloniality and White supremacy that impeded the Revolution for which he had fought. Molina Enríquez (1936) emphasized:

The Revolution has not arrived at its end, because the Indians and Indian-mestizos...have not yet made certain their freedom from the apparent “superiority” and the perverse political action of the Spanish, of the criollos, and the criollos-mestizos. (p. 77)

Molina notes the cul-de-sacs and labyrinths in the liberation of the oppressed that are amply studied by anti- and decolonial intellectuals such as Freire (1970/1998) and Fanon (1952/1967). These intellectuals focus on defending the mind of the oppressed from the oppressor and, also, they understand that the best weapon of the oppressor is the minds of the oppressed working with complicity on their own oppression.

Key to the mestizx-indigenous thinking of Molina Enríquez is to follow mestizaje’s critical-historical direction and deny the doctrinal-hegemonic version that know is co-opted in official national histories. Specifically, it is necessary that we follow the social-justice, critical, transformative, and re-distributive directions of historical mestizaje (e.g. Anzaldúa, 1987; Coronil, 1998; Rivera Cusicanqui, 2012) to reorganize national and international mass-movements. Following these Molinista trajectories also supported by Bolívar, Martí, González Prada, and other critical intellectuals, the archive of decolonial-Hispanophone curriculum from the independence period remains relevant to the South-South cosmopolite dialogue. This independent thought remains relevant because it is here that we find historicized, critical-decolonial, transformative, and redistributive understandings on a massive revolutionary scale that we emphasize in the final subsection on communality/pluriversality.

Which concepts emerge from the preliminary sketch?

In this section, we present three historicized concepts that emerged from the preliminary sketch. These three concepts reflect and, at the same time, should inform the use of and further research on the intellectual content from the preliminary sketch. These three concepts are: (a) the historicity of decolonial thought, (b) mestizx conceptualization, and (c) communality/pluriversality. For each concept, we provide an example of curricular-pedagogical practice from Jim or Mica.



The historicity of decolonial thought

The historicity of decolonial thought is the first historicized concept that should found our non-derived, decolonial, South-South, cosmopolite dialogue. Importantly, our sketch requires us to recognize that decolonial-Hispanophone thought has a long and critical trajectory based on Latin American questions.

Far from being a new and abstract paradigm from the social sciences of the Global North, decolonial-Hispanophone curriculum emerges from a long tradition of decolonial thought in Latin America. Belonging to these traditions, decolonial-Hispanophone curriculum represents a series of historicized, situated, and contextualized practices in specific geo-regions of Latin America that are tied to historical moments and movements. *Not* pertaining to another “innovation” imported from cultural studies, critical legal studies, or the reconceptualization of curriculum from the Global North, decolonial-Hispanophone curriculum moves us away from so called “theoretical frames” of dominant social science production of US universities.

Emphatically, we have not developed the sketch of decolonial-Hispanophone curriculum as isolated academics. To the contrary, our intentions are to better historicize decolonial thought of Latin America. Particularly, we emphasize the recent historicizing directions of Walsh (2013), Mignolo and Walsh (2018), and Rivera Cusicanqui (1984/2010) in recognizing that decolonial thinking preceded the work of the modernity-colonality group of the 90s. We advance decolonial-Hispanophone curriculum because continued decolonial work in Latin America requires the re-interpretation of historical resources, fundamental ideas, and epistemic and axiological traditions.

In order to better theorize its historicity, we advance decolonial-Hispanophone curriculum *not* as another critical counter-narrative (e.g., Acuña, 1972; Galeano, 1971/2003; Giroux, 1992; Lyotard, 1979; Zinn, 1980/2003). Although we identify counternarratives as useful ideological resources, nonetheless, we recognize that these reflect and reproduce hegemonic narratives, especially hegemonic notions of linear time.

Instead of proposing more counter-narratives, we understand decolonial-Hispanophone curriculum in ways similar to indigenous calendars for which the Aztec-Nahuatl calendar is emblematic. Rather than assuming progressive-linear time, the Aztec-Nahuatl assumes cyclical and dynamic wheels-within-wheels that can interrupt, change, destroy, or renew epochs. In the present-day, dominant and hegemonic notions of progress and historical development have to be destroyed. Contrasting with those, we need concepts of cycles, rupture, generation, and renovation to begin the shared work of social-historical reconstruction.

Within this historical trajectory, decolonial-Hispanophone curriculum has presented other alternatives that have been taken advantage of (or lost) in the fight for historical, social, economic, and political self-determination across geo-regions. We emphasize that the most important aspect of decolonial-Hispanophone curriculum, what we understand to be historical cycles or “Aztec suns,” is that decolonial radicalism does not present itself as a doctrine or set of knowledges passed down from Anglo Saxon, French, or German authorities, but rather, that decolonial thinking and work emerges from particular Latin American geo-regions.

Specifically, Subcomandante Marcos (2001) informs our project because he locates our contexts within the historical reality of Latin America, within indigenous and mestizx thinking, and inside an historical cycle that continues:

But it occurs to me now that the most important aspect of dreaming in Reality is knowing what is coming to an end, what is continuing, and overall what was started since the violence of the Conquest...180 years after the appearance of Bolívar and Manuelita Sáenz, 85 years after the prophecy of the Flores Magón brothers, 80 years after Emiliano Zapata, 30 years after the dream of Che, dreaming of the revelation of all true and honest Americans. ...The great oppressor powers have not found the weapon that destroys dreams. (p. 108)

The truth is that systems of domination and exploitation have not attained the ability to annihilate the enzyme of utopia from human cognition. Dreams were never the property of a determined supremacist, occidentalist, criollo, or Anglo Saxon genealogy.

In research conducted by Jim and his colleagues, the historicity of decolonial thought is present in his graduate teaching on curriculum leadership. Jim works in a state university in the border region of the Southwest of the US, Atzlán. Instead of giving the standard course “Social Foundations of Curriculum,” Jim has developed the course “Cultural and Linguistic Sustainability in Transnational Contexts.” From engagement in this course, curriculum leaders study natural and social history of their region omitted in public schools and universities. Among other readings, curriculum leaders study texts by regional intellectuals including Hinojosa (1977), Paredes (1976), and Anzaldúa (1987). In this way, curriculum leaders develop a geo-regional perspective of the curricular resources tied to the national ethnic studies curriculum movement (Sleeter & Zavala, 2020). Through these regional curriculum leaders, Jim and his colleagues influence a geo-regional understanding of curriculum, and additionally, this group is collaborating with a local museum in order to finance the translation of historical regional documents dedicated to teachers’ critical scholarship.

Mestizx conceptualization

Mestizx conceptualization is the second historicized concept that should found our non-derived, decolonial, South-South, cosmopolite dialogue. Decolonial-Hispanophone curriculum begins with the recognition that historical mestizaje is basic and fundamental to Latin American contributions to the world archive. By and large ignored or looked down on in Europe and the US, historical mestizaje is key and principal to decolonial-Hispanophone curriculum’s historicized, South-South dialogue. Simply stated, mestizaje provides primary materials of the Latin American archive, and we insist that the Latin American archive cannot simply be denied or wished away with Global North social science fads. Far from being a “new” critical or post-critical discourse, historical mestizaje is fundamental to Latin American intellectual traditions.

Nonetheless, decolonial Hispanophone curriculum does not begin with the celebrationist habits typical of Latin American intellectuals of previous epochs, but rather, we begin with an understanding that historical mestizaje is problematic. Emergent in the mestizaje archive, we take up the idea of mestizx conceptualization as a rejection of hegemonic-doctrinal mestizaje. In this rejection, mestizx conceptualization seeks a restoration of historical mestizaje’s Molinista, social-justice, critical, transformative, and redistributive capacities (Anzaldúa, 1987; Coronil, 1998; Molina Enríquez, 1938; Rivera Cusicanqui, 2012).

Differing from hegemonic-doctrinal mestizaje, mestizx conceptualization does not refer to the transmission of an historical doctrine. In contrast, mestizx conceptualization provides for located, open-ended, hybridized, generative, curricular-pedagogical interactions that are not tied to European or Anglo Saxon orthodoxies. This heterogenous discord with



orthodoxies even extends to emergent orthodoxies within decolonial thinking in the social sciences. For this reason, *mestizx* conceptualization implies the use of shared linguistic-conceptual yet hybridized capacities to read and modify neoliberal, individualist reality in subversive, interpellative, and collective ways. This reading implies making coloniality visible, studying its forms of production and re-production, and in this way, also conceptualizing and verbalizing subversive alternatives. Through educative institutions, these verbalized and conceptualized alternatives allow for a geo-regional yet simultaneous global message of hope.

If we recognize that reality is made of words and concepts, *mestizx* conceptualization recognizes the force of subverting, appropriating, re-signifying, and influencing historical directions through transcultural, negotiated, historicized, unfinished, and *mestizx* means. Therefore, it is necessary to work through new words, concepts, ideas; it is necessary to create a new language for teacher education and education writ large, a language that helps us think differently, in alternative ways, and when necessary, speak through our silence. For this work, we need to advance *mestizx* conceptualization in the reading of multiple texts and historical realities, as we hoped to perform in our preliminary sketch of decolonial-Hispanophone curriculum.

This is not easy work if we understand that decolonial-Hispanophone curriculum takes place within the language and institutions that are historically colonial and supremacist. Nonetheless, with Freire (1970/1998, 1992/2002) and other sources of independent decolonial thinking (e.g., Anzaldúa, 1987; Martí, 1891/1972; Mignolo y Walsh, 2018; Neruda, 1950/1985; Paz, 1950/1987, Picón Salas, 1944/1994; Rivera Cusicanqui, 1984/2010, 2012; Walsh, 2013), we understand that *mestizx* conceptualization represents, not a small scale or small-minded movement of academics so that a few have “good careers,” but rather, we understand *mestizx* conceptualization as a *social-psychic-linguistic-historical-esthetic-conceptual* intervention that modifies reality. This intervention has to provoke a decolonial conscientization for the educator-educand.

Freire (1992/2002) provides us with the foundations of *mestizx* conceptualization that we elaborate in decolonial-Hispanophone curriculum:

Therefore, teaching and learning represent moments inside great historical processes—those of knowing, thinking, and recognizing. The educands recognize themselves as such by coming to know objects and discovering that they themselves are capable of signifying, and at the same time identifying themselves as signified. This is the way that educands makes themselves signifiers in the process. (pp. 125-126)

Following the thinking of Freire, we come to the work of conscientization as a complex process, which today can emerge, not only through “literacy” as Freire taught us. Rather, this process requires a creative-and-open, decolonial, geo-regional, but simultaneous, global readings of historical reality. Through decolonial means, we can begin to understand this historical process of conscientization through the term *mestizx conceptualization*, and in this way, we both *de-universalize* Freire’s humanisms and also link him to racialized, decolonial, Latin American epistemologies.

In the research conducted by Jim and his colleagues, *mestiza* conceptualization is present in his graduate teaching. Again, working with curriculum leaders from the region, Jim provides critical, feminist, poststructuralist, and decolonial texts to his students. In the process of dialogue, they also study the notion of historical *mestizaje* in various texts (Alonzo, 2020; Saavedra and Nymark, 2008) with a particular focus on Anzaldúa (1987). In dialogues, Chicana feminist students achieve the ability to reflect critically, not only about regional



oppression of class and race, but they also question the patriarchal reality of their lives as daughters and teachers. In these reflections, they share the goal of bringing this critical perspective to their teaching in public schools. Several of these students develop critical research as part of their studies, and these studies impact public schools and their students.

Communality/pluriversality

Communality/pluriversality is the third historicized concept that should found our non-derived, decolonial, South-South, cosmopolite dialogue. In speaking of communality/pluriversality, we retake geo-regional forms of communal organization that have been erased from curricular-pedagogical dialogue by the so-called “global competencies.”

For those of us who have lived close to and participated in curricular-pedagogical communal learning, we can notice the need to link the commons (related to inheritance, the use and conservation of natural resources), the cultural (related to tradition, language, values, and cosmovisions), and local economics (related to the political-educative project, collective learning). In linking the commons, the cultural, and the economic, we find these elements necessary to recover the communal force that can provide particular empowerment, sources of memory, and identity. In this way, communality/pluriversality represents a return to active social-historical re-signification. This re-signification allows us to take control of daily sense-making and re-connect with geo-regional memory.

In addition to the communal and geo-regional, communality/pluriversality emphasizes the analysis of world systems (Grosfoguel, 2010; Mignolo, 2008, 2009; Wallerstein, 1991/2007, 2004). Taking world systems into account, communality/pluriversality cannot only advance via notions of isolated, geo-regional de-linking as it appears in some philosophical (Mignolo, 2008, 2009) or anthropological studies (Aquino Moreschi, 2013; Díaz Gómez, 2004; Luna Martínez, 2004). In contrast, communality/pluriversality functions through a dialectic that works with local geo-regional resources (the common, the cultural, and the economic) *and* links to transnational communities across the Americas.

Overall, communality/pluriversality forms a network that can combat and resist neoliberal and global forces (Sousa Santos, 2007, 2009; Sousa Santos, Nunes, Meneses, 2007; Marcos, 2001; Mignolo, 2008). In order to understand the limits of 20th century state socialism, communality/pluriversality advances a common regional network of understanding, but at the same time, represents:

The collective aspiration of oppressed groups to organize their resistance and consolidate their political coalitions to the same scale as those leveraged by the victimizing oppressors. Of course, this scale is global, anti-hegemonic and global. (Sousa Santos, 2007, p. 10)

Having these aspirations, communality/pluriversality provides a dialectic that recognizes the geo-regional resources mentioned before, but simultaneously, forges connections with transcultural resistant currents in order to be integrated into a decolonial movement. Sousa Santos (2007, 2009) has described communality/pluriversality as insurgent cosmopolitanism (Andreotti, 2011, 2015; Andreotti et al. 2018; Jupp, 2013a, 2013b, Jupp, Calderón Berumen, O’Donald, 2017; Paraskeva, 2011, 2016, 2020). This insurgent cosmopolitanism advances a local resistant network but, at the same time, an anti-hegemonic global one.

In research conducted by Mica and her colleagues, communality/pluriversality is present in her work with Hñähñu communities in Mexico. In community workshops, adult Hñähñu students along with their children elaborate on the reconstruction of collective social-historical, geographic, political, and economic knowledges. In this way, cultural continuation



is provided through vital social y educational space within communities. Through the means of language, this is possible given the circumstances and mechanisms of orality that provide meaning and signification in their community. Through the Freirean method of dialogue, the Hñähñu leverage the workshops for the defense of their community from the intrusions of global culture, mass communication networks, mass migrations to and returns from the Global North, and the capitalist destruction of their language and culture as well as their ecological environment.

The invitation to a South-South Dialogue

We finish our essay with an invitation to a South-South, decolonial, non-derived, and cosmopolite dialogue. In summarizing our preliminary sketch, in the first section we argued that the problem of curricular-pedagogical work must be situated within the arc of the historical colonies and present-day coloniality. Planting our work this way, we emphasized the need for a re-evaluation of historical resources that we leverage to conceptualize the work we do as educators-activists. Following this notion of re-evaluation, in the second section we provided a preliminary sketch of intellectual resources that we called decolonial-Hispanophone curriculum. We provided our sketch, *not* to indicate that the resources we signaled are the only valuable *great books*. To the contrary, we provided the preliminary sketch to emphasize the need for a Latin American historical horizon based on indigenous, mestizx, brown, and Black resources to found and suggest future, more specific research, destined to local-particular and transnationally informed projects. After the sketch, in the penultimate section, we presented three historicized concepts that reflect and simultaneously inform the dialogue we would propose to start: the historicity of decolonial thought, mestizx conceptualization, and communality/pluriversality. In the trajectory of the essay, we emphasized that decolonial-Hispanophone curriculum provides a geo-regional and transnational dialectic to resist global capitalism.

To conclude our work here, we consider the historical reality that presently stalks us. It is necessary to identify that ignoring present-day racialized coloniality is an act of intellectual bad faith, similar to blocking out the sun to light a candle. We present the rest of the essay, including our sketch and the three historicized concepts, with an expressed subjunctive and dialogical tone, knowing that we do not have all the necessary answers; therefore, at the end of our essay, we avoid offering the typical conclusions or the ever-present “implications” of the Anglophone academic essay. In contrast, we finish our essay by identifying a start, a start of a subjunctive dialogue, a South-South and cosmopolite dialogue, one which emphasizes geo-regional and decolonial intellectual resources to better inform our praxis with educands, teachers and teacher educators, or educator-activists.

Notes

¹ jcjupp@gmail.com

²MaGDa57Moon@gmail.com

³freycacb@gmail.com

⁴ carolineahesse@gmail.com

⁵ As a geo-political limit, we take on the territories that are today called “the Americas.” Importantly, for the trajectory of our essay, we use the terms “the Americas,” “Latin America,” and “Latin American” knowing that



these are invented historical constructions that are tied to historical colonies and to present-day coloniality. Regarding the terms Latin America and the Americas, we refer to the territories previously colonized by Spain. Nonetheless—very conscious of these contradictions, we use these terms not to support nationalities and borders of inequality. In contrast, we use these terms in *de*-bordering, post-national, contingent, geo-regional, and critical-utopian ways. And—in the case of North America—we use “the Americas,” “Latin America,” and “Latin American” with the understanding of the diasporic re-territorialization of the US by indigenous and mestizx people of the Global South in the North. With the use of terms, we advance the paradoxical use of or *re*-signification of the term instead of simply calling things by another name. Via this re-signification (explained in the preliminary sketch), this paradoxical use emphasizes *de*-bordering understandings that are similar in terms such as “Atzlán,” “Anáhuac,” “Abya Yala,” or “Turtle Island.”

⁶ Jim Jupp has taught classes for 25 years in the US Southwest and South. For eighteen years, he worked as a teacher of immigrant, Mexican, and indigenous students in the public schools of the US Southwest. During this time, he worked as a rural and later urban teacher with notions of critical and culturally relevant curriculum and pedagogy. In the last decade, he has taught educational foundations and applied linguistics in two universities in the US South. Presently, Jim is Professor and Chair of the Department of Teaching and Learning at the University of Texas, Rio Grande Valley. In his present role, he advances critical and sustainable notions of teacher education in the massive production of Chicanx and bilingual teachers.

Mica González Delgado presently works as a professor in the area of Pedagogical Interventions Mexican National Autonomous University, Actalán, teaching classes for the Pedagogical Studies program. Mica has worked as an activist and educator for twenty years in different contexts and projects, and her research is dedicated to several axes of investigation including environmental education in rural areas, the diagnosis of the causes of social violence, and indigenous-environmental activism in the state of Hidalgo, Mexico.

Freyca Calderón Berumen presently works as a professor in the college of education at Pennsylvania State University, Altoona. Her research focuses on multicultural education and teaching English as a second language. Besides having studied her undergraduate and master’s degrees in Mexico, she also worked as a primary and secondary teacher in Mexico for a decade. Ten years ago, she emigrated to the US to continue studying, where she earned another masters and also her doctorate in education at a university in the US Southwest where she concurrently taught both women’s studies and education classes. Her most recent research focuses on the use of the literary genre “testimonio” in the conscientization of Latin American immigrant mothers in US contexts.

Caroline Hesse has been a teacher for fourteen years, with teaching experience in primary and secondary schools in the US Midwest and Southwest. Caroline has taught Spanish and English as foreign languages, Spanish for Spanish speakers, and later different school subjects in bilingual double immersion programs. Additionally, she has taught pedagogy and linguistics classes in a night program to certify bilingual teachers. Presently, she is a teacher in a double immersion elementary school (Spanish-English) in the US Southeast, and she is studying her doctorate in curriculum and instruction.

⁷ The matrix of power es central to decolonial thought. The matrix of power unites historical questions of race, gender, class, sexuality, ability, and other differences into a single analytic. Important to the concept of the matrix of power es the historical tie-in with different types of exploitation with White, European supremacy in its colonial relations.

⁸Importantly, our preliminary sketch extends but differs from previous projects. Differing from universalizing Greek cosmopolitanism, we developed our preliminary sketch of decolonial-Hispanophone curriculum in re-capacitating the subaltern cosmopolite sensibilities in Latin American intellectual traditions (e.g., Bolívar, 1815/1997; Henríquez Ureña, 1945, 1947/1973; Jupp, 2013a, 2013b; Jupp, Calderón Berumen, O’Donald, 2017; Marcos, 1998/2012, 2001; Martí, 1891/1972; Neruda, 1950/1985; Paz, 1950/1987, Picón Salas, 1944/1994). Differing from Europeanizing critical theory and pedagogy of various Marxian, Frankfurt-psychoanalytic, Gramscian-cultural, and Freirean-dialogic traditions, our preliminary sketch begins with an understanding that Europeanizing theories cannot simply “implemented” through distant prosthesis in the Global South, but rather, that theories need to be developed and thought through within geo-regional contexts. Differing from multicultural education, our preliminary sketch distances itself from the historical myopias and instances of multiculturalism tied expressly or inherently to US intellectual habits of the US 1960s, and in place of advancing those habits, we look to re-constituted understandings of Latin American decolonial archives. Differing from the “internationalization of curriculum,” we distance our dialogue from the instances of curriculum internationalization that serve to re-organize hegemonic relations with the Global North as monolithic “curriculum history” as much as in institutional material relations established in economies of academic prestige.

To conclude this note, our relationship with the work of Adrianna Puiggrós and APPEAL is complicated. Differing from the recent Latin Americanisms of Puiggrós (1997, 2004) and APPEAL (2006, 2013), we advance broader intentions of their transcultural vision, but we reject the nineteenth century tropes of their Deweyan social-democratic vision of socially productive knowledges.



References

- Acuña, R. (1972). *Occupied America: The Chicano's struggle toward liberation*. New York, NY: Canfield Press.
- Alonzo, A. (2020, Junio). La historia del Valle de Rio Bravo. Invited presentation for EDCI 8338 given July 6th 2020.
- Amin, S. (2008). *The world we wish to see*. New York, NY: Monthly Review Press.
- Andreotti, V. (2011). Toward decoloniality and diversity in global citizenship education. *Globalisation, Societies, and Education*, 9, 381-397.
- Andreotti, V. (2015, March). Ethics, interdependence, and global change. Paper presented at the ICP Convention in Helsinki, Finland.
- Andreotti, V. et al. (2018). Mobilizing different conversations about global justice in education: Toward an alternative future in uncertain times. *Policy and Practice: A Development Education Review*, 26, 9-41.
- Anzaldúa, G. (1987). *Borderlands: la frontera* (Vol. 3). San Francisco: Aunt Lute.
- Aquino Moreschi, A. (2013). La comunalidad como epistemología del Sur. Aportes y retos. *Cuadernos del Sur: Revista de ciencias sociales*, 34, 7-19.
- Barrios de Chúngara, D. & Viezzer, M. (1978). *Let me speak! Testimony of a woman in the Bolivian mines* (Trans. V. Ortiz). New York, NY: Monthly Review Press.
- Basave Benítez, A. (2002). *México Mestizo: Análisis del nacionalismo mexicano en torno a la mestizofilia de Andrés Molina Enríquez* (2nd ed.). Ciudad de México, México: Fondo de Cultura Económica. (Obra original publicada 1992)
- Bolívar, S. (1997). Carta de Jamaica. In G. M. Varona-Lacey (Ed.), *Introducción a la literatura hispanoamericana: De la Conquista al siglo XX* (pp. 87-100). New York, NY: National Textbook Company. (Obra original publicada 1815)
- Caso, A. (2014). *El pueblo del sol*. Ciudad de México, México: Fondo de Cultura Económica. (Obra original publicada 1953)
- 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). Ciudad de México, México: Editorial Porrúa.
- De Alva Ixtlilxóchitl, F. (1891). *Obras históricas de Don Fernando de Alva Ixtlilxóchitl* (Notas por Alfredo Chavero). Ciudad de México, México: Oficina de Fomento (Obra original escrita 1608)
- De Ercilla y Zúñiga, A. (1997). Selección de *la Aruacana*. In G. M. Varona-Lacey (Ed.), *Introducción a la literatura Hispano-Americana: De la conquista al siglo XX* (pp. 42-49). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company. (Obra original publicada 1569)
- De Landa, D. (1978). *Yucatan before and after the Conquest* (Trans. W. Gates). London, England: Dover. (Obra original publicada 1566)
- De las Casas, B. (2011). *Brevísima relación de la destrucción de las Indias*. Madrid, España: Editorial Catedra. (Obra original publicada 1552)
- De la Vega, G. (1967). *Comentarios reales*. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Colección Austral. (Obra original publicada 1590)
- Delgado Bernal, D. (1998). Using a Chicana feminist epistemology in educational research. *Harvard Educational Review*, 68, 555-583.
- Díaz del Castillo, B. (1992). *Historia verdadera de la conquista de la Nueva España* (15th ed.). México, Distrito Federal: Editorial Porrúa, S.A. (Obra original publicada 1632)



- Díaz Gómez, F. (2004). Comunalidad y comunidad. In (Eds.), *Antropología sobre cultura popular e indígena: Lecturas del seminario: Diálogos en acción, segunda etapa* (pp. 365-373). México, D. F.: Consejo Nacional para la Cultura y las Artes (CONACULTA).
- Díaz Lopez, K. M. & Osuna Lever, C. (2016). Las evaluaciones estandarizadas del aprendizaje y la mejora de la calidad educativa. *Temas de Educación*, 22, 131-146.
- Duverger, C. (1996). *La conversión de los indios de Nueva España*. Ciudad de México, México: Fondo de Cultura Económica. (Obra original publicada 1987)
- Duverger, C. (2007). *El primer mestizaje: La clave para entender el pasado de mesoamericano*. Ciudad de México, México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
- Dussel, E. (2005). 13 Transmodernidad e interculturalidad (Interpretación desde la filosofía de la liberación). <http://www.afyl.org/transmodernidadeinterculturalidad.pdf> . (Levantado enero 2013)
- Dussel, E. (2011). *Filosofía de la liberación*. Ciudad de México, México Fondo de Cultura Económica. (Obra original publicada 1977)
- Fanon, F. (1967). *Black skin, white masks*. New York, NY: Grove Press. (Original work published 1952)
- Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogía del oprimido*. Ciudad de México, México: Siglo Veintiuno Editores. (Obra original publicada 1970)
- Freire, P. (2002). *Pedagogy of hope*. New York, NY: Continuum. (Original work published 1992)
- Fuentes, C. (1992). *La muerte de Artemio Cruz*. Ciudad de México, México: Fondo de Cultura Económica. (Obra original publicada in 1962)
- Garibay, A. M. (2007). *Historia de la literatura Náhuatl*. Ciudad de México, México: Editorial Porrúa. (Original work published 1954)
- Galeano, E. (2008). *Las venas abiertas de Latinoamérica*. Ciudad de México, México: Siglo XXI Editores. (Obra original publicada 1971)
- Gill, S. (1986). American hegemony: Its limits and prospects in the Reagan Era. *Journal of International Studies* 15(3), 311-336.
- Gill, S. (1995). Globalization, market civilization, and disciplinary neoliberalism. *Journal of International Studies* 24(3), 399-423.
- Gill, S. (2003, January). Gramsci, modernity, and globalization. *International Gramsci Society Online Article*. http://www.internationalgramscisociety.org/resources/online_articles/articles/gill01.shtml (Retrieved June 2013)
- Giroux, H. (1992). *Border crossings: Cultural workers and the politics of education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- González, R. (1967). *Yo soy Joaquín/I am Joaquín*. New York, NY: Bantam.
- González Delgado, M. (2009, octubre). La problematización como estrategia didáctica para la intervención profesional pedagógica. Ponencia II Coloquio de Investigación educativa UIM FES Acatlán.
- González Delgado, M. (2012). Intervención pedagógica. Material de apoyo didáctico a la asignatura Fundamentos de Intervención Pedagógica Profesional FES Acatlán UNAM.
- González Delgado, M. (2014). ¿La construcción del objeto de intervención? Material inédito para la asignatura de intervención pedagógica profesional FES Acatlán UNAM.

- González Prada, M. (1997). La educación del indio. In G. M. Varona-Lacey (Ed.), *Introducción a la literatura Hispano-Americana: De la conquista al siglo XX* (pp. 162-167). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.
- Graham, R. (Ed.) (1990). *The idea of race in Latin America*. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press.
- Grosfoguel, R. (2011). Decolonizing post-colonial studies and paradigms of political economy. *Transmodernity, 1*, 1-32.
- Hall, S. (2004). Gramsci's relevance for the study of race and ethnicity. In D. Moreley & K.H. Chen (Eds.), *Stuart Hall: Critical dialogues in cultural studies* (pp. 411-440). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hinojosa, R. (1977). *Generaciones y semblanzas*. Berkeley, CA: Editorial Justa.
- Icazbalceta, J. (1866). *Colección de documentos para la historia mexicana, Tomos uno y dos*. México, DF: Antigua Librería, Portal de Augustinos No. 3.
- Internacional de la Educación para América Latina [IEAL]. (2015). La estandarización de la evaluación: Las pruebas nacionales e internacionales, ¿medición o evaluación? UEN de Noruega: División Latinoamerica. CCC Publishing <https://ei-ie-al.org/sites/default/files/docs/evaluacion.pdf>
- Jaramillo, N. & McLaren, P. (2008). Rethinking critical pedagogy: Socialismo nepantla and the spectre of Che. In N. Denzin, Y. Lincoln, & L. T. Smith (Eds.), *The handbook of critical and indigenous methodologies* (pp. 191-215). London England: Sage Publishing.
- Jupp, J. C. (2013a). Toward Cosmopolitan Sensibilities in US Curriculum Studies: A Synoptic Rendering of the Franciscan Tradition in Mexico. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 29*, 48-71.
- Jupp, J. C. (2013b). *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*, 54-72.
- Jupp, J. C. (2017). Special issue: An engaged discussion organized around João M. Paraskeva's recent books. *Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies, 12*(1), 1-174.
- Jupp, J. C.; Calderón, F.; O'Donald, K. (2017). Advancing testimonio in educational research: A synoptic rendering. *The Journal of Latinos in Education, 17*, 18-37.
- Kanellos, N. (2002). An overview of Hispanic literature of the United States. In N. Kanellos (Ed.), *Herencia* (pp. 1-32). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Lafaye, J. (1974/2002). El indio: problema espiritual (pp. 71-95). *Quetzalcoatl y Guadalupe: La formación de la consciencia nacional*. Ciudad de México, México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- León Portilla, M. (1995). *Los antiguos mexicanos*. Ciudad de México, México: Fondo de Cultura Económica. (Obra original publicada 1961)
- Liotard, J. F. (1979). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge*. Minneapolis, MN: The University of Minnesota Press.
- Maldonado-Torres, N. (2007). Sobre la colonialidad del ser: Contribuciones al desarrollo de un concepto. In S. Casto-Gomez y R. Grosfoguel (Eds.), *El giro decolonial: Reflexiones para una diversidad epistémica más allá del capitalismo global* (pp. 127-167). Bogotá, Colombia: LESCO Pensar Siglo del Hombre Editores.
- Marcos, S. (2001). *Nuestra arma es nuestra palabra: Escritos selectos*. New York, NY: Siete Cuentos Editorial.

- Mariátegui, J. C. (2007). *Siete ensayos de interpretación de la realidad peruana*. Lima, Perú: Biblioteca Ayacucho. (Obra original publicada 1928)
- Martí, J. (1972). *Nuestra América*. In *Antología José Martí*. Madrid, España: Biblioteca General Salvat. (Obra original publicada 1891)
- Martínez, E. (1991). *500 years of Chicano history/500 años del pueblo Chicano*. Albuquerque, NM: SWOP.
- Martínez Luna, J. (2004). Comunalidad y desarrollo. In (Eds.), *Antropología sobre cultura popular e indígena: Lecturas del seminario: Diálogos en acción, segunda etapa* (pp. 335-354). México, D. F.: Consejo Nacional para la Cultura y las Artes (CONACULTA).
- Menchú, R. & Burgos, E. (1985). *Me Llamo Rigoberta Menchú y así me nació la consciencia*. Ciudad de México, México: Siglo Veintiuno Editores.
- Motolinía, T. de (2001). *Historia de los indios de la Nueva España*. Mexico, DF: Porrúa. (Obra original publicada 1866)
- Mignolo, W. D. (2008). Hermenéutica de la democracia: El pensamiento de los límites y la diferencia colonial. *Tabla Rasa*, 9, 39-60.
- Mignolo, W. D. (2009). Epistemic disobedience, independent thought, and decolonial freedom. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 26(7-8), 159-181.
- Mignolo, W. D.; Guiliiano, F.; & Berisso, D. (2014). Educación y decolonialidad: Aprender a desaprender para poder re-aprender. *Revista del Instituto de Investigaciones en Ciencias de la Educación*, 35, 61-71.
- Mignolo, W. D. & Walsh, C. E. (2018). *On decoloniality: Concepts, analytics, praxis*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Molina Enríquez, A. (1906). *La reforma y Juárez*. Ciudad de México, México: Tipografía de la viuda de Francisco Díaz de León.
- Molina Enríquez, A. (1909). *Los grandes problemas nacionales*. Ciudad de México, México: Imprenta de A. Carranza e Hijos.
- Molina Enríquez, A. (1938). *La reforma agraria*. Ciudad de México, México: Imprenta de A. Carranza e Hijos.
- Neruda, P. (1997). Canto general. In R. Alberti (Ed.), *Pablo Neruda: Antología poética* (4a Edición). Madrid: Espasa Calpe, S.A. (Work originally published 1950)
- Paraskeva, J. M. (2011). *Conflicts in curriculum theory: Challenging hegemonic epistemologies*. New York, NY: Palgrave.
- Paraskeva, J. M. (2015, mayo). *Desterritorializar: Hacia una teoría curricular itinerante*. Ponencia en Desafíos curriculares pedagógicos en la formación de profesores. Minho Portugal.
- Paraskeva, J. M. (2016). *Curriculum epistemicide: Toward an itinerant curriculum theory*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Paraskeva, J. M. (2017). Itinerant curriculum theory revisited on a non-theoricide towards the canonicide: Addressing the “curriculum involution”. *Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies*, 12(1), 1-43.
- Paraskeva, J. M. (2018). Against the scandal: Itinerant curriculum theory as subaltern momentum. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 18, 128-143.
- Paraskeva, J. M. (2020). *Curriculum and the generation of utopia: Interrogating the current state of critical curriculum theory*. Routledge: New York, NY.
- Paredes, A. (1976). *Cancionero tejano-mexicano/Texas-Mexican Cancionero* Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press.

- Paz, O. (1987). *El laberinto de la soledad*. Ciudad de México, México: Fondo de Cultura Económica. (Obra original publicada 1950)
- Phelan, J. L. (1970). *The millennial kingdom of the Franciscans in the New World*. Berkley, CA: University of California Press.
- Picón Salas, M. (1994). *De le Conquista a la Independencia*. Ciudad de México, México: Fondo de Cultura Económica. (Obra original publicada 1944)
- Poma, F. G. (2013). *Nueva crónica y buen gobierno* (Trans. J. L. Urioste). Ciudad de México, México: Siglo XXI Editores. (Obra original publicada 1615)
- Posas, R. (2012). *Juan Perez Jolote: Biografía de un Tzotzil*. Ciudad de México, México: Fondo de Cultura Económica. (Obra original publicada 1952)
- Puiggrós, A. (2004). Presentación al premio Andrés Bello de memoria y pensamiento Iberoamericano: De Simón Rodríguez a Paulo Freire. <https://catedracomeduc.files.wordpress.com/2013/03/puiggrc3b3s-de-simc3b3n-rodr3adguez-a-paulo-freire1.pdf> (Levantado Enero 2016)
- Quijano, A. (1992). Colonialidad y modernidad/racionalidad. *Perú indígena*, 29(13), 11-20.
- Quijano, A. (2000). Colonialidad del poder, eurocentrismo y América Latina. In E. Lander (Ed.), *La colonialidad del saber: Eurocentrismo y ciencias sociales* (pp. 201-246). Buenos Aires: Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales.
- Ravela, P. (2008). Las evaluaciones que América Latina necesita. *Revista Iberoamericana de Evaluación Educativo 1*, 46-62.
- Recinos, A. (Trans.) (1995). *Popul Vuh: Las antiguas historias del Quiché*. Ciudad de México, México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Ricard, R. (1966). *The spiritual Conquest of Mexico*. Berkley, CA: University of California Press. (Original work published 1933)
- Rivera Cusicanqui, S. (2010). *Oprimidos pero no vencidos* (4ª Ed.). La Paz, Bolivia: Editorial La Mirada Salvaje. (Obra original publicada 1984)
- Rivera Cusicanqui, S. (2012). Reflection on the practices and discourses of decolonization. *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, 11, 95-109.
- Saavedra, C. & Nymark, E. (2008). Borderland-mestizaje feminism: the new tribalism. In Denzin, N. K., Lincoln, Y. S., & Smith, L. T. *Handbook of critical and indigenous methodologies* (pp. 255-276). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Sahagún, B. (2006). *Historia general de las cosas de nueva España*. Ciudad de México, México: Editorial Porrúa (Obra original publicada 1578; obra recirculada 1866)
- Sleeter, C. E. & Zavala, M. (2020). *Transformative ethnic studies in schools: Curriculum, pedagogy, and research*. Teachers College Press, New York, NY.
- Sousa Santos, B. (2007). Human rights as an emancipatory script? Cultural and political conditions. In B. Sousa Santos (Ed.), *Another knowledge is possible: Beyond Northern epistemologies* (pp. 3-40). New York, NY: Verso.
- Sousa Santos, B. (2009). A non-occidental West? Learned ignorance and ecology of knowledge. *Theory, Culture, & Society*, 26, 103-125.
- Sousa Santos, B.; Nunes, J. A.; Meneses, M. P. (2007). Opening up the canon of knowledge and recognition of difference. In B. Sousa Santos (Ed.), *Another knowledge is possible: Beyond northern epistemologies* (pp. xix-lxii). New York, NY: Verso.
- Tezozómoc, H. A. (1994). *Crónicas mexicanas*. Ciudad de México, México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
- Ureña, H. (1973). *Historia de la cultura en al América Hispánica*. Ciudad de México, México: Fondo de Cultura Económica. (Obra original publicada 1947)

-
- Wallerstein, I. (2004). *World systems analysis: An introduction*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Wallerstein, I. (2007). *Geopolítica y cultura*. Barcelona, España: Editorial Kairós. (Obra original publicada 1991)
- Walsh, C. (2008). Interculturalidad, plurinacionalidad, y decolonialidad: Las insurgencias político-epistémicas de refundar el estado. *Tabla Rasa*, 9, 131-152.
- Walsh, C. (2012). “Other” knowledges, “other” critiques: Reflections on the politics of and practices of philosophy and decoloniality in the “Other” America. *Transmodernity: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World*, 1(3), 11-27.
- Walsh C. (2013). Introducción – Lo pedagógico y lo decolonial: Entretejiendo caminos. En C. Walsh (Ed.), *Pedagogías decoloniales: Practicas insurgentes de resistir, (re)existir, y (re)vivir: Tomo I*. Ediciones Abya Yala: Quito, Ecuador
- Zinn, H. (2003). *A people’s history of the United States*. New York, NY: Harper Perennial Classics. (Original work published 1980)

Submitted: December, 20, 2019.

Approved: July, 27, 2020.

