

79 /

# DISCURSOS

PRONUNCIADOS EN EL ACTO DE  
INVESTIDURA DE DOCTOR *HONORIS CAUSA*  
DEL EXCELEN'TÍSIMO SEÑOR

**D. THOMAS S. POPKEWITZ**

PRESENTADO POR

**D. MIGUEL A. PEREYRA-GARCÍA CASTRO**



UNIVERSIDAD DE GRANADA  
MMXV

BIBLIOTECA HOSPITAL REAL  
GRANADA

Señal: \_\_\_\_\_

Estado: \_\_\_\_\_

Autore: \_\_\_\_\_

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21

( )

BIBLIOTECA HOSPITAL REAL  
GRANADA

SEÑAL: \_\_\_\_\_

ESTADO: \_\_\_\_\_

NUMERO: \_\_\_\_\_





# DISCURSOS

PRONUNCIADOS EN EL ACTO DE  
INVESTIDURA DE DOCTOR *HONORIS CAUSA*  
DEL EXCELENTÍSIMO SEÑOR

D. THOMAS S. POPKEWITZ

UNIVERSIDAD DE GRANADA

MMXV



© UNIVERSIDAD DE GRANADA  
DISCURSOS DEL ACTO DE INVESTIDURA DEL DOCTOR  
*HONORIS CAUSA* D. THOMAS S. POPKEWITZ.  
Depósito Legal: GR. 527-2015  
Edita: Secretaría General de la Universidad de Granada  
Imprime: Gráficas La Madraza

Printed in Spain

Impreso en España



DISCURSO DE PRESENTACIÓN PRONUNCIADO POR EL  
DOCTOR MIGUEL A. PEREYRA-GARCÍA CASTRO  
CON MOTIVO DE LA INVESTIDURA  
COMO DOCTOR *HONORIS CAUSA* DEL PROFESOR  
DON THOMAS S. POPKEWITZ



Excelentísimo Sr. Rector Magnífico  
de la Universidad de Granada  
Excelentísimas e ilustrísimas autoridades y miembros  
del Equipo de Gobierno de la Universidad de Granada  
Claustro de profesoras y profesores  
Queridas y queridos colegas y estudiantes  
Señoras y Señores

While I am interested in change and correcting social wrongs as expressed in the sentiment given about “social practices,” my concern is with the politics and the political of the distinction that makes the university expertise as the motor of change in a democracy ... [But in] the question of activism is not sufficient to say that one works with commitments... I take this activism as one that promotes democratic engagements without reenlisting a hierarchy between those who hold the expertise and those who are the subject of that expertise. In saying this, I have continually asked whether critical study is about changing people in the name of democracy or if the practices of democracy require critical studies that open up the possibilities of alternatives... [And here] the task is to rethink how to theorize and research in ways that honors the other as part of the self and to challenge the doxa of the comparative [research] modes that exclude and abject in the impulses to include.

Thomas S. Popkewitz (2014)<sup>1</sup>

El pasado 11 de diciembre de 2014 el Claustro de la Universidad de Granada aprobó la concesión del Grado de Doctor Honoris Causa al Profesor Thomas S. Popkewitz con la aprobación previa del Consejo de Gobierno de nuestra universidad. Se concluía felizmente el proceso de este nombramiento que inicialmente fue propuesto por los Departamentos de Pedagogía, Didáctica y Organización Escolar y Didáctica de la Expresión Musical, Plástica y Corporal de la Facultad de Ciencias de la Educación. El Profesor Popkewitz ha sido la primera propuesta de Doctor Honoris Causa realizada desde el ámbito de la educación en nuestra universidad. Desde su creación en el curso académico 1992-1993, la Facultad de Ciencias de la Educación ha venido creciendo como institución en el territorio nacional al tiempo que establece provechosas relaciones con reputados profesores e investigadores internacionales, como es el caso del Profesor Thomas S. Popkewitz, catedrático de Currículum en la School of Educational Sciences de la Universidad de Wisconsin en Madison.

---

↑ Véase Miguel A. Pereyra, "The Meanings of Scholarship: An Intellectual Interview with Tom Popkewitz", en M.A. Pereyra y B.M. Franklin (comps.), *Systems of Reason and the Politics of Schooling School Reform and Sciences of Education in the Tradition of Thomas S. Popkewitz* (Nueva York: Routledge, 2014), págs. 92, 97 y 90:

"Mientras me interesa el cambio y la corrección de los males sociales tal como se expresan en el sentimiento que damos a las "prácticas sociales", mi preocupación se halla en la política y la política de la diferencia que crea el conocimiento experto universitario como motor de cambio en una democracia... [Pero en] la cuestión del activismo [que demanda lo que vengo sosteniendo] no es suficiente decir que uno trabaja o funciona con compromisos... Aprovecho este activismo como uno que promueve compromisos democráticos sin afiliarse a jerarquías que divide entre las que poseen el conocimiento experto y aquellas que son objeto de dicho conocimiento. Al decir esto, me he preguntado continuamente si el objeto de todo estudio crítico es cambiar a las personas en nombre de la democracia o si por el contrario las prácticas de la democracia requieren de estudios críticos que abran posibilidades de alternativas... [Y aquí] la tarea es repensar cómo teorizar e investigar con formas que den honor al otro como parte de uno mismo; y también de impugnar la doxa de los modos comparativos [de investigación] que excluyen y abyectan en los impulsos que desplegamos por incluir".

En este solemne acto y en este histórico lugar, me corresponde a mí hacer la laudatio de nuestro nuevo doctor, lo que es sinceramente un gran y sentido honor. Conozco personalmente al Profesor Popkewitz desde 1985 aunque intelectualmente ya lo conocía desde 1980, cuando estudiaba en la Universidad de Columbia en Nueva York y había entonces descubierto algunos de sus escritos. Popkewitz es un neoyorkino que se doctoró en la New York University (NYU) en 1970, después de haber ejercido en Manhattan durante seis años de maestro de enseñanza primaria de sobre todo niños hispanos y afroamericanos. Una vez obtenido su doctorado consiguió que le contratara el entonces ya importante Department of Curriculum & Instruction de la Universidad de Wisconsin-Madison. En 1979 le nombraron catedrático de su especialidad y años después director de su departamento, que siempre suele ocupar el primer lugar entre los departamentos universitarios de Currículum en los ránquines que anualmente se confeccionan en Estados Unidos.

El Profesor Popkewitz nunca se ha movido de Madison y de su Universidad pero sí ha sido y es un gran viajero, conociendo la realidad educativa de diversos países en los cinco continentes. Desde hace años viene manteniendo anualmente una relación de docencia e investigación con las universidades de Granada, Gotemburgo en Suecia y Luxemburgo (más recientemente se ha vinculado a centros universitarios principales relacionados con la formación del profesorado en China).

Por más de treinta y cinco años, el Profesor Popkewitz ha desarrollado una portentosa actividad investigadora que ha logrado plasmar en 30 libros, unos 300 artículos y capítulos de libros

y unos 20 informes técnicos, con traducciones a 18 lenguas. Los temas centrales de sus publicaciones se relacionan con la epistemología social o los sistemas de razón que gobiernan las políticas educativas contemporáneas y la investigación sobre la enseñanza y la formación del profesorado. Su investigación incluye estudios históricos, etnográficos y comparados sobre las reformas educativas y las ciencias de la educación en Europa, América Latina, Asia, Sudáfrica y Estados Unidos. Tiene traducida al castellano lo más relevante de su producción, tanto en libros como en artículos.

El Profesor Popkewitz ha codirigido proyectos comparados de investigación de *large scale*. Por la repercusión que tuvo entre nosotros, citaré el que aprobó y generosamente dotó el V plan marco de investigación de la Unión Europea, el famoso proyecto EGSIE (*Educational Governance and Social Inclusion and Exclusion of Youth*), desarrollado entre 1997 y 2000 con la participación de relevantes investigadores de 10 países de Europa, América y Australia. El caso de España fue investigado por el equipo de Granada, que tuve la suerte de coordinar, formado por entonces por becarias y becarios, que hoy son profesoras y profesores de nuestra universidad, que sin duda encontraron una oportunidad única para interactuar con muy destacados investigadores de tantos países en diversos escenarios y geografías como en los que se desarrolló el proyecto EGSIE.

La atención al alumnado, a su alumnado, es una de las tareas profesionales y humanas que más cuida el Profesor Popkewitz que, independientemente de sus clases, se reúne con ellos en lo

que llaman el *Wednesday Group*, que semanalmente quedan convocados para discutir sus 'papers' o dialogar sobre nuevas lecturas o sobre autores y obras de vanguardia en todo el mundo. Hasta el presente Popkewitz ha dirigido 41 tesis doctorales de alumnos de todos los continentes.

El Doctorado Honoris Causa concedido por nuestra universidad ocupa el quinto lugar entre los que posee el Profesor Popkewitz. Tiene otorgados cuatro Doctorados Honoris Causa por sus contribuciones a los estudios de las reformas educativas y las ciencias de la educación: por las Universidades de Umeå (Suecia), 1989; Lisboa (Portugal), 2000; Católica de Lovaina (Bélgica), 2004; y Helsinki (Finlandia), 2007. En 1996, la Academia Rusa de Educación lo nombró Académico de número, distinción homologable a un doctorado honoris causa.

Su universidad le otorgó en 2008 el *University of Wisconsin-Madison School of Education Distinguished Faculty Award*, y más recientemente la American Educational Research Association le nombró *Fellow* en 20014.

Nos encontramos, pues, ante una de las figuras más importantes de nuestra época en el campo académico de la educación, cuya influencia se viene dejando sentir de forma ininterrumpida desde hace años. Precisamente, la influencia de la erudición científica del profesor Popkewitz en el campo de la investigación educativa se ejemplifica en un reciente libro que edité con mi colega y amigo Barry Franklín, que imprimió el pasado año la prestigiosa editorial Routledge en su sede de Nueva York. El libro, titulado *Systems of Reason and the Politics of Schooling*

*School Reform and Sciences of Education in the Tradition of Thomas S. Popkewitz*, muestra como su *scholarship* se ha ido moviendo y difundiendo a través de diversas disciplinas educativas para abrir nuevas vías de indagación y nuevos enfoques para el estudio de la educación. Veintiún colaboradores de universidades europeas, americanas (incluyendo América Latina) y asiáticas presentaron contribuciones. Cada contribuyente, prominente en su campo de investigación y especialidad, abordó en sus estudios la cuestión sobre cómo la investigación de Popkewitz ha aportado nuevas formas de pensar la indagación científica en educación sobre los fundamentos y sobre métodos y los modos y enfoques de análisis de las cuestiones educativas. Sinceramente, en las últimas décadas son pocos los académicos de la educación vivos que han logrado tener un impacto tan pronunciado en la investigación educativa con relación a su estilo de pensar acerca de los problemas educativos y las estrategias metodológicas (y sobre el aparato conceptual de su investigación).

Conocí a Tom Popkewitz en la década de 1980 cuando estaba en el Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia de los primeros gobiernos socialistas, trabajando en la reforma de la formación permanente del profesorado. Entoncec, uno de mis cometidos principales, que después desarrollé más al encargarme de la secretaría de la *Revista de Educación*, fue estimular la difusión de nuevas ideas tal como se proyectaban en la literatura científica internacional más relevante del campo de la educación. La producción científica del Profesor Popkewitz fue aquí especialmente relevante. En concreto, lo fue en el diseño de la nueva política española sobre la formación del profesorado, y en la compren-



sión de las reformas educativas y sus dinámicas contradictorias (o, como tiempo después Popkewitz diría, en “los dobles gestos”). Me influenció en particular la lectura de la investigación etnográfica del Profesor Popkewitz en su libro *The Myth of Educational Reform* (1982) (*El mito de la reforma educativa*, 2007), libro que basó su investigación en un conocido programa de reforma de la escuela primaria de Estados Unidos.

Para decirlo de forma general, pienso que se puede decir que la *scholarship* del Profesor Popkewitz es original y, al mismo tiempo, única, por su capacidad de innovación y por la amplitud de su alcance intelectual que intelectualmente compromete no a una singular disciplina de las ciencias de la educación sino que se basa en un diálogo de la educación con la historia y las disciplinas sociales. En un mundo en el que la práctica disciplinaria está muy especializada, uno de sus colegas (Michael Subkoviak, que fue vicedecano de su facultad y catedrático de Quantitative Methods in Educational Psychology) le ha llamado “a Renaissance man”, un hombre renacentista; en particular, por la interconexiones de diferentes literaturas provenientes de los campos de la sociología política, la sociología del conocimiento, la historia cultural y la filosofía europea. En este sentido, el trabajo de Popkewitz busca comprender el complejo fenómeno de la escolarización mediante el examen de los principios sociales, culturales y epistemológicos que ordenan los procesos y la selección de lo que se aprende en las escuelas. Él denomina este enfoque el estudio de la epistemología social, un término que desarrolla para examinar la relación entre conocimiento y poder (epistemología social en este caso se diferenciaba de términos similares utilizados en la filosofía y la

historia social que aparecieron casi al mismo tiempo de pensarlo Popkewitz).

Su investigación es, pues, intelectualmente seria e innovadora por las relaciones que establece entre los desarrollos teóricos, por sus imaginativas creaciones conceptuales, por su investigación histórica y los estudios empíricos de la educación; y también por cómo la plasma en diversos sitios, en estudios etnográficos y estadísticos de las reformas educativas de su país y de la Unión Europea, así como en los estudios sobre el cambio educativo en el EE.UU. El Profesor Popkewitz es realmente una mente privilegiada porque es único en el campo de la educación ya que logra combinar estos diferentes terrenos académicos, al mismo tiempo que aporta contribuciones intelectualmente fuertes y originales.

Quiero aquí igualmente resaltar la importancia de sus estudios en España y en América Latina, en particular en los casos de México y Argentina. Esta importancia es triple. Primero, porque los estudios de Popkewitz han proporcionado una perspectiva histórico-social importante para comprender las estrategias educativas de reforma que se importan a nuestros países desde los EE.UU. Segundo, porque la investigación de Popkewitz ofrece “herramientas” teóricas –y no sólo etiquetas para decorar “papers” o escritos de corte académico, como suele ocurrir con la literatura “importada” en el ámbito de la educación–; herramientas a veces muy poderosas para el estudio de la complejidad del cambio educativo. Por poner un ejemplo, el desarrollo de la idea que Popkewitz hace en muchas de sus publicaciones de la alquimia en el campo del currículum y la escolarización que la concibe como

la manera de considerar el movimiento o el viaje de las ideas a través de los espacios culturales, sociales e institucionales (como pueden ser el que se crean en torno a, por ejemplo, las materias de estudio o asignaturas), movimiento que lleva a que se produzca una suerte de transmutación mágica de las propias ideas (como se decía que producían los alquimistas del medievo con los metales). De este modo, a medida que el conocimiento académico se introduce en los espacios de la escolarización, se produce una curiosa “alquimia” que transforma el saber matemático, químico, geográfico... en asignaturas escolares con su propia naturaleza, lógica y fines. Y tercero, porque Popkewitz ha proporcionado uno de los análisis más sintéticos de los debates actuales sobre el modernismo/teoría social posmoderna, que se ha convertido en objeto de algunos artículos suyos importantes que abordan los cambios epistemológicos e históricos ocurridos en el campo de la investigación.

Permítanme que, finalmente, explore esto, con brevedad, a través de la caracterización de las cuatro obras que creo fundamentales del Profesor Popkewitz. Con ello pretendo elaborar un breve ejercicio intelectual destinado a esbozar el pensamiento de nuestro nuevo Doctor Honoris Causa.

Una contribución central del trabajo de Popkewitz es considerar la interrelación de factores sociales y políticos en la producción de la investigación educativa. Este trabajo en su caso está muy ligado a la sociología del conocimiento y a los estudios históricos actuales de la ciencia que se producen en Europa y Estados Unidos. El primer libro de Profesor Popkewitz que comen-

to ahora, *Paradigm and Ideology in Educational Research* (1984) (*Paradigma e ideología de investigación educativa*, 1988), es uno de los estudios más citados y originales de la sociología histórica de las ciencias de la educación contemporáneas. En lugar de centrarse exclusivamente en las cualidades analíticas de la ciencia, Popkewitz utilizó aquí su perspectiva analítica e histórica para explorar cómo se construyen las prácticas teóricas, conceptuales y metodológicas de la ciencia como parte del cambio de las condiciones sociales. Uno de los capítulos del libro deconstruye la lógica dialéctica generada en la antigua Unión Soviética, con la que argumenta que las teorías sociales en educación estaban en realidad preocupadas por cuestiones relacionadas con las ideas de la actividad y el movimiento y no precisamente con el cambio educativo. En varios aspectos este libro estuvo muy por delante de su tiempo en su conceptualización de la investigación como una actividad social, y se ha convertido en un estudio importante sobre las dimensiones sociales y epistemológicas en la investigación en educación. Tanto en España como en América Latina, el libro es casi considerado un clásico moderno en el estudio de la investigación educativa. Routledge lo ha reeditado recientemente asignándole precisamente un lugar entre las obras englobadas en la categoría de clásicos educativos.

El Profesor Popkewitz ha escrito una contribución única para los estudios de la reforma educativa con su obra *A Political Sociology of Educational Reform* (1991) (*Sociología política de las reformas educativas*, 1994), uno de sus libros más citados en su traducción al castellano. Aquí Popkewitz entreteje datos histó-

ricos, conceptuales y empíricos para hacer un innovador estudio de las prácticas de la formación del profesorado, las teorías del currículum y del Estado. La importancia de esta obra estriba en que su exploración histórica de temas contemporáneos la usa Popkewitz para proporcionar una comprensión específica y detallada del funcionamiento interno de las escuelas: la enseñanza que imparten y el currículum como prácticas culturales e históricas generadas por los efectos del poder a través de principios acerca de quién es el niño y cómo debe ser.

Centrándose en cuestiones de epistemología social, Popkewitz ha hecho una importante contribución para repensar la investigación relacionada con los temas de la desigualdad y la exclusión social, lo cual se expresa en otra obra suya muy conocida, *Struggling for the Soul* (1998) (*La conquista del alma infantil*, 1998). Este estudio es una amplia investigación nacional de una reforma norteamericana de la formación de los maestros (*Teach for America*), diseñada para mejorar las escuelas urbanas y rurales. Aquí el uso de la etnografía en múltiples áreas urbanas y rurales del país desafía a la investigación y la política dominantes sobre la formación del profesorado y los estilos particulares de razonar en los modelos pedagógicos que producen en realidad exclusión, aunque los mismos modelos traten de esforzarse por incluir.

Esta paradoja de la reforma educativa contemporánea y la investigación se persigue en uno de los libros más recientes del Profesor Popkewitz, que es a su vez hoy por hoy una de sus obras fundamentales. Me refiero a *Cosmopolitanism and the Age of School Reform: Science, Education, and Making Society by Making*

*the Child* (2008) (*El cosmopolitismo y la era de la reforma escolar: la ciencia, la educación y la construcción de la sociedad mediante la construcción de la infancia*, 2008). En muchos sentidos, un concepto antiguo, el cosmopolitismo ha adquirido una nueva vida en la mente de muchos estudiosos que desean establecer un objetivo de carácter emancipatorio para la interpretación de la política social contemporánea y para la práctica de la educación en particular. El Profesor Popkewitz se centra en su libro en el cosmopolitismo como estrategia para el cambio de los soportes históricos de la institución escolar, de la escuela moderna, ilustrándolo con el caso de la formación de la República norteamericana y relacionándolo con la materialización de la ciudadanía, con lo que significó y significa ser buen ciudadano de la República. Popkewitz traza con imaginación y de forma sistemática los cambios producidos en los principios epistemológicos del cosmopolitismo a través del movimiento de la Educación Progresista ocurrido con el cambio de siglo XIX al XX, y toma de nuevo la cuestión en la actualidad, a principios del siglo XXI. La importancia del libro estriba en que examina históricamente cómo los compromisos de la Ilustración sobre qué es razón y racionalidad están cambiando continuamente. Lo podemos advertir en una serie de cuestiones presentes en las reformas educativas sobre las ideas de pertenencia colectiva y los principios de la inclusión y la exclusión de los ciudadanos en el contexto de una de las ideas cada vez más recurrentes en nuestra época, la de la planificación de las sociedades a través de la planificación de las personas.

En este orden de cosas, la idea de “los dobles gestos” que el Profesor Popkewitz desarrolla en esta obra proporciona una

manera de examinar cómo la política, la investigación y el currículum escolar expresan la esperanza de una sociedad y producen simultáneamente distinciones y divisiones que proyectan temores sobre las poblaciones que se consideran peligrosas para la República y la ciudadanía (como, por ejemplo, es el caso hoy de los inmigrantes, percibidos en realidad como amenazas para la seguridad y la armonía, en la actualidad y de cara al futuro). De esta suerte, hoy hemos llegado a elaborar pedagogías para escolares que no son “del promedio” que en su envoltorio discursivo aportan un gesto racionalizador cosmopolita y que pretenden crear un futuro mejor y más feliz. Pero, y aquí encontramos la contrapartida del doble gesto, el discurso de esta pedagogía apoya también un discurso que suele ir unido al de la construcción de un tipo de niño que, concebido como un “chivo expiatorio”, se piensa que hay que “salvar” a través de la escuela y que incluso hay que diferenciar y “adyectar” (hacerlo invisible). En la elegancia teórica y en los matices empíricos en la idea de los dobles gestos, Popkewitz es capaz de conectar en su trabajo la filosofía feminista y psicoanalítica sobre la abyección (Julia Kristeva), la teoría literaria de la raza (Toni Morrison) y la filosofía europea de la ciencia sobre lo patológico y lo normal (Georges Canguilhem).

Dicho todo esto, quisiera concluir diciendo que el Profesor Popkewitz viene siendo reconocido como uno de los estudiosos de la educación más importantes del mundo. Desde la década de 1980 hasta la actualidad, ha venido presentando una excelencia académica, proyectada en su importante obra, en la que la rigurosidad viene caracterizada por la innovación teórica y la imaginación científica incomparables. Sus estudios teóricos y

empíricos han abierto nuevas vías para la conceptualización de la escolarización en los sistemas educativos contemporáneos y en la organización del campo del currículum y la formación del profesorado en América, Europa y en los últimos años en Asia, en particular en China. Con su *scholarship*, el Profesor Popkewitz ha influido genuina e imaginativamente la producción académica en el campo de la Ciencias de la Educación de muchos eruditos e investigadores en todo el mundo.

*Last but not least*, me queda mencionar aquí un aspecto de la figura y obra de Thomas Popkewitz que me gustaría, destacar. Daniel Tröhler, catedrático de la Universidad de Luxemburgo, un querido colega y amigo que también, como Popkewitz, es miembro del cuerpo docente del máster universitario en Investigación e Innovación en Currículum y Formación de nuestra universidad, ha dicho que “Tom Popkewitz representa a todos aquellos intelectuales que no se limitan a predicar [los grandes] ideales, sino que en realidad viven por y para ellos”. Tom Popkewitz es, en efecto, un intelectual y profesor universitario crítico y comprometido con el cambio social, quien desde su papel de miembro del mundo académico en una universidad principal como la suya, se preocupa por la política; por, como me ha dicho recientemente (y lo he puesto al inicio de mi Introducción), “la política de la diferencia que crea el conocimiento experto universitario como motor de cambio en una democracia...”. Y hablando de política, Popkewitz concibe su activismo “como la acción que promueve compromisos democráticos sin afiliarse a jerarquías que dividen a las personas entre las que poseen el conocimiento experto y aquellas que son objeto de dicho conocimiento”. Al decir esto,



afirma que continuamente se pregunta si el objeto de todo estudio crítico es “cambiar a las personas en nombre de la democracia o si por el contrario las prácticas de la democracia requieren de estudios críticos que abran posibilidades alternativas...”. Este es su compromiso y su trabajo y dedicación.

He dicho



DISCURSO PRONUNCIADO POR EL  
EXCELENTÍSIMO SEÑOR  
D. THOMAS S. POPKEWITZ  
CON MOTIVO DE SU INVESTITURA COMO  
DOCTOR *HONORIS CAUSA*



Señor Rector Magnífico de la  
Universidad de Granada  
Miembros del Equipo de Gobierno de la  
Universidad de Granada  
Claustro de Profesoras y Profesores  
Queridas y Queridos colegas y amigos

Bucnos días a todos y a todas

Me gustaría dar las gracias al Doctor Miguel Pereyra por su presentación. Aunque voy a hablar sobre mis estudios académicos y mi valoración de mis años trabajando en la universidad y ciudad de Granada, primero necesito reconocer la importancia del Doctor Pereyra para mi propio trabajo, así como reconocer su trabajo en España. Conocí al Doctor Pereyra cuando trabajaba para el Ministerio de Educación y buscaba renovar la profesión docente después de la creación de la democracia tras la muerte de Franco. Su labor

fue la de lo que hoy podríamos llamar un intelectual público y un activista intelectual. El Doctor Pereyra comprendió la política del conocimiento y la necesidad de una comprensión profesional crítica de los debates intelectuales que se desarrollaron durante el paréntesis en el que España estuvo separada de comunidades intelectuales en otros países, especialmente en el campo de la Educación.

Es un grandísimo honor para mí ser investido Doctor Honoris Causa. La Universidad de Granada es una de las más prestigiosas de España, con estatutos fundacionales que datan del siglo dieciséis. También es un grandísimo honor recibir este título de la Facultad de Educación de esta Universidad.

*(I wish to thank Professor Miguel Pereyra for his introduction. While I will talk about my academic studies and my appreciation of my years working in the University of Granada and its city, I want first to acknowledge the importance of Professor Pereyra both in my own work but also to recognize his work in Spain. I met Professor Pereyra when he was working for the Ministry of Education and seeking to renovate the teaching profession after the creation of the democracy with the fall of Franco. His work as, what we might today call a public intellectual and intellectual activist. Professor Pereyra understood the politics of knowledge and the need for a critical professional understanding of the intellectual debates that occurred during the hiatus that separated Spain from the outside intellectual communities, particularly in the field of Education. I am greatly honored in my investiture of a Doctor Honoris Causa. The University of Granada is one of the most prestigious in Spain, with its original charter dating into the 1500s. I am also honored to receive the first such degree from the Faculty of Education at this University.)*

**The University of Granada and Its City:** The University and the City of Granada have been very gracious to me since first coming here in 1990. I continually appreciate the intellectual life given through the presence of this university, the panorama views of the Sierra Nevada, the vibrant cultural life and the historical winding streets of the downtown, and of course, the magnificence of Alhambra and the history it tells of Spain, Europe and North Africa.

The first time I visited Alhambra was after a seminar that Professor Pereyra and I organized in Madrid in December 1990 through a bilateral commission of the US and Spain with the participation of Professor John Meyer from Stanford University. After the seminar, my wife and I flew down to Malaga, rented a car and drove to Granada to visit the historical legacies of the city (John Meyer and his wife joined us in our tour of Alhambra). My luxury today is staying at the Carmen de la Victoria, the University Guest Residence and seeing the beauty of Alhambra from my window each morning and evening.

That first visit was my introduction to the graciousness of the people of the city. My wife and I drove a rented car from Malaga. This was of the time of two lane highways and not as well signed for directions as it is now. After we walked around the city and visited Alhambra, we began to drive out of the city to return to Malaga. But I was having trouble finding the right road from the downtown and stopped a Granada taxi driver to ask for directions. He listened to my Spanish, realized that I was a slow

learner in high school language classes and in trouble. Without a moment of hesitation, the taxi driver motioned to follow him to the highway, guessing, correctly, that I would not get there by myself or with his directions given in Spanish. He drove carefully and slowly so I would not lose him on the path to the highway entrance, signaled me on to drive on as he drove back to the city center. The taxi driver's graciousness was an extremely welcoming act!

And then there are the foods, the wine, and the arts – the Granada ceramics and ceramics sculptures that decorate my house. There are sculptures by Agustos Morales Jiménez and Morrish style pottery by Miguel Ruíz Jiménez. It is the photo that I took at Nasrid Palaces in Alhambra that gives elegance to the cover of a book that I edited.

“Me” Learning how to Spell “Graduate School”: To understand more about why this investiture is such a personal honor, I need to say more about my own background.

I am a first generation American and the first to graduate from college. My mother came to the US from Antwerp Belgium when she was five, although her family was from a part of Poland. My father came from Poland at the age of 14, just after World War One. Coming to America was to find better life away from the threats of Programs. No one in my family realized how lucky they were to migrate as no relatives left in Europe survived the Nazis.



My parents' working lives began prior to the Great Depression but were influenced by it. My father never graduated from high school as my grandfather told him that he had to leave school to earn money. My father became a carpenter and a local officer in its trade union. One my father's regrets in life were not finishing high school. He wanted to be a draftsman – something he expressed in his 70s when he showed me the drafting tools that he still had. My mother was a nurse.

Somehow – don't ask me how – I seemed to know that I was going to college even if I did not know what it meant other than more years of schooling after high school. How my parents did this to me – the will to go to college – I still do not know.

While the desire was there, distinctions, complexities or nuances about college or later graduate school were not. I went to the least expensive college for my parents, Hunter College of the City of New York. I had no idea that universities differed in their academic ranking; and the university you went to could have implications beyond education to social and economic positions. When it came to my doctorate, it was another simple choice. Who would accept me? I thought naively that I would get a doctorate (my cousin had gotten one) by then and like waving a magic wand, I would become a professor. There were no distinctions or nuances in this for me – What I decided were surely to happen as I wanted. I now know better (and my children know even better than even me) about the social and cultural distinctions that differentiate universities that are not only

about education but also about the opening of options and opportunities. The social distinctions and differences were just not available for me coming from a working class family.

Hunter College was part of a group of New York City colleges founded in the 1800s. By the early 20th century, they provided higher education to the city's immigrant populations who were excluded from many of the older, elite universities. The City Colleges had no graduate programs until the middle of the 20th century although they did have one of the highest percentages of graduates who went on for graduate degrees.

I entered Hunter as an engineering student but quickly changed and became a history major. Its liberal arts program was like reaching into a cookie jar of intellectual delights for four years; except for the times I had to study all night for tests. Oddly, I studied English Constitutional History— odd for someone whose parents were from Eastern Europe and with a name of Popkewitz. At Hunter, I minored in education to become a primary school teacher. At that time, education was considered a professional degree and not a major in this liberal arts college.

As in choosing a college, becoming a teacher was accidental. My Aunt was a New York City schoolteacher and thought I would be good with children because I excelled in sports (American football) in high school. My aunt told my mother who told me, and I entered the primary teacher certification program. My aunt's advice to me is interesting as she had a college education

and used her distinctions when advising her children - those who know the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu work on cultural distinctions and social positions in society would recognize the different advise my aunt gave to her children who became an electrical engineer and medical pathologist.

My career may have been organized serendipity; it is not anything that I regret. I enjoyed teaching for 6 years in a Harlem, New York primary school where its children were mostly from poor Puerto Rican, Cuban, or African American families. While I was raised with a strong sense of social equality and justice, my teaching gave me first-hand knowledge of the struggles of people who face systematic inequalities and poverty. While my family worried about money, these worries did not parallel the conditions confronted in American inner cities.

After graduation, I went to Teachers College, Columbia University for a Masters Degree. My aunt suggested it! My teaching contract provided a large salary raise for the Masters Degree so there was little time between finishing my first degree and returning to school.

I realized after 6 years of teaching, however, that I was no longer intellectually challenged by teaching and wanted to do something else. What to do beyond teaching evolved around two things: one was to become a school administrator and head a school; the other was to go to get my doctorate and teach in a university. I thought about what school leaders do and thought

it was not what I wanted to do. So I applied and entered a PhD program at New York University.

When I decided to go to graduate school, I am not sure that that I could spell “graduate school” nor did I have any idea of what a doctorate meant other than you had to apply. I did not even realize that there was such a thing as an honorary doctorate. The former was merely a magic place and the latter, honorary doctorate, had no entry in my collected wisdom. The lack of distinctions in planning a career turned out “ok” as serendipity worked as my career path. Growing up in New York City, the Hudson River was my boundary and I never thought beyond what was near me. I found out later that my career decisions were in a period of great economic and educational expansion so it was easy to think that what I wanted to do, I could do. Working with PhD students at the University of Wisconsin-Madison now tells a different story of careers and finding employment in higher education.

While I am not suggesting serendipity as a mode of life, the decisions about graduate school entailed a series of accidents that had little calculation. To reflect on it now, the range of choices is not merely about one’s biography. How one sees the world is related to the social and cultural fields in which they are located. Education was thought of as a way to change careers! Yet, while my parents wanted me to have a better life than they, little did they know that I now work seven days a week, and probably for about 60 hours where my father worked 35 hours – when he had work. There is a difference, however. I chose my hours and my work is a

way of life and I do not think of what I do as work. Someone once said to me that academics are the inheritors of the Greek leisure class but without their wealth.

**My Intellectual Work:** Let me quickly move to the world entered into with my doctoral studies. My field was curriculum studies, and I wanted to think about the new wave of school reform that emphasized students learning how to think about inquiry and what were called “discovery” approaches rather than learning just facts. This work on the “new curriculum” was being intellectually guided by cognitive psychology. My advisor, Millard Clements, suggested that I try an alternative approach. He suggested reading in the sociology of knowledge to think about the reform efforts. Although a history major with a liberal arts degree, I knew nothing about this literature. It was written by historians, literacy theorists, scientists and sociologists who thought about the “craft” of their fields and its relation to the knowledge generated. Among these writers was the Spaniard Ortega y Gasset writing about history.

The literature was intellectual elegant to me. It opened up whole new ways of thinking about knowledge, questions and thought. Maybe it was my naivety; I had trusted the knowledge given to me as verities of the world and my self – not something made historically possible for me to think about. The books read for my dissertation were like novels about people thinking about how their curiosities, methods, and disciplinary knowledge are produced and shaped in historical-cultural conditions.

My reading in the sociology of knowledge produced frustration and anger in realizing how its questions were hidden in my education. My frustration spilled over into a session with my thesis advisor. I remember yelling (mildly, I guess) in one tutoring session (This is not something I would generally advise). I asked, "Why didn't anyone ever told me about this literature?" My advisor smiled. I guess he felt that his intellectual experiment worked with me.

After finishing my doctorate and coming to the University of Wisconsin-Madison, a new but related literature of European and Spanish translations and American origins appeared to help me in my studies— some called it post-modernism or the linguistic turns in the US. The scholarship combined philosophical discussions social and cultural histories, and theories of power that became a horizon for my pursuing questions about what is taught in schools and the sciences of education.

My career continues to work around the ideas of what I today would call a cultural-sociology of knowledge. It asks about the historical and cultural practices that make possible the principles that order the psychologies of children's learning, the selection of knowledge for the school curriculum, and organization that shapes the teacher's planning. These studies are not to describe who is thinking about the matters of schooling. In contrast, the studies are to understand how current mode of reflection and action about children, families and communities are made historically possible; and important to this, the limits of

these modes of reasoning in terms of social commitments and correcting social wrongs.

If I take the famous book by the American Philosopher, John Dewey, about *How We Think* and invert its thesis into questions of history, I ask about the conditions that make possible what is seen, talked about, and acted on in the modern school. This way of thinking can be thought as playing with the double qualities of the pronoun "I" that the feminist philosopher Judith Butler expresses. "I" speak and write to provide the autobiographical "I." It is me who writes this speech for the investiture and gets up on the podium to talk about its ideas.

This idea of the author's "I," Butler reminds us, is not enough to understand what is said and done. That autobiographic "I" has its historical traveling companion. The historical part of the "I" is determined by numerous historical events that precede us but travel to give communal intelligibility to authorship. Michel Foucault talked about the historical "I" when he wrote about "the author function." Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari used the phrase of "conceptual personae" to explore the multiple flows and assemblies of events that make possible the thinking of the writer as the origin of a book or novel. We don't think much about the historical "I" as the world that we navigate daily presenting itself with a naturalness and unquestioned character.

Yet, to make visible this historical "I" is to understand the enclosures and internments that limit the present. This un-

derstanding of the limits of the present is also to think about change. To show how what seems as natural and given is in fact historically produced. To poke holes in the self-evident truth and the seeming causality of daily life is a strategy for openings of possibilities other than those already present. The historical study of “the reason” of the present, then, is to think differently than current social theories about the problem of change.

I know that to speak about “reason” as historical is difficult. Our ways of reasoning about everyday life enables our navigating among its complexities that simultaneously connects us to others. The knowledge that we have is our commonsense in daily life by giving the world its unquestioned appearances and naturalness. If I provide an analogy, it is like the fish swimming in water. The knowledge available to talk, think, and “see” the world is like the water. It is the medium that surrounds us and serves as a security blanket. When we cross the street, we want to trust in the knowledge that the red light means cars will stop; or that it is a safe bet to think of the kinds of people sitting in the classroom as “children” who, if the right teaching methods are applied, will grow and develop into “reasonable people.” The ways we reason about the world make daily life and experience as manageable, stable, and natural.

And there lies the beginning of the problematic of studying knowledge and its systems of reason. The rules and standards of reason have a double quality. The systems of reason that order our lives create boundaries about what is possible



and not possible. They provide paths or processes about how to navigate the world. The boundaries, however, are not only about what is possible/impossible. They are inscriptions about kinds of people that are included and excluded.

The two elements of knowledge and its system of reason are central to the issue of power and the political of modernity. They create boundaries of the possible and exclude in the impulses to include. My concern with “reason” as a historical ‘fact’ to study, then, is to make visible the shaping of what is seen and acted on, and the rules of exclusion in the impulse to include.

I have pursued this historical question of “reason” in what I call social epistemology; maybe too fancy a set of words to say that the way we know and the objects of that knowing is historically and socially produced. My starting point is the school and its system of reason. In more recent research, I have thought of modern education as bringing into its pedagogy the Enlightenment’s idea of the cosmopolitan. This idea of the cosmopolitan was incorporated into political theories of the new republics and its idea of the citizen. The modern school was to produce this kind of person. My interest in the Enlightenment and its notion of the citizen is not to ask how the school can produce the cosmopolitanism. Rather it was to ask the principles of cosmopolitanism generated about who the child is and should be, and how do these principles change over time and in the different cultural spaces of modern schooling.

Why talk of the school as making kinds of people and cosmopolitanism when thinking about the school? The first part of the answer to this question was for me almost commonsensical once I raised it. Why send children to a place called schools if not to make them different kinds of people than if they did not go to school? When we take away the noble sound of the words about children's learning, the school pedagogy and curriculum are to teach children how to think, problem solve and act so they can become "reasonable people." That is, to make them into a particular kind of person.

The second part of the answer related in making kinds of people is thinking about power and the political in modernity. One of the characteristics of modernity and modern governments is that they act less through brute force and more through indirect forms of power. The power that I speak about is productive. It provides the rules and standards that order reflection and action. Michel Foucault talked about this as governmentality, a word that is what it says governing by the mentalities. The question of power that I am concerned with is the governing through the principles of how judgments are made, conclusions drawn, rectification proposed, and the events of daily life made manageable and predictable.

This governing is a productive kind of power rather than one that is repressive. That is, to teach children how to think, provide the rules and standards for determining what is a problem to solve, and the processes and criteria for finding solutions is an example

of productive power. It is a form of power that “acts” indirectly on people and presupposes their freedom to act in one way or another. Schools are the archetypical place for this productive power.

The issues of productive power and the making of kinds of people direct my research. Again and once I began thinking about it, this notion of power and the political in schools seem obvious. If I go back to the idea of cosmopolitanism, modern governments required the citizen in order for government to operate. And the citizen is not born but made. The founding of the American and French Republics recognized this. They called upon education to provide for the making of the citizen. The citizen is a kind of person that is different from what was needed when the individual was the subject of the King. The modern citizen is one that incorporates the Enlightenment’s cosmopolitanism into a political theory of the person whose agency and participation makes possible the social and political institutions of the state. The organization of curriculum and the administration of children’s learning join as the cultural site for internalizing the modes of participation, responsibility and belonging that make modern government possible.

As I express this interest in the cosmopolitanism of the modern school, I must return to the serendipitous, a word that keeps cropping up in my life. While on a 2000 fellowship to the University of Helsinki, I decided to go to the sociology library and found the millennium issue of the British sociolog-

ical society. The articles were about the cosmopolitan promise of the new millennial. In reading this issue, I realized that the images and narratives of the cosmopolitan are exemplified in the modern school from the 19th century to the present, although the word is almost never used. What became important in my studies were the epistemological qualities that gave substance to the qualities of the cosmopolitanism. These seemed to center around attitudes of the Enlightenment about reason, rationality and progress (the temporal in processes change). These qualities were given to a particular kind of person whose human agency could effect change.

The importance of exploring this historical idea became my central interest over the next seven years. Exploring the changing historical principles of the cosmopolitanism in the school was to think about the concrete operations of power, social inclusion/exclusion in the school's making of kinds of people. I read everything I could find and talked to anyone I thought would know something about the Enlightenment and the ideas of cosmopolitanism. My travels went through histories of the Enlightenment's cosmopolitanism and the social sciences, philosophy and cultural sociologies, among others. I found, for example, that some American reformers at the turn of the 20th century wanted to call the new common high school as "the Cosmopolitan School." They rejected the name because it sounded too elitist. The marvel of John Dewey's pragmatism in American Progressive Education was to provide a method to bring the elite Enlightenment ideas of the cosmopolitanism into actual processes of education.

Eventually, I wrote a book, *Cosmopolitanism and the Age of School Reform* (2008) that was also published in Spanish (Morata, 2009). My interest in cosmopolitanism was not about its salvation theme about the new millennial. It was about issues of power, the political and the issues of exclusion, abjection, and inclusion. It was about particular historical assembly of different and changing historical practices that governed “the reason” that ordered and classified the practices of schooling.

In pursuing how the school made this cosmopolitan person as an issue of power, my research explored two related issues of the Enlightenment: one of social exclusion and the other of the problem of change. Let me say a few words about each as I think the ideas of the cosmopolitan, the issue of exclusion, and the problem of change addresses the central question of the political and power in my work.

First are the issues of inequality and social exclusion. In an earlier book *Struggling for the Soul* (in Spanish, Pomares, 1998), which Professor Pereyra spoke about, my concern was with the comparative style of reason inscribed in contemporary curriculum models and the psychologies of learning. The ethnographic study is teaching for marginalized populations in urban and rural US schools. The research explores how differences were inscribed in the very programs that were to help the children achieve. These differences were generated a continuum of value that divided the normal from the pathological. After the study, I would relate the normal as a particular kind of “unfinished

cosmopolitanism” that serves as the norms from which to establish the distinctions that differentiated and divided the marginal child. The inscriptions of difference gave specificity to the operation of power and the political of schooling.

Second is the issue of change. I want to suggest from these studies that the way in which change is thought about needs to be rethought and recalibrated. We normally do not think of knowledge or “reason” as an actor in human affairs. However, knowledge has material consequences. Knowledge “acts” on what is done in the administering and forming of the child.

The problematic of social epistemology gives attention to knowledge as an actor. It draws attention to the paradox of the commitment to contemporary social and educational reforms and research. Programs and policies to include engage a comparative mode of thought that ironically excludes and abjects. If I reflect on this comparative quality of reforms and research in education and teacher education, the reforms do not and cannot work in relation to their social commitments. The challenge of change to enact our social commitments requires unthinking how things are done in order to find alternatives. The alternative that I have tried to address related that historicizes the present is one strategy. It comes with no guarantees, but I am not sure what other option we have but to try.

Finalmente me gustaría dar las gracias a los Doctores Miguel Pereyra, José Luis Aróstegui, Juan Bautista Martínez y An-

tonio Bolívar por haber propuesto mi candidatura en sus Departamentos universitarios, y por haber apoyado en la universidad el proceso de mi investidura como Doctor Honoris Causa en la Universidad de Granada. También quiero mostrar mi agradecimiento al Decano de la Facultad de Ciencias de la Educación, José Antonio Naranjo, quien firmemente apoyó mi candidatura, así como a las muchas otras personas que hicieron posible esta investidura.

(Finally I want to acknowledge Professors Miguel Pereyra, José Luis Aróstegui, Juan Bautista Martínez y Antonio Bolívar for proposing my candidacy to their university departments, and supporting the process as it moved through the university for appointing me Doctor Honoris Causa de la Universidad de Granada. I also need to acknowledge the Dean of the School of Education, José Antonio Naranjo, who strongly supported my candidacy and numerous others that made this investiture possible.)







the 1970s, the 1980s and the 1990s. The 1970s were dominated by the 'New Right' and the 1980s by the 'New Labour'.

The 1970s were dominated by the 'New Right' and the 1980s by the 'New Labour'. The 1990s were dominated by the 'New Right' and the 2000s by the 'New Labour'.

The 1990s were dominated by the 'New Right' and the 2000s by the 'New Labour'. The 2010s were dominated by the 'New Right' and the 2020s by the 'New Labour'.

The 2010s were dominated by the 'New Right' and the 2020s by the 'New Labour'. The 2030s were dominated by the 'New Right' and the 2040s by the 'New Labour'.

The 2040s were dominated by the 'New Right' and the 2050s by the 'New Labour'. The 2060s were dominated by the 'New Right' and the 2070s by the 'New Labour'.

The 2070s were dominated by the 'New Right' and the 2080s by the 'New Labour'. The 2090s were dominated by the 'New Right' and the 2100s by the 'New Labour'.

The 2100s were dominated by the 'New Right' and the 2110s by the 'New Labour'. The 2120s were dominated by the 'New Right' and the 2130s by the 'New Labour'.

The 2130s were dominated by the 'New Right' and the 2140s by the 'New Labour'. The 2150s were dominated by the 'New Right' and the 2160s by the 'New Labour'.

The 2160s were dominated by the 'New Right' and the 2170s by the 'New Labour'. The 2180s were dominated by the 'New Right' and the 2190s by the 'New Labour'.

The 2190s were dominated by the 'New Right' and the 2200s by the 'New Labour'. The 2210s were dominated by the 'New Right' and the 2220s by the 'New Labour'.

The 2220s were dominated by the 'New Right' and the 2230s by the 'New Labour'. The 2240s were dominated by the 'New Right' and the 2250s by the 'New Labour'.

The 2250s were dominated by the 'New Right' and the 2260s by the 'New Labour'. The 2270s were dominated by the 'New Right' and the 2280s by the 'New Labour'.

The 2280s were dominated by the 'New Right' and the 2290s by the 'New Labour'. The 2300s were dominated by the 'New Right' and the 2310s by the 'New Labour'.