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ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS

The Globalization of Knowledge Productions: A Comparison of UNAM and UCSD’s Philosophy Departments and Their National Communities

by

Claudia Vizcarra

Master of Arts

University of California, San Diego, 2015

Professor John D. Blanco, Chair

A comparative case study of the philosophy departments and curricula from Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM) and University of California, San Diego (UCSD) reveal the preferences in philosophical currents and research. The philosophical advancements of each department, whether political or technological, result in the denial and recognition of philosophical
thought that disclose institutional priorities. The struggle between the legitimacy and illegitimacy of particular philosophical currents is problematic because dominant knowledge forms benefit from power structures in the academic institution and market; these tensions reveal how philosophy’s claim to knowledge is disadvantageous for philosophies unincorporated within the philosophy curricula that result in marginalized philosophies. I argue marginalized philosophies are at the expense of the hierarchy of knowledge and negatively affect philosophical study at large; therefore the creation of an inclusive philosophy curriculum and pluri-versal university is necessary.

Throughout this thesis, a theoretical foundation situated among the Frankfurt School and Critical theory along with a Decolonial conceptual framework, and a historical, socio-political, and curricular comparison inform the knowledge productions each university is intent on producing. The comparative factors that guide this analysis are based on course syllabi, reading materials, as well as informal discussions with students, faculty, and staff from each university. The broader implications of this study are representative of other philosophies and marginalized forms of knowledge that are considered illegitimate by academia. This study brings attention to the existence of these issues between two universities and contributes to an ongoing critique of the field of philosophy and academic university.
Introduction

To my surprise, conducting a research study or inquiring on Latin American Philosophy proved to be more complex than originally envisioned. The lack of expertise or awareness within a philosophy department on this philosophical current was a peculiar insufficiency within one department. However after investigating several other philosophy departments, this insufficiency resulted in a widespread outcome in most philosophy departments. After discussing these inquiries and research interests with fellow peers and faculty members, similar experiences were expressed that shaped a recognizable pattern of denial among philosophy departments. If Latin American Philosophy is unaccounted for in several philosophy departmental curricula, what other philosophy currents are not included? Essentially, each university emphasizes particular research currents as a result of several elements guiding philosophical precedence that are examined throughout this thesis. Exploring what is not there and what one university has and lacks to exchange perspective propels a dialogue among two universities and their philosophy departments that result in a comparable case study.

A comparative analysis of the philosophy curricula from Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM) and University of California, San Diego (UCSD) and their respective philosophy departments reveal the functions and disparities among each university, philosophy department, and nation. Why compare UNAM and UCSD? UNAM and UCSD associate with each other through student exchange, research programs, and research scholars. Although
less than 2,000 miles apart, these two universities manifest diverse philosophical interests that possess what the other lacks. UNAM is located in Mexico City, Mexico and is considered the most reputable university in Latin America by Latin American scholars, meanwhile UCSD is located in La Jolla, California and is one of ten University of California public universities. This case study is limited to two universities, although they represent two major research institutions that are reputable and distinguished within their respective nations and among each other.

The philosophical trends and the curricula of each department reflect the priorities of each university along with their student body and faculty. Why look into philosophy departments? The production of knowledge and the instruction of philosophy within the academic market present the polemic of prioritizing what a university and philosophy department elects to teach, promote, and represent as a research institution. This study probes the historical, socio-cultural, and political factors that contribute to the philosophical development reflected in the curricula, research interests, and publications of each philosophy department. These disparities provide insight into the national and public interests that constitute the student body and the field of philosophical study at large. The comparative factors that guide this analysis are based on course syllabi, reading materials, informal discussions with students, faculty, and staff from each university. The latter capture empirical ethnography about ideas on their respective university, and ethnographic experiences to understand the knowledge productions and priorities surrounding UNAM and UCSD, along with their philosophy departments.

To support these questions and analysis, Chapter One discusses the
theoretical framework for this study within the Frankfurt School and Critical Theory as well as Decolonial Theory. The first section on the Frankfurt School and Critical Theory sets the theoretical foundation and considers the triad relationship among the nation, academic market, and knowledge production with the works of Herbert Marcuse’s *One-dimensional Man*, C.P. Snow’s *Two Cultures*, and Michel Foucault’s *Insurrection of Subjugated Knowledges*. This section aims to answer: How have these two universities addressed the division between philosophy and science, and how have they stimulated an enterprise within the philosophical discipline? The second section discusses the conceptual framework from Decolonial Theory, such as post-continental philosophy, interculturality, and pluriversity among the works of decolonial theorists and philosophers including Enrique Dussel, Walter Mignolo, and Nelson-Maldonado Torres. How can universities recognize and legitimize diverse philosophies and promote inclusion in the philosophical curriculum? What are the conflicts of contemporary philosophy’s intent and function? These central research questions within the framework of the Frankfurt School and Critical Theory as well as Decolonial Theory open a dialogue among scholars that have contemplated these questions during their circumstance and are still relevant and called into question today. This thesis is best situated amid the issue of *Human Architecture: Journal of the Sociology of Self-Knowledge*, entitled “Decolonizing the University, Practicing Pluriversity” which includes papers and case studies that address the possibility of the decolonial Westernized university and look for alternative efforts from theoretical concepts and concrete examples of a pluriversal
The concepts and ideas discussed in this chapter offer alternatives for the problematic hosted throughout this thesis. To understand these theoretical elements, a descriptive analysis of each university and philosophy department follows.

Chapter Two is a historical analysis of UNAM and UCSD along with their respective philosophy departments based on three themes of political and philosophical involvement: 1) national and administrative interests that affect each university and knowledge production, 2) political and educational tensions that are reflected in each philosophy department, 3) student body and faculty that undergo and may or may not respond to these elements in their philosophical research interests. The consideration of these themes clarifies the research goals of each university, philosophy department, as well as the philosophical trends and project each university is intent on fulfilling.

Chapter Three investigates the philosophy curriculum and knowledge productions of each philosophy department. How does each institution determine philosophy as a field of study? What is the function of philosophy itself at an institutional level? Exploring both philosophy department’s focus, courses and reading materials available, along with faculty research interests provides a comparable detailed analysis of material to assess the philosophical priorities of each institution and provides insight on faculty and student knowledge productions. The unique character of each philosophy department and university

---

reveals the advancements, whether political or technological, that guide and exhibit the disparities and philosophical responsibilities each department is intent on fulfilling. Each university defines philosophy as a field of study at their own standards and research; the result of this is each institution denies and recognizes certain philosophies and adheres to their own form and level of philosophical legitimization.

The legitimacy or illegitimacy of certain philosophies is problematic because the hierarchy of knowledge garners privilege from dominant knowledge forms, have greater influence, or benefit from the power structures of the academic institution and market. These tensions reveal how philosophy’s claim to knowledge is at the disadvantage of global regional areas that are not incorporated within the majority of American universities and their philosophy departments that result in marginalized philosophies. The broader implications of this study are representative of other philosophies and marginalized forms of knowledge that are considered illegitimate. The stakes include marginalization and segregation that result in an ignorant academic institution. I argue marginalized philosophies are at the expense of the hierarchy of knowledge and are negatively affecting individuals and philosophical study at large; therefore the creation of an inclusive philosophy curriculum is necessary. The possibility of opening a dialogue and exchange among philosophical knowledge productions should be offered and promoted as a course of study among global philosophies. The research objectives and purpose of this study is to call attention to the prevalence of these issues and contribute to an ongoing critique of the academic university within the field of
philosophy. The significance of this critique is for all individuals, especially those within academia or for those interested in pursuing philosophical academic interests. This study is useful for future philosophical research and academic curricular planning for issues within marginal, illegitimated, and ignored philosophical knowledge forms. Contemplating UNAM and UCSD in particular is due to my awareness, experience, and consciousness of these themes accompanied by the motive to promote a discussion among scholars and individuals willing to listen. The interpretation at a micro level allows for an in-depth discussion of the particular stakes within these institutions and the cultures that propel them. Based on my research, the lasting value of this thesis illuminates an academic truth of the academic market’s encouragement and neglect that is at the disadvantage of knowledge and truth.
Chapter 1. Theoretical Framework

The university is an enterprise of knowledge, and the instruction of philosophy as a business market is problematic; taking this factor aside, what remains is the polemic of legitimacy on what the university market should or should not sell. The triad relationship among the nation, academic market, and knowledge production reveal the historical trajectories that shape universities and their respective philosophy departments. This chapter presents this relationship and theorizes over the resulting tensions within each philosophy department, university, and among UNAM and UCSD’s relation to each other. Ultimately, the central theme along this chapter and thesis links how universities reflect and refract knowledge productions within contradictory and conflicting demands among the nation, market, and notion of national or public good.

The Frankfurt School and Critical Theory as well as Decolonial Theory provide the theoretical framework for this study. Although not all theorists and philosophers mentioned may be considered exclusive members to either theoretical school or practice, this thesis is best situated along the lines of these theoretical traditions. Herbert Marcuse, C.P. Snow, and Michel Foucault respond to a unique set of problems that provide diverse versions of the same analysis. Herbert Marcuse, a member of the Frankfurt School and Critical Theory, provides perspective on the relationship between technology, society, and culture. His one-dimensional man is considered in terms of a multi-dimensional university and the possibility of holding multiple philosophical perspectives among universities,
such as UNAM and UCSD.\(^2\) To garner a multi-dimensional university, the stark differences between the two universities, such as the treatment of philosophy, science, and technology are elaborated. How have these two universities addressed the division between philosophy and science? How have they stimulated an enterprise within the philosophical discipline? C.P. Snow’s lecture on *The Two Cultures* reveals tensions among philosophy and the sciences have traditional disciplinary antecedents.\(^3\) Considering each university’s national character, academic market, and knowledge production in relevance to these theorists work, exposes how each university prioritizes a particular set of political beliefs and philosophical undertakings through their historical and curricular elements. Each university, philosophy department, and nation share and reject elements that link and distance each other to produce historical events and knowledge productions that are inherent in these structures and are simultaneously relative to their development that are in conjunction of a comparable investigation. Essentially, each university defines philosophy as a field of study at their own standards and research; the result of this is each institution denies and recognizes certain philosophies and adheres to their own form and level of philosophical legitimation. Michel Foucault’s *insurrection of subjugated knowledges* clarifies this central issue on subjugated philosophies that are discredited in the hierarchy of knowledges and segues into the next section on


decolonial theory. This matter begs the question: How can universities recognize and legitimize diverse philosophies and promote inclusion in the philosophical curriculum?

The second section on decolonial theory alters and advances the critique against academia from the first section by providing insight onto this polemic where decolonial theorists and philosophers have already contributed to greatly, but remains an issue, and is continued with my elaboration and intervention. The concepts of post-continental philosophy, interculturality, and pluriversity within a decolonial conceptual framework progress the Frankfurt school’s findings within the university setting, and maintain Marcuse’s contribution of a one-dimensional society and multi-dimensional university that situate this thesis. The above concepts are stimulated by decolonial theorists and philosophers, such as Enrique Dussel, Walter Mignolo, and Nelson-Maldonado Torres, that advocate a multidimensional conversation and exchange among philosophers of all ethnicities and geographic locations. In doing so, a pluriversity instead of a university would be stimulated, where a philosophy that rejects continental divisions creates a post-continental philosophy of unique and equal value that are taught in the university curriculum and are accessible for all. My conclusions are shaped by tracing historical events, curricular analysis, informal discussions with students, faculty, and staff from each university that hold no scientific value, however capture empirical ethnography about ideas on their respective university.

---

and ethnographic experiences to understand the knowledge productions and priorities surrounding UNAM and UCSD, along with their respective philosophy departments.

1.1 Frankfurt School and Critical Theory: the nation, academic market, and knowledge production

A general question the Frankfurt school addresses is, “What precisely has gone wrong in Western civilization that at the very height of technical progress we see the negation of human progress; (such as) dehumanization?” Max Horkheimer and Theodor W. Adorno argued the constant reproduction of technology and science as an instrument of dominant rational administration, in which the project of “enlightenment becomes wholesale deception of the masses.” Herbert Marcuse contributes the theory of social change to Horkheimer and Adorno’s Dialectic of Enlightenment (1947), which criticizes the infallibility of science by arguing the Enlightenment is not all encompassing nor all knowing. Marcuse, a member of the Frankfurt school of philosophy and professor emeritus from UCSD’s philosophy department (1965-1979) integrates philosophy, social theory, and politics throughout his work. He provides a dialectical text, which contrasts one-dimensional thought with multidimensional possibilities and behavior. His multidimensional person represents freedom, creativity, and a

---

6 Ibid., 42.
variety of perspectives that contrast with a one-dimensional perspective, which
dominates and absorbs spheres of society.

According to Marcuse, the inherited material of intellectual cultures is
organized by dominant interests that anticipate possibilities of transforming and
utilizing its institutions to fulfill the exclusivity and possibilities of society’s
development as a whole. “In the medium of technology, culture, and politics, and
the economy merge into an omnipresent system which swallows up or repulses all
alternatives. The productivity and growth potential of this system stabilize the
society and contain technical progress within the framework of domination…the
historical achievement of science and technology has rendered possible the
translation of values into technical tasks—the materialization of values. Technological rationality has become political rationality.”

Marcuse’s one-dimensional critique clearly warns us of the dangers in
creating what one might call a “one-dimensional university.” Marcuse viewed
technology as a destructive repetition of mental autonomy. “Even in its less
extreme use, constant repetition, imposed upon more or less captive audiences,
may be destructive: destroying mental autonomy, freedom of thought,
responsibility and conducive to inertia, submission, rejection of change. The
established society, the master of repetition, becomes the great reduction of
tension is one of high and not very satisfactory sublimation: it does not lead to an

---

9 Ibid., 232.
10 Ibid., xlviii.
instinctual nirvana of satisfaction.”¹¹ The products of technology are created and tailored from a specific reality that may not be conducive or relevant to all.

“Today domination perpetuates and extends itself not only through technology but as technology, and the latter provides the great legitimation of the expanding political power, which absorbs all spheres of culture.”¹² Considering Marcuse’s one-dimensional man and his view on technology, his perspective relates to our discussion in understanding the treatment of philosophy and the sciences with technology’s rising utilization and research within the university. Although one may argue the two disciplines between the humanities and the sciences are stagnantly in juxtaposition, the integration of research among both has become widespread within universities.

The division between the humanities and the sciences is worth considering when questioning the tensions between philosophy and the sciences or two universities such as UNAM and UCSD. C.P. Snow, a contemporary of Marcuse’s, defined culture anthropologically as a group of individuals that live in a similar community or environment whose “harmonious development of those qualities and faculties which characterise our humanity.”¹³ He promoted dialogue among the two cultures of the humanities and sciences and concluded that education should promote the knowledge of both shared cultures.¹⁴ The divide and issue Snow articulated of the significance of the “two cultures”—that is how far

¹⁴ Ibid., 100.
humanists in philosophy should consider the professional activity of chemists or biologists is not less urgent nor less relevant today as it was when originally written in 1959. “Division of disciplines, feelings/relations of superiority between disciplines, science, humanities, universities, should be seen as problems and shouldn’t be fatalistically determined.” Snow designated the origin of the division between the two cultures as originating from “a distinctive development of the social institutions within which education and research were carried on.” One can clearly see how the disciplinary divisions between the humanities and sciences are based on European antecedents, are still prevalent in the modern university model, and result in tensions among knowledge productions in philosophy departments.

How have the two universities under study addressed the division between philosophy and science? How have they stimulated an enterprise within the philosophical discipline? Interdisciplinary and sub-disciplinary growth has altered traditional disciplinary empires into shared disciplines and methods producing crisscrossing results that stimulate networks of alliance to form innovative creations.

Taking ‘scientific research’ in its broadest sense, one has to acknowledge a preponderant American presence: in 1984 one commentator calculated that ‘half of the Western world’s research and development is carried out in the United States which…spends more money on science than Japan and the industrialised nations of Europe combined’. Furthermore, an increasing proportion of this ‘research’ (much of which, of course, is not basic science’ is carried on in laboratories funded directly or indirectly by private industry,

---

15 Ibid., lxi.
16 Ibid., xi.
and even where this is not apparent we need to recognise ‘the dominant role of the private sector in setting the agenda for the public funding of science.’

The US is a leading figure in funding scientific research, besides being the largest producer of scientific knowledge production and determining which research areas or emphasis are worth researching, foreign countries are dependent on the resulting research and products. The requirement of English fluency to upkeep with scientific discoveries across countries is also dependent on other non-US countries for the technological import from the US. If “closing the gap between cultures is a necessity intellectually and in practicality,” what are the ramifications of disregarding this necessity? The socio-cultural and political philosophical undertakings at UNAM are responding to academic demands by adopting and depending on foreign techno-scientific philosophical currents, similar to the scientific shift at UCSD’s philosophy department in the recruitment of faculty researching philosophy of the sciences. A shift toward scientific philosophy at the rate of UCSD’s philosophy department is improbable for UNAM, although the continual dependency on this foreign knowledge production is likely. As innovators in the philosophy of the sciences, UCSD does not borrow from external knowledge powers on this philosophical current, however since the department is largely focused on this scientific field, other currents such as socio-

---

17 Ibid., lxxv.
18 Ibid., 50.
cultural philosophies have not developed at equal rates creating a gap in this knowledge production.

The relationship among the state, market, and nation are stimulated by the academic market and scientific industry that demand technological innovations to receive funding and concurrently maintain their prestigious status among global universities. UCSD’s social prestige is granted through its scientific research and through its academic productivity. Research institutions such as UCSD demand that faculty place a premium on avant-garde knowledge production, and the professors instill this ethic upon the graduate students, who upon graduation may carry forth that academic chain. The university’s techno-scientific emphasis and its research in the philosophy of the sciences create products that bring public recognition and patronage to the university. The economic and social powers constituted by funding from external sources and produced techno-scientific innovations are academically reputable as well as socially formidable for technology at large. Economic funding for scientific research in the department stimulates knowledge production in the philosophy of the sciences. Although the department's original focus was the philosophy of history and political philosophy, the scientific epistemic priority advocated by the university deans and department itself is epitomized by the adoption of the philosophy of the sciences. The philosophy department was responsive through faculty participation to political events and protests during the first decade of the department in 1960, but this political engagement has dwindled since then. Instead, departmental attention and priority has deliberately been allocated to the development of the philosophy
of the sciences. The department, which is made up of the higher-ranking faculty conduct this disregarding the socio-political and cultural circumstances affecting departmental knowledge production, and more importantly ignore its impact on student interests. The economic and social powers within UCSD's philosophy department and university affect the field of philosophy as well as scholars both receiving and partaking in this knowledge production. Along with pressures to contribute to the scientific enterprise, scholars that abide by these scientific currents are regarded as innovators in the academic business market. UCSD’s socio-economic powers and epistemic influence are not only unique to the patrons and consumers of its knowledge production, but also the greater innovative contributions for the philosophical discipline.

The knowledge productions of each university also provide insight into the peripheral limits and ignored areas by UNAM and UCSD and their philosophy departments. UNAM's emphases in socio-cultural powers have created a specific knowledge production representative of the nation, university, and student body. UNAM has also inherited the dependency on scientific knowledge production, such as the philosophy of the sciences from foreign powers. UCSD's socio-economic powers have affected the philosophy department's knowledge production and have deviated from the original political philosophical currents at its inception; in effect, there remains a space that is directly responsive to events and demands that are socio-political and cultural in nature that revolve around circumstances surrounding UCSD. UNAM maintains its socio-political and cultural emphasis in their philosophy department in addition to incorporating
philosophy of the sciences. UCSD prioritizes the philosophy of the sciences meanwhile the history of philosophy along with political philosophy is not of equal importance for the department. UCSD’s philosophy department chair along with an external review committee recognized the legitimacy in the shift toward the philosophy of the sciences for the rise in techno-scientific research held inevitable prospects. Philosophy of the sciences has now been incorporated in UNAM’s curricula, although the philosophy department has not entirely changed their research focus. Each university and department sustains their powers through knowledge production, which affects their research priorities and incentives. This results in the denial and recognition each university upholds along with certain philosophical priorities, which adhere to their own form and level of philosophical legitimacy and denial.

The forms of institutionalization, that is the hierarchical structures and the distribution of all power relations in a given social unit, are evident in the scholarly customs and traditions of each philosophy department and the cultural prestige given to the type of knowledge production performed by its scholars. These forms of power provide insight into the power relations that regulate and stimulate each university’s market and national tendencies. The power relations that make the possibilities for certain knowledges to be produced or repressed are featured in each philosophy department. Fundamentally, as the university and their disciplines mature they must continuously become responsive to student

---

20 Letter written by Georgios Anagnostopoulos, Philosophy Department Chair on April 21, 1986 to Harold Ticho, Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs. Dean of Arts and Humanities Records: Philosophy. UCSD: Special Collections, La Jolla. 6 May 2015.
interests and needs, otherwise the danger of becoming stagnant in curricular and epistemological practices provokes the university to take the position of dictating knowledge.

Michel Foucault elucidates the matter of dictating knowledge and subjugated philosophies in what he calls an “insurrection of subjugated knowledges” as meaning two things: First, historical contents which have been “buried and disguised in a functionalist coherence or formal systemization…Subjugated knowledges are thus those blocs of historical knowledge which were present but disguised within the body of functionalist and systematizing theory and which criticism—which obviously draw upon scholarship—has been able to reveal.”\textsuperscript{21} Second, subjugated knowledges consist of a “whole set of knowledges that have been disqualified as inadequate to their task or insufficiently elaborated: naïve knowledges, located low down on the hierarchy…as low-ranking knowledges.” He explains these knowledges may involve a local, regional, or particular knowledge that is not commonsense knowledge to all; “…through the re-appearance of this knowledge, of these local popular knowledges, these disqualified knowledges, that criticism performs its work.”\textsuperscript{22} An example of this is Mexican philosophy’s specific knowledge that is political and responsive to the state.\textsuperscript{23} “…the products of meticulous, erudite, exact historical knowledge, and on the other hand local and specific knowledges, which have no common meaning and which are in some fashion allowed to fall

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}
\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{22} Ibid., 82.
\end{flushright}
\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{23} elaborated on see Chapter 3.1
\end{flushright}
into disuse whenever they are not effectively and explicitly maintained in themselves. Well, it seems to me that our critical discourses of the last fifteen years have in effect discovered their essential force in this association between the buried knowledges of erudition and those disqualified from the hierarchy of knowledges and sciences.”

Mexican philosophy may be neglected outside of Mexico because of its local and practical philosophical subject on the nation and its political events, and as a result plenty of this knowledge production has been “disqualified” from the hierarchy of knowledges by US academia. To scrutinize the issue, why would a foreign country care to philosophize over a local philosophical knowledge production, such as Mexico’s? Although one may argue the locality of Mexican philosophy is detrimental to the philosophical development of Mexico, it is in itself a de-colonial philosophy that separates itself from imperial knowledge and rejects the imperial agenda. Foucault claims these subjugated knowledges are concerned with a “historical knowledge of struggles” that responds to hostile encounters that have been confined to the margins of knowledge. “…the claim that knowledge-making for well being rather than for controlling and managing populations for imperial interest shall come from local experiences and needs, rather than from local imperial experiences and needs projected to the globe, invokes also the body-politics of knowledge…De-colonial thinking presupposes de-linking (epistemically and politically) from the web of imperial knowledge (theo- and ego-politically grounded) from disciplinary

---

24 Ibid.
management.” Since a grand portion of these subjugated knowledges and philosophies are discredited in the hierarchy of knowledges, what theories and concepts can be applied to stimulate a conversation and situate these questions? How can universities recognize and legitimize diverse philosophies and promote inclusion in the philosophical curriculum? This form of inclusion should be a philosophical priority for all individuals, principally within a university’s philosophy department where philosophical findings and resources need to be capable of a multidimensional perspective and university. Foucault’s analysis highlights a problematic that segues into the next section on decolonial theory.

1.2 Decolonial Theory: Post-continental philosophy, interculturality, and pluriversity

The concepts of post-continental philosophy, interculturality, and pluriversity within a decolonial framework advance the Frankfurt school’s findings within the university setting, and continue Marcuse’s contribution of one-dimensional society and university that situate this thesis. “For decolonial thought there is no single epistemology that can claim a monopoly over critical thinking on the planet as imperialism has sought to do for Western thought in the last 500 years of the world-system.”

Decolonial theorists and philosophers, such as Enrique Dussel, Nelson Maldonado-Torres, and Walter Mignolo, have


recognized the need for a critical intervention that seeks the production and stimulation of questions and concerns on a variety of continents and their respective philosophical theories.

Post-continental philosophy attempts to renew thought after suspending the honor of the Eurocentric philosophies of history and common sense which tend to shape academic training. In this sense, it is, or at least aims to be decidedly post-Eurocentric. It takes as its priority, not the nation or the continent, but questions of identity, liberation, and epistemic decolonization. Post-continental philosophy became more visible and gained strength when Europe began to decline in the twentieth century. This decline, which had its climax in the Second World War and the struggles for decolonization in now its former colonies, intensified the disenchantment with Europe that was on-going since at least the sixteenth century—particularly in colonized and racialized communities.  

Decolonial ethics, politics, and theory are prioritized within this framework to better understand the lived realities along with the existential and epistemological significance of these designations and experiences. “In short, post-continental philosophy focuses on the description and critical analysis of manifold forms of normativity (racial/sexual/gender/spatial/spiritual/aesthetic/temporal/epistemic/economic/etc.), on the one hand, and on the study of socially produced liminality and the challenges as well as possibilities for transformation that are found in such a space, on the other.”  

The contribution of all cultures, continents, and ethnicities are essential to create the manifold sources and possibilities of decolonization.


28 Ibid.
To stimulate post-continental philosophy, an intercultural dialogue is necessary, that is a symmetrical form of communicative exchange not only among academics or institutionally-dominant worlds, but all individuals.\textsuperscript{29} This dialogue not only promotes a discussion among cultures, but a self-criticism and reflection within one’s traditions and assumptions to re-create their cultures from critical assumptions to be understood from a traditional perspective and globalizing modernity. All continents should contribute a South-South and North-South dialogue that is not limited to what are considered peripheral countries. An intercultural dialogue stimulates the consciousness of many universalities that put forward positive elements of modernity to create a valuable globalized unity.

Post-continental philosophy with an intercultural dialogue promotes a pluriversity, which promotes multiple perspectives for the university model in contrast to a sole model. Decolonial theorists propose the pluriversity as an alternative to the universally presumed Euro-centric epistemic model that is “based on the presumption of a Eurocentric epistemic canon that attributes truth only to the Western way of knowledge production at the expense of disregarding “other” epistemic traditions.”\textsuperscript{30} Pluriversity involves not only applying non-Eurocentric university models to a Euro-centric epistemic model or running the university to function with academic and industrial interests with privatized models of academic capitalism, rather “involving epistemic pluriversity as the


guiding and foundational premise of a vision of what an alternative institution of
knowledge production especially in the age of globalization may be.”

The construction of “pluriverses” of meaning by taking seriously
the knowledge production of “non-Western” critical traditions and
genealogies of thought would imply a refounding of the Western
university. There are social scientists and humanists in many parts
of the world who, because of epistemic racism/sexism, are silenced
or ignored or inferiorized by the canon of Western male tradition
of thought, that is, the foundational authors of all the major
disciplines in Westernized universities. Reforming the university
with the aim of creating a less provincial and more open critical
cosmopolitan pluriversalism would involve a radical re-founding
of our ways of thinking and a transcendence of our disciplinary
divisions.”

Advancing what Marcuse called a one-dimensional man/society to a one-
dimensional university, the critical process of pluriversal universities must
incorporate horizontal dialogues, otherwise the different traditions of thought will
continuously be sublimated or ignored. Although this utopic vision of a
pluriversal academia provides a stimulating alternative, its effectiveness and
strategies have not been executed completely. Several theorists, however, have
contributed case studies and theoretical findings to contribute and stimulate a
pluriversal university and dialogue for possibilities, such as Human Architecture:
Journal of the Sociology of Self-Knowledge, Decolonizing the University:
Practicing Pluriversity.\textsuperscript{33}

\textsuperscript{31} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{32} Boidin, Capucine, Cohen James, and Grosfoguel, Ramón. “Introduction: From University to
Pluriversity: A Decolonial Approach to the Present Crisis of Western Universities.” Human
2015.
\textsuperscript{33} “The aim of the conference was to think about what it could mean to decolonize the
Westernized university and its Eurocentric knowledge structures. The articles in this volume are,
in one way or another, decolonial interventions in the rethinking and decolonization of academic
knowledge production and Western university structures.” Tamdgidi, Mohammad H. "Editor's
Fundamentally, the market-oriented university and research priorities are based on market needs; analyzing the academic differences prevalent in specific universities, such as UNAM and UCSD enables a profound understanding of the university’s status today. If the Eurocentric university is taken as the normality or innovator when compared to other universities, the disciplinary divisions and hierarchy of knowledges will continue to exist. “Any critical thinking or social scientific development produced by and from a non-Westernized perspective/epistemic location is inferiorized, received with suspicion and considered as not serious or not worthy of being read in the Westernized university. We find the same structure of knowledge in Westernized universities every-where in the world, no matter where they are located.”

The potential of non-Western epistemologies, intercultural dialogue, post-continental philosophy are threatened by the monoepistemic Eurocentric fundamentalist framework. The two philosophical enterprises concerning knowledge production and its fields of application integrated within the university and nation propelled by unique elements that are particular to the cultural, social, and economic powers create a dynamic particular to each population and philosophical undertakings. Philosophy’s relation to the academic market at UNAM is of a national cultural character that probes questions and issues related to autonomous struggles and

political events. The participation of philosophy in political struggles shapes the goal of UNAM’s philosophy department and curriculum to better articulate and expand these issues surrounding national struggles. Meanwhile, philosophy’s relation to the academic market at UCSD fetishizes techno-scientific innovations that respond to the university’s priorities along with national economic interests. UCSD’s participation of philosophy in political struggles is of a different element when compared to that of UNAM’s. Instead of philosophical undertakings that are reactionary to political events, UCSD politicizes its philosophical research in scientific maneuvers that prioritize and apply an idealized universal subject that assumes the disposability of techno-scientific resources for all. The strengths of one department are the weaknesses of the other. The two philosophical foci of each university are representative of their national and academic market interests that make their philosophical knowledge productions complementary to create an inclusive curriculum and philosophical undertaking that are emblematic of a potential inter-cultural dialogue.
Chapter 2. Historical comparison of UNAM and UCSD

UNAM and UCSD’s historical analysis consists of tracing essential political events and educative changes that are representative and characteristic of each university and philosophy department. The deliberation of each university’s historical context is telling of its philosophical basis as an institution, department, and national community. UNAM has a complex and colossal history that offers substantial modes and perspectives of analysis, such as the university’s embeddedness and participation with Mexico’s social, political, and educational developments. The historical analysis presented here highlights political movements and signifies the establishment of historical milestones to gain an understanding of UNAM and its national impact as a university. Informal discussions with students and faculty both currently enrolled at UNAM, UNAM alumni who presently reside at UCSD, as well as historical texts and documents on UNAM give direction to its historical analysis and the philosophy department’s value to the university.

UCSD’s history is congruent to scientific advances spearheading the technological age. Main points stressed in UCSD’s context include its creation with a scientific focus, emphasis on the political upheavals linked to ethnic debates among students, faculty, and the La Jolla community, and the foundation of the humanities, particularly the philosophy department. These events provide insight into the university climate today and contribute to an overarching commentary on the university and humanities. An Improbable Venture: A History of the University of California, San Diego written by Nancy Scott Anderson was
commissioned by UCSD whose notes serve as the university’s unofficial archive. Anderson provides a brief historical overview and illustrates the intended image the university favors. Along with *Improbable Venture*, archival investigations, discussions with and texts written by past and current UCSD professors guide the historical analysis for this section.

This chapter maps the historical trajectory of each university while stressing key events and factors to create a comprehensive and comparative understanding of these universities and their relationship to each other. UNAM and UCSD are based on different university models: UNAM models after the European university and UCSD models after the American university. Examining UNAM’s history in its entirety in section one simultaneously provides insight into the development of the philosophy department. In the second section, UCSD’s history examines the university’s foundational history, the philosophy department, followed by an elaboration on Third College and the core issues surrounding UCSD and its philosophical development. The third section unites three central tying factors of political and philosophical involvement that shape what UNAM and UCSD have become today, as well as provide main determinants of individual philosophy departments including: 1) national and administrative interests that affect each university and knowledge production, 2) political and educational tensions that are reflected in each philosophy department, 3) student body and faculty that undergo and may or may not respond to these elements in their philosophical research interests. Considering these themes illuminates the research goals of each university, philosophy department, as well as the
philosophical trends and project each university is intent on fulfilling. The historical background and central themes expressed in this chapter are crucial to grasp a comprehensive comparative analysis for this thesis, which scaffolds the context for the following chapter that examines the curricular elements of each philosophy department.

2.1 UNAM: *Por mi raza hablará el espíritu* (Through my race speaks my spirit)

As of 2015, UNAM has 11,984 full time professors and over 342,541 students mostly originating from Mexico City.\(^{35}\) UNAM is considered the “most important cultural project of the country in the 20th century…and has contributed to the comprehension and recreation of our history.”\(^{36}\) The role of philosophy, politics, and educational reforms are significant aspects in understanding the historical foundation of UNAM. Student and faculty political engagements have been conventional for the university since its establishment. The classical humanities reside in medieval structural molds of the university that today still revolve around the elite public or upper social classes that maintain the status quo. In contrast, UNAM’s philosophy instruction reveals historically progressive trends of its educative ideologies that are crucial to the university. In this section I analyze UNAM’s fundamental structural evolution, including its reformations and adaptions most relevant to this thesis. I do not intend to historicize the complex relationship between UNAM and the state, but indicate pivotal markers of this


relationship that signal and define the university and provide insight into the philosophy department today.

A Royal Decree signed by Charles I of Spain founded the Real y Pontificia Universidad de México on September 21, 1551. Real university prepared students for scholastic thought and dogmatic Roman Catholic religious teachings.\textsuperscript{37} Theology, writing, law, rhetoric, and grammar were first taught on June 3, 1553.\textsuperscript{38} The aim of fomenting university learning was centered upon: “The clergy’s objective for Spanish colonial university desired to maintain and expand traditional dogmatic scholastic education that it had for three decades; to maintain cultural hegemony and guarantee domination over society.”\textsuperscript{39} This initial purpose of the university contrasts future autonomous and liberal ideologies that shape the university and student body that are integral to UNAM’s pivotal characteristic.

Unlike other Spanish medieval universities, Real had several political and religious disruptions that affected its ability to evolve scientific innovations at the equal rate of its European counterparts. In 1867, Benito Juarez and his dominant Liberal Party closed the university.\textsuperscript{40} Juarez’s main pedagogical principal interest was the creation of la Ley Organica de Instruccion Publica para el Distrito Federal, which made public elementary and middle school compulsory by the

\textsuperscript{37} Ibid., 85.
\textsuperscript{38} Ibid., 391.
\textsuperscript{40} “Antecedentes ENP.” Dirección General de la Escuela Nacional Preparatoria. UNAM, 2011. Web. 28 Sept. 2015.
government. The resulting ley organica sought to reorganize Mexico's educational system in its entirety, in order to restructure Mexican society and civilization itself. The Liberal counter view to Real university’s ideologies promoted an ideal non-dogmatic education to create inquiry and exploration among youth. New objectives included questioning the clergy to gain educative space, as well as develop a counter-culture and a novel global conception that would be indispensable. Positivism replaced the clergy with the new social order that was influential for the university’s renewal. Positivism had a significant impact on Latin America during the latter 1800s, especially in Mexico. Based on Auguste Comte’s philosophy, positivism replaces metaphysics and theology with the scientific method and the validity of knowledge with science. “Latin American intellectuals widely adapted the European philosophy of positivism in keeping with the demands of their own social and political contexts, effectively making positivism the second most important philosophical tradition in the history of Latin America, after scholasticism.” Similar to several philosophical currents, Latin American positivism is different from European positivism; variations between individual Latin American countries also exist. Essentially, individuals behind positivism in Mexico were officials and scholars that strongly impacted

the country’s education and political climate upholding this philosophical current; the following discussion of Justo Sierra elucidates this point.

Philosophical currents and ideologies mirror changes in the university’s political administration and structural developments. Key figures in the university’s evolution were also national influential representatives that reflect philosophical principles for UNAM’s philosophy department. Founded in its modern form on September 22nd, 1910 by Justo Sierra, who was minister of education under the government of Porfirio Díaz, the National Autonomous University intended to overhaul higher education in Mexico while upholding dominant Mexican Liberalism. In Sierra’s famous inauguration he advocated pedagogy different from previous colonial structures and promoted a model of Mexican thought original to that of its students and culture. To Sierra, the Real university in its then-current form had no original intellectual Mexican thought, and instead only regurgitated arguments made by archbishops and viceroyos. He acknowledged and paid tribute to the University of California school system heralding its openness to new currents of inquiry and vast advancements that were also objectives for Sierra’s ideal university.\(^{45}\) He also advertised the necessity of having nothing in common with the previous colonial university by turning away from religious doctrine while designating the ideal politic as a democratic and liberal attitude adopting positivism as a philosophical basis. With religious inclinations, Sierra stressed that initial philosophy courses should focus on the

history of philosophy, positivist European philosophy, and metaphysical philosophy.

Sierra was a strong advocate for Mexican positivism in education and was a member of Díaz’ científicos, which were a group of officials and intellectual followers of Gabino Barreda, led by Minister of Finance José Ives Limantour abdicating Porfirio Díaz’s forty year ruling (1876-1911).\(^4^6\) The goal of the científicos was to produce pragmatic professionals rather than construct social understandings through education. Yet as one critic observed, “Positivism was Díaz’s ideology because it allowed him to become more dictatorial while hiding it under economic optimism and the prospering of Mexico as a country, but it denied the poor and uneducated any chance of improvement.”\(^4^7\) Sierra’s racial segregating inclinations are also evident in his promotion for positivism under the Porfiriato with a modernizing rationale: for Sierra, positivism was worthwhile for the sake of development, such as seeing the bourgeois mestizos as the saviors of development, meanwhile considering the indios (indigenous Mexicans) and criollos (direct descendants of Spaniards) as backwards. Leopoldo Zea, one of the most renowned Mexican philosophers, argued the Mexican bourgeoisie used positivism as an ideology to maintain colonial forms of oppression while simultaneously creating new ones.\(^4^8\) The anti-positivist turn started in the 1900s.


This new trend inhabited an anti-positivist attitude in nature and aimed to distance itself from positivism, although positivism’s influence still remained.\(^{49}\) Antonio Caso (philosopher and university rector) and José Vasconcelos (philosopher and politician) sought to separate themselves from positivism, similar to the ateneístas that in striving to escape their early philosophical training from positivism, initiated a new period in history for philosophical ideas in Mexico.\(^{50}\) This revival of Mexican culture would be based on the humanities that are contrary to scientific and positivistic ideologies.

Beyond acknowledging the university’s philosophical antecedents, student movements and political activity play a crucial role in the development of the philosophy discipline; therefore an analysis of key socio-political insurrections and their philosophical basis is necessary. Since the early 1900s student movements have played a significant role in defining UNAM. As a result from state pressures attempting to incorporate the university under its agenda of transformative measures, historians claim the years with most conflict between the university and the state were between the 1920s and 1940s, specifically 1912, 1917, 1923, 1925, 1929, and 1933.\(^{51}\) Rural education expanded and became a vehicle for the Mexican Revolution (1910-1920) by instilling the revolution’s liberating ideals through education.\(^{52}\) In 1929, students went on strike after a new


\(^{52}\) Ibid., 17.
requirement evaluating students on their performance and educational plan was created by university administrators. Contrary to educational objectives, external evaluative mechanisms inhabit a “social filter to eliminate children from unfavorable families from superior education.” Law students got involved after being unable to either have a dialogue with the university’s administrators or come to an agreement on new evaluative measures. Students published a manifesto and an ultimatum for university administrators to find a solution within 48 hours, however the administration did not come to an agreement. Some university professors protested and quit, and professors together with students from several other disciplines got involved throughout the university in response to police and fire department enforcement; this united front created a camaraderie among students and faculty that is representative of the political responsibility inhabited at UNAM. The implication of having an autonomous university is having autonomous individuals constituting that university to maintain its autonomy. The students and faculty that sought autonomy over university policies and curricula continued to strike until May 28, 1929, where a consensus from the university administrators for the university’s autonomy was declared.

The experience of student strikes and protests created the realization, consciousness, and impact of their role as students who were part of an institution.

La ley organica, also known as Ley Bassols, first published on July 10th, 1929 in

54 Rodríguez-Gómez, Roberto. El siglo de la UNAM. Vertientes ideológicas y políticas del cambio institucional (First ed). México: UNAM y Miguel Ángel Porrúa, 2013.
el Diario official became public and gave the university a cohesive autonomous goal, the separation from the state, and its own national character. The law was republished in 1933, and was rooted in dialectical materialism, the renouncement of capitalism; moreover, it contained a natural philosophy of its own. The move from positivism to Marxist educational ideology is evident and mirrored the national growing trend of revolutionary nationalism. The university’s professors debated and favored both the plurality of philosophical currents and a philosophical Marxist orientation. Promoted by Antonio Caso, the Marxian liberal socialist attitude became influential in defense of providing a free socialist education for all. A reorganizational educational plan was approved in 1935. Once again, a tumultuous period of strikes over differences between the government and scholars followed. President Lázaro Cárdenas (in office 1934-1940) imposed changes in education reform, which students and professors perceived as a threat to Ley Bassols, precipitating protests and strikes in 1937. Cárdenas agreed to establish the Instituto Politécnico Nacional in the same year to give students different options for higher education heavily inclined towards a scientifically based curriculum.55

Protests addressing political events, and national sentiments undeniably affected the university structure and educational developments. From 1940 to 1956 several protests from universities erupted around the country advocating for a halt to socialist education and a return to liberal education.56 The 1960s were

defined by a series of student movements around the country questioning the autocratic nature of the Mexican political system, which strongly affected the university. The student protests of 1968 are defined by a collective anti-authoritarian stance and resentment toward the government, which culminated with the Tlatelolco Student Massacre in the same year during which the National Guard machine-gunned more than 300 students and killed an undetermined number of others in Mexico City’s streets. The nation was responding with violence toward domination as a result of globalizing reforms and inaccessible education, especially due to the allocation of funds toward Mexico’s hosting of the summer Olympics. Eventually, university rectors approved a list of student demands after a tumultuous period of student movements and violence. The appraisal for political activism is a remarkable trait for the student body and philosophical responsibility for both students and faculty. Class-consciousness as well as radical and political influences became a tradition of protest that promoted a moral system of political support. One can see how, even today, UNAM students take political action earnestly and value the philosophical background and contributions belonging to the university’s past and present. With the government’s repression, the gulf separating the rich and poor, and the living memory of activists, students, and educators’ involvement in 1968, a vibrant tradition of protest at UNAM came to express the philosophical and political inclinations of the student body and faculty.

---

57 Ibid., 27-28.
During the 1970s industrialization and urbanization forced the university to provide education for the masses, especially in Mexico City. “Education programmed for the masses by economic and social power elites in Latin America correspond to fictionalized national concepts, an image reinforcing individualism and egoism; which in an abstract sense is separate from the historical and cultural reality.”  

For American universities this growth was easily accommodated in their structures, but for Mexico, the issue resided in higher student acceptance rates without developing proper constructs concurrently maintaining its traditional organizational structures.  

UNAM continued training professionals in law, accounting, and medicine to satisfy this demand, but there was a lack of professionals in the sciences and technology, such as biology, engineering, and chemistry. The university’s dependence on external knowledge in scientifically inclined disciplines was detrimental and inefficient for its prosperity. In the past, differences in industrial capitalism functioned as excluding segregators of social and economic classes. Throughout the course of time, aside from splendid scientific advancements, technology became an additional segregator by creating greater disparities and rifts between social classes. The dependence on foreign scientific advancements is presently evident in the adoption of the philosophy of the sciences in UNAM’s philosophy department.

---

60 Ibid., 44.
61 Ibid., 46.
In UNAM’s *Plan de Estudios*, philosophy is defined as an investigation over investigation to understand and explain cultural productions, such as art and morality. The university also characterizes philosophy as a discipline by its critical and rational analysis without dogmatic principles; therefore, this reflection is radical. This discipline exercises and promotes the development and capabilities of concepts and imaginative creations. It is critical and rational through its nature; philosophy has always contributed to understanding diverse practices of what it means to be human. The investigation of philosophy contributes to the strengthening of fundamental values of universal culture in Mexico and the profound comprehension of historical, social, and cultural processes. Although the *Facultad* was created in 1924, it was not until 1970 that the university offered master and doctorate degrees in philosophy. UNAM is the global leading research institution for Latin American Philosophy and inhabits a substantial authority on philosophical research in Latin America. At UNAM, Latin American Philosophy is understood as an engagement of critical philosophical thought and analysis on social, cultural, and/or political issues on Latin America or by someone with Latin American descent while providing possible solutions to enhance one’s understanding of our global reality.

We have seen how, throughout the 20th century the surge of Latin American philosophers were politically inclined and responsive to political events throughout Latin America. Since then, Latin American philosophy has been

---

defined as a political philosophy. Consistent with UNAM’s philosophical understanding, critical philosophy must question establishment; anti-dogmatism consists in radical inquiry because it does not accept any ethical, political, cultural, nor economic orthodoxy, which makes education relative to the humanities and social sciences because philosophical practice is essential to the critical investigation and outcome of these disciplines. UNAM’s student protests characterized a politically active student body; however several continuous protests with violent and catastrophic outcomes also suggests the political climate is not any idyllic narrative. Schools with industrial and technological delays teach students to respond to norms, requirements, and dates made significant by foreign countries belonging to their social classes that produce an ideological and marginalizing domination of the “best” schools and opportunities belonging to these advanced foreign countries. The national and administrative interests that shape the university and its knowledge production are evident in the political

63 The exemplar of this approach, Ezequiel A. Chávez (1868-1946) was Subsecretario de Instrucción Pública and Justo Sierra’s right hand. Chávez had studied law and became University president in 1923. He was originally an avid supporter of positivism, but after the Mexican revolution he strayed away from positivist ideals. In a letter written to constitutionalist Luis Cabrera on March 13, 1937 he wrote he had found a weakness within positivist philosophy. He changed his philosophical viewpoint to accommodate student interests and social responses. For Chávez, philosophy must be based on radical action, in pragmatic responsibility and compromise with society, la patria, and humanity as well as transformations of existential collective and social life. In 1945 Chávez was designated professor emeritus.

64 Magallón Anaya, Mario. Filósofos Mexicanos del Siglo XX: Historiografía Crítica Latinoamericana. Mexico City: UNAM, 2011. Print. 86. Throughout the 1960’s, three main philosophical currents prevailed: Latinamericanist philosophy that intended to defuse philosophical thought within Latin American and on issues pertaining to this region that were supported by Leopaldo Zea; analytical philosophy that intended to authenticate Latin American Philosophy and was reinforced by Luis Villoro; and philosophy of praxis that surged as a Marxist anti-Stalinist philosophy and was characterized by Adolfo Sánchez Vázquez. These ideas are discussed in greater detail in Chapter 3.

upheavals that stir activism from the student body and faculty. In response, the research interests and knowledge production of students and faculty affect their research interests and philosophical undertakings.

2.2 UCSD: *Fiat lux* (Let there be light)

UCSD was founded on November 16th, 1960 with the approval of the UC Regents board for a research institution and graduate program in science and technology.\(^6\) Initially, UCSD was established as a land-grant university that is an American university that was intended to be available for all citizens.\(^7\) Land-grants aimed to be anti-elitist until universities started performing “research,” that is innovations with the intention of producing material products which is indicative of UCSD’s evolution as a university.\(^8\) UCSD’s current student enrollment is 31,502 as of 2014\(^9\) with 1,011 full time faculty as of 2013.\(^10\) Research activity in the sciences has been integral to shaping the university’s academic focus since its establishment. Taking into account the communities surrounding UCSD and their socio-cultural interests is imperative for understanding the political disputes that the philosophy department, and to a greater extent the humanities are embedded with. Racial conflicts materialized during the allocation of UCSD’s inhabited property in La Jolla, which became the

---

first of many responses from the community toward the university climate that set
the tone for future protests.\textsuperscript{71}

As we will see in the following chapter, UCSD reflects the framework of
higher education in the United States, which is built around single-subject
departments that are hierarchical, conservative, and committed to preserving their
power and reproducing themselves by a system of apprenticeship with origins in
the middle ages. The prime concern of the research university is in the faculty it
attracts and the innovations produced by these recruitments; departmental and
student needs are secondary in precedence. Political agendas and economic
funding issues are driven by differences among the La Jolla community and the
university, as well as the humanists and the scientists. For example, ethnic divides
created differences with the La Jolla community following protests by students
and faculty against the US intervention in the Dominican Republic (1965-1966).
The mainly conservative atmosphere of the La Jolla community labeled the
university as fiercely radical although the majority of the university members
were not. The reality of campus relations among humanists and scientists differed
on the direction campus growth should take. The majority of scientists at the
university were apolitical, which stirred antipathy toward and from political

\textsuperscript{71} After several legal disputes and the renaming of the university from UC La Jolla to UC San
Diego, the university construction went underway. “The La Jolla Real Estate Brokers Association
(REBA) enforced restrictions in property deeds that denied residency in the village to all but white
Christians. Written in 1932, the language of the clauses was similar to that for a piece of property
adjacent to Scripps in La Jolla Shores stating no “part of said tract shall, at any time, be lived upon
by any person whose blood is not entirely that of the Caucasian race.” Anderson, Nancy Scott.\textit{An
Print.
activists that disrupted the university climate and brought to light issues that were not of great priority for research scientists.

Political occurrences during the 1950’s and 1960’s simultaneously stimulated and stunted growth for the university in terms of funding and prioritizing its scientific production. With the 1950’s military-industrial complex universities functioned not only as arenas of critical thought, but also as significant components of the state economic machine such as performing national security research during the cold war.⁷² Anderson claims after the 1960s the “university had outgrown its beginnings as a creature of the national and local military-industrial complex,” and after this turn of events, government funding for research in universities has been in decline causing universities to form private alliances with profit-seeking corporations. Therefore, the “privatization of the university became noticeable about the time the unrests of the 1960s began to subside” where the university looked to research funding from outside agencies, such as the government, industry, and foundations.⁷³ Thus, although the University of California is designated as “public,” it is semi-privatized where research areas such as computer software and engineering have been globally recognized. This recognition stimulates the administration’s priorities to the extent of being representative as a scientifically inclined research university.

The hiring of humanities and social sciences faculty members during the 1960s marked a new time for the university where departments other than the

⁷³ Ibid., XI and 211.
sciences were given attention and allocated funds. Initially, humanities recruiters hired the first candidates they received instead of sticking to an organizational timetable of hiring. This usually resulted in each department model being based on the subspecialties of these original faculty hires and creating distortions in departmental research interests. However, after student protests during the 1960s and 1970s, multiculturalism became naturalized and assimilated within the university system.\textsuperscript{74} As an outcome of this and in contrast to primary humanities recruiters, currently “Each department insists on preserving its [structural] autonomy [especially the humanities], like the neoliberal practice, it promotes self-interest…humanities is now a plurality of incommensurable autonomies.”\textsuperscript{75} Although departmental freedom was necessary for humanities disciplines to expand in their individual research tracks, the lack of unity linking the humanities was seen to be beneficial, especially when existing in a predominantly scientific university.

One may argue considering UCSD as the archetype of the top-tier American research university is misleading because most research funding is allocated to the sciences and engineering. In actuality, universities are not extraordinarily epistemically diverse from each other in course content and subject matter. Studies have found colleges differ in statistically small effects, are trivial in magnitude, and have similar results in student outcomes.\textsuperscript{76} The real

\textsuperscript{74} Ibid., 216.
\textsuperscript{75} Ibid.
differences are at the departmental and classroom level, in the courses offered and the faculty that teach them. Ultimately, UCSD epitomizes to what degree of severity research universities can become: a scientifically based university that prevails in the sciences and neglects the humanities as well as departmental and student needs. A detailed analysis of the philosophy department housed within UCSD, reveals the university’s priorities, as well as offers insight on how the university has handled and continues to respond to philosophical, ethnic, and racial conflicts throughout the years. A historical investigation of the philosophy department supplies an understanding of its knowledge production that responds to the university’s interests and the political and educational tensions among the student body and faculty, as well as influence the prosperity of other domains, such as Third College that responds to these issues.

The philosophy department initially determined that “the curriculum at both the undergraduate and graduate level is designed to emphasize the history of philosophy, political and social thought, and the widest possible variety of philosophical approaches. It is hoped thereby to provide students with a solid foundation and to encourage them to do independent, imaginative, mature, and self-critical work in philosophy.” Graduate instruction began in 1963 with authorization for its M.A. and Ph.D. programs in 1965. Undergraduate instruction

began in 1964 with the first admitted freshman class. Although the number of enrolled philosophy students eventually declined, in part because of the lack of state support for philosophy, the department faculty remains highly reputable and select. Richard Popkin (history of philosophy), Jason Saunders (classical Greek philosophy, social-political theory), and Avrum Stroll (contemporary theory of language and epistemology) founded the philosophy department on July 1, 1963. The history of philosophy as well as social and political philosophy were the main specialties of the department throughout the 1960s and 1970s. The founders and first hires of the department following the 1960s were politically active among the campus climate and aimed to create a politically responsive department. Although the department struggled in attracting students, it replicated the university’s elitist aims; hiring reputable scholars projected the image of a small but select faculty with hired members including Paul Henry, Herbert Marcuse, and William Bartley. For example, Popkin and Marcuse, along with other philosophy faculty, signed a telegram in January 1968 congratulating Japanese students who protested against the visit of the U.S. nuclear aircraft carrier Enterprise. Marcuse is a principle representative of the campus activism that brought attention to the university’s involvement in the arms race, domestic education, and corporate industry.

---

78 Ibid.
79 Ibid.
80 Ibid.
81 Interview with Dr. Roy Harvey Pearce, Department of Literature, University California, San Diego, August 21, 1984, Dr. Pearce’s Office, UCSD, Interviewer, Kathryn Ringrose. UCSD 25th Anniversary Oral Histories: Roy Harvey Pearce. UCSD: Special Collections, La Jolla. 6 May 2015.
Initially, philosophy faculty had a strong participatory presence in political protests on campus, however faculty activism declined in time with new philosophical research interests taking priority in the department. The first faculty hires, their research interests, and publications prove the early emphasis of the department on history of philosophy and social-political philosophy. These initial research interests changed in response to national and administrative interests. Positive outcomes of the shift toward the philosophy of the sciences propelled the philosophy department to become a leading research institution in this research area, however the repercussions of this brought impartiality to the development of other philosophical branches.

The departmental shift toward the philosophy and the sciences made its most substantial changes to its curriculum and faculty since the department’s inception. The first departmental phase with its specialties in the history of philosophy ended in 1969-1973 when nearly all of the initial faculty members had resigned or retired. The second phase would constitute their replacements and recruitment of faculty researching philosophy of the sciences.  

Departmental reviews recommended balancing the emphasis of the history of philosophy with philosophy of the sciences with the rationale that a shift toward a science focus would be a great asset for the department. The effort to develop a stronger emphasis on the philosophy of the sciences and philosophy of the mind resulted in

---

82 Letter to Stanley Chodorow, Dean of Arts and Humanities on May 14, 1986 from Georgios Anagnostopoulos, Subject: A Ten Year Development Plan for Philosophy. Dean of Arts and Humanities Records: Philosophy. UCSD: Special Collections, La Jolla. 6 May 2015.

83 Letter written by Georgios Anagnostopoulos, Philosophy Department Chair on April 21, 1986 to Harold Ticho, Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs. Dean of Arts and Humanities Records: Philosophy. UCSD: Special Collections, La Jolla. 6 May 2015.
several senior hires that eventually established an interdisciplinary Program in Science Studies with History, Sociology, and Philosophy.\textsuperscript{84} The department gained recognition in neurophilosophy and eventually became forerunners of this field with the faculty hires of Patricia and Paul Churchland in 1984.\textsuperscript{85}

The biggest moment of rupture demonstrating a new wave in the philosophical focus of the department from the previous founding philosophers is evident in the Churchland’s vigorous thesis on the defense of eliminative materialism.\textsuperscript{86} Essentially, Churchland argued for eliminative materialism, which argues common-sense psychology is false and instead favor a biological and neural explanation that reveal concrete evidence for mental states and brain functions. Simultaneously and ironically, the department was gaining recognition from new research on German idealism, which had been advocated by historical materialism that was implemented by Marcuse, Moore, and others.\textsuperscript{87} The department made space to house both philosophical specialties, despite the fact that there was no direct philosophical connection between the fields of historical and eliminative materialism.\textsuperscript{88}


\textsuperscript{85} Monte Johnson. “Chronology.” UC San Diego Philosophy Department Institutional Memory. UCSD. Web. 6 May 2015.


\textsuperscript{87} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{88} For example, Philip Kitcher (philosophy of mathematics and philosophy of biology) and Patricia Kitcher (philosophy of mind, philosophy of psychological and cognitive science), both hired in 1986, had an expertise in both the history of philosophy and philosophy of the sciences. Letter written by Georgios Anagnostopoulos, Philosophy Department Chair on April 21, 1986 to Harold Ticho, Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs. Dean of Arts and Humanities Records: Philosophy. UCSD: Special Collections, La Jolla. 6 May 2015.
philosophy department, such as hiring, promotions, chairmanships, and awards, reveal the tendency in acquiring faculty and advocating research interests in both the history of philosophy and philosophy of the sciences from the 1980s onwards.

The history of UCSD’s philosophy department begs the question: Did the philosophy department pursue industrial imperatives at the expense of traditional academic values, or did they achieve new levels of innovation and create new industries in the pursuit of traditional academic values? The historical trajectory of the department suggests that although levels of innovation with new industries were created, university support was in pursuit of fulfilling industrial and mercenary concerns that altered the philosophy department to ceaselessly cater to these demands. The philosophy of the sciences did not completely take over departmental content and faculty, however the philosophy of the sciences garners more attention both in funding and academic inventions that inevitably push aside other philosophical values that warrant attention. The philosophy department turned out to be irresponsible to ongoing social, ethnic, and racial issues within the university, and instead shifted its focus toward the sciences. Concurrently, as the philosophy department became scientifically inclined during this decade, Third College responded to these global educational transformations.

Third College also known as “Third-World” College evokes a counter-philosophical college whose eruption was the first of its kind in the entire University of California system and is worth contemplating in relation to the
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political and philosophical tensions within UCSD. The establishment of the college was approved on December 8, 1969 with its main goal to improve contemporary social and economic problems for the public benefit of our society at large.\textsuperscript{90} As stated in the student proposal, “At the University of California, San Diego, we will no longer ensure the undisturbed existence of a false institution which consistently fails to respond to the needs of our people…The puny reforms made so far are aimed at pacifying the revolts and sapping our strength. We therefore not only emphatically demand that radical changes be made, we propose to execute these changes ourselves.”\textsuperscript{91} The college’s academic plan outlined a “stultifying curriculum” which it was determined to change and dedicate its education to minority students whose objective would be to encourage students in becoming leading citizens within their own communities. Carlos Blanco’s role as chair of the curriculum subcommittee proposed a humanistic course of study.\textsuperscript{92} “It [the Committee on Educational Policy and Courses] recognizes that the University of California has not met this objective up to the present time and believes, therefore that an innovative approach towards achieving it is well

\textsuperscript{90} “Education Philosophy and Goals.” Third College Academic Plan: Third College Planning Committee October 1, 1969. Approved by the San Diego Division of the Academic Senate, December 8, 1969. Dean of Arts and Humanities Records: Carlos Blanco Aguinaga, Third World Studies Program Documents: Meeting minutes, class curriculum, and notes. UCSD: Special Collections, La Jolla. 6 May 2015.

\textsuperscript{91} While planning for Third College, Provost-designate Armin Rappaport asked students for input on possible ethnic studies courses and received a program plan from the Black Student Council (BSC) and Mexican American Youth Association (MAYA) activists that derailed the university administration’s previous plans. As quoted in: Mariscal, George. \textit{Brown-eyed children of the sun: Lessons from the Chicano movement, 1963-1975}. UNM Press, 2005. Print. 221.

\textsuperscript{92} Ibid., 229.
warranted.” In fact, one might argue that this objective had not been met by the entire University of California (UC) system, beyond UCSD; and for the first time it was being addressed on this particular campus because its founders realized the pressing need of a college addressing social and ethnic demands. “Because there exists no successful models on which to pattern such a college, Third College must be regarded as an experimental endeavor representing one possible approach…that is characterized by a required core program especially oriented to minority interests and planned with the expectation and intention that the majority of Third College students be members of minority communities.” Being the first of its kind, Third College was an experimental approach for the UC system to present a curricula catering to minority ethnic groups. As stated by Professor Jorge Mariscal, “…the UC San Diego experience embodied one of the most radical attempts by students and faculty of color to transform the elitist and Eurocentric university into an inclusionary and democratic space that reflected the concerns of traditionally excluded communities.” The concerns Third College raise determine the lack of philosophical productivity that were irresponsible within the philosophy department.

Third College’s original academic plan included departmental majors, one of which was philosophy. Third College’s departmental philosophy major

---
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anticipated that the philosophy department would offer special courses in response to the needs of Third College’s demographic. Third College Philosophy majors could concentrate on one or both Philosophy and Society or Comparative Philosophy of Religion. “As soon as staffing permits, upper division courses will be offered in such areas as…Philosophical Themes in Literature, several non-European religious philosophies, and Philosophy of Education [among others].” The possibility of these courses being offered was discussed among the departments; however, the Third College Philosophy major did not survive, presumably because the intended courses were not offered extensively. The philosophy department clearly did not recognize the concerns Third College raised within its philosophical scope, department, or knowledge production. The tensions this illuminates prove the division between scientific and humanistic philosophical interests that exist within UCSD’s philosophy department, along with the lack of comprehensive philosophical opportunities available for students. Ultimately, Third College did not have the impact it intended to implement to the university as a whole. Third College provides an example of the political frustrations that were not continuously addressed by the philosophy department and push activist faculty and students to react.

2.3 Comparative Findings

---

The character and aspiration each university prioritizes reflects the monetary value and attention given to designate disciplines, specifically the humanities and social sciences for UNAM and the sciences for UCSD. The most significant disparities between these two universities include historical circumstance, economic differences, resources, and viable cultural fields of inquiry. Through a historical analysis it is apparent student responsibilities and university objectives reflect national cultural markers to indicate modes of knowledge production: either knowledge production through political progress or technological advancement. Demands that question and require institutional changes have issues realizing their goals that cannot be completely met, such as catering to UNAM’s dependence on foreign scientific knowledge production and ethnic issues raised by Third College at UCSD.

The knowledge production responsive to each university’s academic market both propels and impedes on its abilities and resources to reach an inclusive philosophical domain. Each philosophy department has transformed throughout its historical trajectory and legitimized its philosophical undertakings by political necessity or administrative priority. Subjugate philosophical currents from each department indicate missing elements that characterize the strengths and weaknesses of each university. The historical character of each university and philosophy department also mirrors the curricular objectives each philosophy department executes and sustains to generate their philosophical enterprise.
Chapter 3. Philosophy Curricula and knowledge productions within UNAM and UCSD

The philosophical advancements that are characteristic of each university along with the disparities between UNAM and UCSD provide insight into the university’s role as a producer of knowledge. The analysis of each university’s philosophy curriculum is guided by principles that illuminate existing structures in each philosophy department, university, and within UNAM and UCSD’s relation to each other, such as what content gets taught, why it is taught, and to serve what purpose. The analysis of philosophy curricula provides insight into existing university structures since research areas and course content exemplify the priorities each department is committed on teaching. To provide a comprehensive approach to each university’s philosophical study the following factors are investigated: departmental goals, undergraduate and graduate courses offered, course reading materials, course syllabi, faculty research interests, graduate program areas of study, job placement, academic resources, and publications. A thorough explanation of the requirements from each department, its organization, and teaching purpose are identified, not only to promote the research areas available in both departments, but also to reveal each university’s educational requirements are not severely discrepant. The consideration of these factors, as well as essential historical links, along with strengths and weaknesses of each discipline provide affirmation for the knowledge production each philosophy discipline and university is intent on creating. A description of each
philosophy department as well as commentary on the resources and disparities that limit and propel knowledge productions for each university follows.

3.1 UNAM

Consistent with the university’s historical structure, the philosophy discipline is modeled after the European tradition. After the closure of Real university, Roman Catholic theological dominance left a vacancy in the university’s contemplative and philosophical thought. Philosophy as a field of study had not been established outside of theology until 1910. Justo Sierra, the minister of education and founder of UNAM in its modern form, was influenced by and relied on European positivism to initiate the philosophical trend at UNAM. Sierra is a key figure to understand the intellectual formation of UNAM’s philosophy department in his promotion of an original Mexican thought particular to Mexico’s students and culture. Today, the philosophy staff hosted by UNAM is one of the most prestigious in Mexico and several of UNAM’s philosophers and their work are recognized throughout Latin America. The philosophy discipline, its faculty, and students view each other’s philosophical undertakings as a responsibility in continuity with the university’s philosophical understanding. As stated in UNAM’s Plan de estudios, “philosophical teaching and research develop critically conscious and rational attitudes, which deepen the understanding of the embedded historical, social, and cultural processes that strengthen core values of universal cultures.”

discipline mirrors the autonomous character or educational liberty the university is determined to promote.

The school year at UNAM consists of two semesters in the duration of 16 weeks. Undergraduate and graduate courses currently offered during the school year include: aesthetics, ethics, philosophy of language and the mind, logic, philosophy of history and social sciences, philosophy in Mexico and Latin America, ontology and metaphysics, philosophy of science, and theoretical knowledge. Current faculty research interests reflect listed courses, in addition to the philosophy of literature and bioethics. By surveying course syllabi, it is evident that course reading materials vary among philosophers of European and Latin American descent which reflects the European model and its philosophical influence.

Attaining a bachelor’s degree at UNAM is advantageous because of the specialized study in the student’s major. A philosophy major will commence taking philosophy courses in their first semester and throughout their undergraduate studies. There are no general education requirements, whereas in the US, most universities require students to take the first two years of undergraduate coursework of general education requirements and the remaining two years specializing in the student’s major. The bachelor’s degree is awarded
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after four years of study. Undergraduate students are required to take 6 courses each semester, and 12 in the entire school year; philosophy majors need a total of 8 semesters and start taking philosophy courses in their first semester, and students are allowed to take electives by their 3rd and 4th year. To complete the bachelor’s degree, students take a total of 48 courses, 35 in philosophy, 11 electives, and 2 thesis-writing courses.¹⁰² Students receiving their bachelor’s degree at UNAM attain more specific knowledge on their major because of the greater amount of undergraduate credits and courses tailored to their designated field of study. This advantage gives UNAM students the opportunity to develop a specialized understanding of their major with four full years of study making their bachelor’s degree comparable to an advanced degree beyond the undergraduate level.

To graduate, students must complete their course credits, social service, take an oral exam, and submit one of the following seven options: 1) Thesis: the goal is to demonstrate the student has the adequate formation of the discipline and is capable of systematically organizing relevant concepts and expressing their thoughts in a proper and coherent format, 2) tesina: similar to the thesis with the same objective, except it focuses on a monographic character, or 3) academic report: an investigation conducted from personal experience of a professional activity; possible options for the academic report include: a) professional job/activity experience, b) a published academic article, chapter, or essay, c) academic investigation conducted over one year throughout their fourth year of

study, d) support for teaching through the development of educational materials, e) social service investigation, or f) fieldwork investigation.\textsuperscript{103}

As the plan de estudios expresses, “the highest quality education is guaranteed at a national level; to achieve this, there is diversity in philosophical foci and prestige bestowed on the liberality of thought for graduate study.”\textsuperscript{104} The graduate program’s main goal, in addition to the contribution each work makes to the field of philosophy, is to create teachers and investigators to constitute UNAM and other universities in Mexico. Graduate program areas of study include the following: 1) epistemology: the main focus is to analyze empirical and \textit{a priori} knowledge, theoretical and observational knowledge, knowledge of the self and others, and knowledge of the past and future, 2) aesthetics: emphasizes theoretical perception and the appreciation of artistic phenomenon with diverse concepts of space, expression, imagination, and creation, 3) ethics: aims to promote philosophical reflection on moral issues affecting contemporary society whose interpretation contributes to building a rational, tolerant, just and democratic society, 4) philosophy of culture: the study of the concept of culture and its classical problems, such as the interpretation and possibility of investigating the nature of philosophy as a social phenomenon and its relationship with other disciplines, in particular the social sciences and politics, 5) political philosophy: deals with issues related to the analysis of political phenomena from a normative-prescriptive perspective, such as the origin of organization of political power,

social institutions, and the nature of politics, 6) philosophy of religion: engages with links of humanity and the sacred use of religious concepts and texts and the relationship between the sciences and religion, 7) logic, philosophy of language, and mind: allows students to deepen their knowledge of mental tools to distinguish between valid and invalid arguments, and translate different types of reasoning to formal mathematically-defined languages, 8) metaphysics and ontology: prompts fundamental problems from metaphysical and ontological perspectives, such as issues of being and knowing, the temporality of existence, and modernity/postmodernity. 105

The master’s degree is awarded in two years. Master’s students take a total of 9 courses, with varying courses credits, all in philosophy and special studies courses. To obtain the degree, students must complete course credits with a B average, and either, a) submit and defend a thesis with an oral exam, or b) translate a philosophical text and complete a critical investigation on the selected text with a letter of authenticity from an advisor. Four out of five committee members must approve completion of either option. 106 The option of submitting a translated philosophical text emphasizes the university’s demand and recognition given to a translated work to build on the body of knowledge on philosophical translated texts. The student’s quality of translation and interpretation is awarded a master’s degree, which essentially creates a professional translator. The training

of students as translators of philosophical texts indicates the philosophy
department’s interest and demand in prompting philosophy translation as a career.

Considering the following sample of a core graduate seminar, its syllabus,
content, and teaching purpose proves the philosophical inquiry and intention of
the course responds to Latin America’s socio-political sphere. The course offered
to master and graduate students studying philosophy and Latin American Studies
titled *Epistemology in Latin America: Philosophy, History of Ideas, and
Ideologies in Latin America* was taught by Dr. Mario Magallón Anaya. The
course was offered in semester one of the 2015 school year and met once a week
for 3 hours. The following description extracted from the course syllabus explains
course goals, topics, and main purpose:

The main aim of the course is to gain a profound understanding
beyond classical philosophy on ethics and politics. In an era of the
postmodern and postcolonial there exists a disenchantment with
politics and with the principles of philosophical politics and
modernity as a whole. Topics include the discussion of ethical,
social, economic, historic, and cultural implications that contribute
to a phenomenological study situated on reality while
simultaneously posing questions and solutions in a world charged
with violence, destruction, and death; where convivial relations,
responsibility, and a social and ethical compromise has been
broken; where there exists no principals, norms, nor rules that
guarantee forms and practices of human relations of respect and
coeexistence. The goal of the course is to suggest the possibility of
opening new pathways to foreground post-modern cultural
philosophical currents that are inconsistent and nihilistic in nature;
where all human relations, as subject, as metaphysical, and as
history of the humanities and philosophical practice has been
considered a virus that obstructs the possibility of understanding a
cyber reality of social media and new concepts of time. This course
proposes other alternatives that permit incursive new experiences of political philosophies.  

As the above descriptions suggests, an employment of practical philosophy relevant to current issues such as violence and social responsibilities are a feature of Mexican philosophy. Reading materials for the course consisted of the following philosophers from European and Latin American descent: Remo Bodei, Axel Honneth, Rosa María Rodriguez Magda, Luis Villoro, and Mario Magallón Anaya. The writing of a seminar paper and a presentation on a course reading were required to pass the course.

Another core graduate seminar offered during semester one of the 2016 school year titled *Philosophy of the Sciences: Epistemology of Thought Experiments* is taught by Dr. Jorge Ornelas. The following description from the course syllabus explains course topics, along with general and specific course objectives:

A majority of disagreements in the philosophy of the sciences revolves around methodological problems: whether induction is a good method for obtaining scientific knowledge, whether the concept of objectivity that scientists use is adequate enough, whether scientific institutions are reliable or not, etc. One of the most useful tools in scientific methodology, from antiquity to present day, is the employment of thought experiments: experiments that scientists and philosophers run in their own minds with the pretense to extract relevant empirical conclusions for their own scientific theories from them. The history of science makes clear that the distinct branches (mathematics, physics, biology, etc.) that constitute this methodology has captured a preeminence that is limited in study: Are thought experiments truly a vehicle for obtaining knowledge on the empirical world? How reliable are thought experiments? Are thought experiments debatably reductive?
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or do they inhabit an inalienable dimension beyond argumentative reconstructs? Do thought experiments have (justifiable) epistemic power? The course is designed to address and repair the relevance of these and other questions to scientific methodology to analyze principle responses that have been outlined by tradition. General objective: Students become familiar with the main methodological problems of philosophy of science through the analysis of the methodological proponents proposed by thought experiments. Students become familiar with classical discussions surrounding philosophy of sciences where thought experiments have been practiced. Students [should] analyze thought experiments methodological strengths and weaknesses. Specific objectives: Focus on methodological problems within the reflections of the philosophy of science. Notice the relevance of thought experiments in the scientific enterprise. Unify the treatment of thought experiments in both science and philosophy.109

Thought experiments are given greater emphasis on this core course than any other type of experiments that are studied in the philosophy science, such as controlled experiments and simulations and modeling. Solely focusing on thought experiments versus any other types of experiments stresses not only the understanding of how or why scientific epistemology functions, but how thought experiments might be useful within the socio-cultural, political, and educational context pertaining to this course and audience, along with the scientific enterprise as the syllabus description mentions. Weekly course themes include: Platonism v. Empiricism, experimentalism, constructivism, and mental models, and mental experiments in philosophy. From twenty course readings, ten are in English and ten are in Spanish; readings in Spanish are translations from English texts. None of the course readings are from authors or publications from Latin America; most are from publications in the US, which designates this field of thought

experiments is relying on adopting foreign knowledge from philosophy of the sciences.

These two core graduate courses mentioned are from different camps of political philosophy and philosophy of science. In the *Epistemology in Latin America* course, naturally, readings were in Spanish and centered on Latin America. In the *Epistemology of Thought Experiments* none of the course readings were originally written in Latin America or by a scholar of Latin American descent. Evidently, UNAM adopts foreign scientific knowledge production from philosophy of the sciences by those advancing this field. Instead, UNAM is invested in and inclined toward the creation of philosophical texts within the context of Latin America, Mexico, and specifically UNAM’s circumstances. UNAM’s interest in philosophy of science is apparent, although considering its own philosophical tradition and academic resources the department is prone to generate an analysis on this field rather than be situated as an originator for it.

Besides being capable of teaching, graduate students must obtain the necessary conceptual and methodological tools to conduct an original philosophical investigation. With this formation, graduates are prepared to participate in the rational discussion of greater national problems and the diffusion of fundamental ideas and values for society’s benefit.\(^{110}\) The doctorate degree is awarded after four years of study and provides students and advisors creative

---

autonomy in designing individual coursework and requirements. Both the advisor and student plan the academic courses, seminars, or other activities the student will carry out each semester, which may include an elaboration of essays on a certain theme. The purpose of catering academic requirements for each student and advisor is to fit the particular academic needs and research interests of the student. The ability of designing coursework to the student and advisor’s choosing is a trait of the philosophy program’s intent on aiding students with educational freedom.

To acquire the doctorate degree, students must obtain letters of approval from three committee members, along with completing a written dissertation and oral defense. Limited data is available in the job placement of graduates, with the exception of the graduating class of master’s students in the year 2000, where 16% were in jobs congruent with their studies mainly teaching at the high school or college level. 77% continued doctoral studies in philosophy.\textsuperscript{111} Doctorate students are encouraged to publish in national and international journals and write books to promote diverse philosophical specialties within and outside the nation, and contribute to universal culture.\textsuperscript{112} Besides applying to other universities, master and doctoral students are encouraged to apply for a post-doctorate or job placement at the Facultad de Filosofía y Letras and Instituto de Investigaciones Filosóficas resulting in several graduates remaining within the university.

\textsuperscript{111} Ibid. 
Resources particular to philosophy students at UNAM include the Biblioteca “Eduardo García Márquez” del Instituto de Investigaciones Filosóficas, that contains the best resources for philosophy in Latin America containing 40,8000 books and 578 journal publications with 16,407 fascicles.\textsuperscript{113} The Samuel Ramos Library belonging to the Facultad is also beneficial for students. Students have access to online databases, such as JSTOR and EBESCO. Texts originally written in a foreign language and then translated into Spanish are delayed in availability of the text’s employment for courses. Several articles from databases, such as JSTOR are written in English without a Spanish translation limiting students’ use of these resources. An assortment of philosophical texts used in courses and seminars stemming from European authors have not been translated to Spanish, and many students do not have English proficiency. Meanwhile there is no English language requirement to graduate, Spanish text availability is problematic for teaching capacity. Several of UNAM’s philosophers and their work are well known throughout Latin America and their texts are available throughout the region, however the marketability and accessibility of Spanish philosophical works outside of Latin America may be inopportune which stunts the awareness UNAM’s philosophers and application of their creations.

Examining the knowledge production of the department’s journal publications provide insight into faculty interests and student opinion. Two significant philosophy journals produced in the Facultad include: Theoría: Revista

\textsuperscript{113} Plan de Estudios: Aprobado por el Pleno del Consejo Académico del Área de las Humanidades y de las Artes. UNAM: Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, 13 March 2009. Web. 8 March 2015.
del colegio de filosofía, which is published each semester and is characterized by its broad philosophical themes,\textsuperscript{114} meanwhile Ensayos is a student-orientated publication and engages student outlook.\textsuperscript{115} Ensayos published an essay by Marina Gómez-Robledo Ramosa, an undergraduate student majoring in philosophy, which imparts perspective on the dissemination of knowledge; this essay is most relevant to evaluate UNAM’s student knowledge production in its thematic corroboration. Along with an analysis on the circulation of Latin American Philosophy, Mexican Philosophy, and the pursuit of philosophical study, Ramosa incorporates Leopalido Zea’s perspective on the circumstances surrounding Mexican philosophy.\textsuperscript{116} Ramosa argues that for Zea, philosophy must be a practical discipline to reflect on the most urgent problems of reality.\textsuperscript{117} A thought-provoking idea with which Ramosa concludes her essay is the teaching of philosophy as a primordial knowledge and responsibility instilled in Mexican culture and education. This is an essential quality of Mexican philosophy that is evident throughout Mexico’s 20\textsuperscript{th} century philosophical production in response to political events, as well as the university and philosophy department’s emphasis in this practice.

3.2 UCSD

Consistent with the university’s historical foundation, UCSD follows its own American structure for philosophical study. The department continues to

\textsuperscript{114} Ensayos: Revista de estudiantes de filosofía de la facultad de filosofía y letras, UNAM. UNAM, n.d. Web. 3 Aug. 2015.
\textsuperscript{117} Ibid.
have exceptional strengths in the history of philosophy from antiquity to the twentieth century, as well as philosophy of the sciences. The department is best known for research opportunities available in the philosophy of science, philosophy of biology, and the philosophy of mind as it has recently been influenced by developments in neuroscience and cognitive science. Significant research trends that affect the department are evident through faculty interests and course offerings in the history of philosophy and philosophy of the sciences, and some faculty hold an interest in researching both philosophical trends and their relationship with each other.

The school year consists of three quarters in the duration of 11 weeks (including finals week). Undergraduate and graduate courses offered as of 2015 include: history of philosophy, logic, moral and political philosophy, epistemology and metaphysics, and research methods. The bachelor’s degree is awarded after four years of study along with the completion of the following requirements. Students may take 3 or 4 courses each quarter and must take a total of 15 philosophy courses. There are 6 core requirements students must fulfill, a total of 8 courses with varying options which are the following: 1) lower-division logic, 2) upper-division logic, 3) history of philosophy sequence (3 courses), 4) moral and political philosophy (4 courses), 5) metaphysics and epistemology (5 courses), and 6) philosophy of science (7 courses). Seven elective philosophy courses are also required from the following optional areas of emphasis: a) law,
ethics, and society, which are geared toward students interested in law and/or politics, b) science, technology, and medicine: these have a strong emphasis on modern technologies and science, c) mind, brain, and cognitive science: new perspectives on the understanding of the brain at the cellular and social level, d) historical perspectives on philosophy, science, and religion: employs history as an advantageous method of understanding scientific and religious viewpoints. A GPA of 2.0 must be maintained throughout coursework to graduate. Students with a philosophy GPA of 3.7 are eligible to apply for the departmental honors program consisting of two courses based on research and submission of a written thesis. A departmental committee reads the submitted thesis and decides whether philosophy honors will be awarded.

Doctoral degree requirements are rigorous and intend to meet specific demands of the discipline and graduate scholarship at large. The graduate program is career oriented and beneficial for the majority of students interested in pursuing a career in academia. The doctorate degree is normally awarded in 6 years of study or more. The department does not admit students with the intention of completing their studies with a terminal master’s degree; however, PhD students may elect to receive a master’s degree during the course of their academic studies. To receive a master’s degree, students must pass 8 required seminars and complete a master’s research paper with a faculty committee of 3 members. The areas of study graduate students may choose to specialize are the following: 1) philosophy of science: studies the methodology, foundations, and

implications of science, and has been the major strength of the department for over 25 years, 2) ethics and social-political philosophy: emphasis in the analytical tradition of ethical theory, history of ethics, political philosophy, applied ethics and jurisprudence, 3) history of philosophy: historiographical approaches along with diverse faculty interests provide students with numerous resources for research in the history of philosophy, 4) epistemology and metaphysics: epistemological issues include empirical knowledge, the nature of perception, and rationality, and metaphysical topics including free will, truth, and the self.

Students normally take a total of 14 philosophy seminars. The department also offers two interdisciplinary programs: Cognitive Science and Science Studies, each with their own requirements mainly consisting of taking courses from outside departments; once completed, students may receive a degree with both philosophy and the interdisciplinary program title. Students must take three seminars in the history of philosophy and two seminars in two of the following areas: a) history of philosophy, b) philosophy of science, c) philosophy of mind and philosophy of language, d) ethics and political philosophy, e) metaphysics and epistemology. During the third year of study, students must have a dissertation committee, and write an essay between 7,500-9,000 words that is more substantial than a graduate seminar paper to prove the fulfillment of standards to philosophical sophistication and demonstrate the necessary skills acquired for exploring philosophical problems. Students also have a research skills requirement to indicate competence in a discipline outside philosophy that is relevant to their research and determined satisfactory by both student and
advisor, such as proficiency in a foreign language or passing an undergraduate/graduate course outside their typical field with a B+ or better. To become a PhD candidate, a dissertation prospectus and oral candidacy exam on the intended subject and plan of research must be passed by the end of the 4th year. With the completion of a written doctoral dissertation, oral exam, and approval by the doctoral committee, students may be awarded the PhD in philosophy.

Considering the following core graduate seminar, its syllabus, content, and teaching purpose proves the philosophical inquiry and intention of the course is analytical in nature by investigating five main theories to gain a profound understanding and arrive at the core analysis of epistemology. Dr. Sam Rickless taught a core graduate seminar for philosophy graduate students titled Epistemology: the Semantics of Knowledge-attributions. The course was offered in the Fall of the 2011 school year and met once a week for 3 hours. The course description on the syllabus included the following:

This course discusses a recent influential debate about the semantics of knowledge-attributions and the nature of knowledge. Call “Invariantism” the view that the truth-values of knowledge-attributions do not vary with context of use or circumstance of evaluation (in virtue of the semantic properties of “knows”). Call “Intellectualism” the view that a subject’s knowledge is not a function of her practical interests. Classical Invariantism, the combination of Invariantism and Intellectualism, was the standard view until fairly recently…There are two theories of this sort: Contextualism and Relativism. Contextualists hold that the truth-values of knowledge-attributions vary with context of use, but do
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not vary with circumstance of evaluation…Relativists hold that the truth-values of knowledge-attributions vary with circumstance of evaluation, but do not vary with context of use…Our task in this course is to determine which of these five theories (Classical Invariantism, Pure Contextualism, Contrastivism, Relativism, Subject-Sensitive Invariantism) has the better of the argument(s).  

The above description and course topics were of a theoretical and analytical employment of epistemology that would be beneficial for graduate study. Weekly topics for instruction included: The Ordinary Language Case for Contextualism, Pure Contextualism vs. Contrastivism, From the Context-Variability of Assertability to Contextualism, The Knowledge Account of Assertion, Disagreement and Single Scoreboard Semantics, Bamboozled by Our Own Words?, Subject-Sensitive Invariantism, Knowledge, Assertion, and Action, Relativism. Weekly course readings included articles and readings from the philosophers Keith DeRose, John Hawthorne, and Jason Stanley. To pass the course students must have completed a seminar paper and presentation on course readings.

Another core graduate course offered in Fall 2011, titled Philosophy of Science: The Epistemology of Science was taught by Dr. Christian Wüthrich. The course syllabus states the following:

Science asserts an epistemically privileged role among our attempts to grasp the world around and within us. This assertion is based on the empirical support which mature scientific theories garner and on the systematic and methodical way in which they do this. To understand this relation between evidence and theory is the ambition of theories of ‘confirmation’. This seminar attempts to
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survey a few of these, to analyze what ‘evidence’ is, and to enter various recent philosophical debates concerning some types of experiments and their epistemic status in various fields of scientific enquiry.\textsuperscript{124}

The course description asserts scientific epistemology is privileged and justified; instead it is concerned in providing a survey approach to investigate the status of types of experiments in scientific inquiry. Weekly course topics included: Hypothetico-deductivism and the paradoxes of confirmation, Bayesianism: a) The basics: probability calculus and Bayesian confirmation, b) Bayes and underdetermination, c) Criticisms of Bayesianism, Alternatives: formal learning theory and severe testing/error analysis, Data and evidence, Types of experiments: a) Controlled experiments in different sciences, b) Simulations and modelling, c) Thought experiments. The course contributes ample time to the development of Bayesianism, which essentially determines a frequency or degree of accuracy or probability of truth or results, rather than an all or nothing approach. Course readings include an assortment of scholars, such as Nancy Cartwright, James Robert Brown, and John D. Norton.

With budget cuts impacting the philosophy discipline, the job placement of the following graduates in well-established research universities is considerable. Available data on 21 graduates awarded a PhD in the past 5 years since 2010 (including 2015); the initial job placement consists of the following positions: 1 Fixed term, 7 Tenure track, 7 Post-doctorates, 3 Lecturers, 2 Visiting, and 1 Philosopher in museum residence. The current placement of these

philosophers (excluding recent 2015 graduates) are the following: 3 Fixed term, 7 Tenure track, 2 Post-doctorates, 3 Lecturers, 2 Visiting. Most of these positions were at universities in the US with the exception of 5 European positions abroad.

The department continues to host its two analogous strengths: the philosophy of history and philosophy of the sciences. *The Journal of the History of Philosophy* originally established in 1963 by the department is one of the leading journals in its field and is currently published by the *John Hopkins University Press* and is available online on *Project Muse*. The uniqueness of this combination, as well as the resources available for students interested in the latter strength are a particular asset for the department and the scientifically inclined university. Resources available for students include a collection of philosophy texts tailored to the philosophy department’s research interests at Geisel library. Students have access to online research databases, such as JSTOR and EBSCOHOST. The strength in the philosophy of science, which may inevitably take over the department in the future, brings more attention to the department and is more easily advertised for funding than the history of philosophy.

### 3.3 Comparative Findings

The advantages between each university’s philosophy undergraduate and graduate program vary. UNAM’s undergraduate study demands several rewarding requirements. The master’s program offers students an optional career emphasis.
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between philosopher and translator, and the doctorate program is of an autonomous character in providing students and advisors the freedom to customize course requirements. UCSD’s undergraduate program requires less than half as many philosophy courses than UNAM, and ultimately UNAM undergraduates gain more advantage from attaining a bachelor’s degree with more than double the philosophy credits than UCSD undergraduates. UCSD’s doctoral program is rigorous and career orientated which gives its doctoral graduates increased chances of finding a reputable job position.

Surveying course syllabi from each philosophy program refines the variables in course content and distinct objectives. Both universities offer courses with similar titles that overlap, but what is studied within the scope of each course and area of study differs. The first two course syllabi mentioned from each university: UNAM’s Epistemology in Latin America: Philosophy, History of Ideas, and Ideologies in Latin America and UCSD’s Epistemology: the Semantics of Knowledge-attrubitions serve as examples that manifest comparable philosophical priorities. UNAM’s Epistemology in Latin America is concerned with solving the problematic of its reality. The course readings revolve around topics, such as a colonized consciousness, consciousness of moral and social domination, and praxis for the philosophy of liberation, to analyze how previous scholars intended to solve issues related to Mexico’s ongoing and current socio-political circumstances. Meanwhile UCSD’s Semantics of Knowledge-attrubitions course readings are concerned with avoiding semantics that inherently intersects with the philosophy of language and is linked with practical and theoretical
rationality. For this course, the goal is to find the best epistemological theory, refining one’s understanding, and employment of epistemology better suited for the subject, context, and knowledge base of any particular circumstance. UNAM’s course expectedly chooses to philosophize over Mexico as its own subject, and UCSD’s course is concerned with refining a suitable proximity of a possible theoretical subject. UNAM’s course has already chosen its subject, context, and knowledge base of Mexico’s present socio-political reality with the knowledge base of European and Latinamericanist readings, meanwhile UCSD’s course is concerned with situating an array of possibilities to better solve and choose the best epistemological theory and understanding necessary for whichever context. Certainly, UNAM’s course is particularly beneficial for students aiming to teach/research within UNAM, Mexico, or Latin America, however this may be disadvantageous when applied to foreign realities or further career opportunities. UCSD’s course is advantageous for obtaining the tools to advertise and expend in any context, but may lack a fixed circumstance to apply these tools.

The second course mentioned from each university, UNAM’s *Epistemology of Thought Experiments* and UCSD’s *Epistemology of Science* overlap in several areas. Although UNAM’s course solely focuses on thought experiments and UCSD’s offers a survey approach with thought experiments constituting only a portion of course readings, the overarching goals, course questions, and readings correspond to each other. For example, both courses assigned the same readings from James Robert Brown, *Why thought experiments*.
transcend empiricism (2004) and John D Norton, Why thought experiments do not transcend empiricism (2004). Despite the fact that the courses were offered five years apart, the course content evokes similar expertise. Besides examining the constituents of thought experiments, UNAM’s course mostly centers on the validity and analysis of thought experiments themselves and questions the scientific enterprise, meanwhile UCSD’s course asserts science is already entitled an “epistemically privileged role,”\textsuperscript{126} and is inclined toward investigating the status and practice of experiments within scientific inquiry. As previously mentioned, UNAM’s adoption of foreign scientific knowledge production also pinpoints its philosophical tradition and academic recourses easily accommodate the production of a Mexicanist philosophy that is responsive to national circumstances, but is also adept in adapting to scientific philosophical currents.

Considering the four courses altogether, UNAM relies on its own political and socio-cultural philosophical sources from Latin America, and scientific advancements from the US that are front-runners of philosophy of the sciences, such as institutions as UCSD. These features also reiterate and prove the types of knowledge productions that are not only strengths belonging to each department, but which priorities, what is legitimized, what is considered “epistemically privileged,”\textsuperscript{127} and what questions are fostered within each department. What philosophy is can be agreed upon in each department; however how it is defined is unique and characteristic of each university and its historical circumstances. Why


\textsuperscript{127} Ibid.
the respective professors chose their specific course material in their particular epistemology core course is because they viewed these readings and possible discussions as fundamental knowledge for students to grasp in their careers and lives. Essentially, what is crucial to know within the context of each reality differs.

The value given to philosophy as a socio-political response that is characteristic of Mexican Philosophy and UNAM’s historical background is evident in its philosophy curriculum. However, Mexican philosophy’s practical focus, and to a greater extent UNAM’s philosophy curriculum, is also at a disadvantage; there is space for a philosophy that determines its own identities and traditions, that subordinates the state and nation, and is at another dimension in itself rather than exclusively inhabiting a reactionary nature to political affairs. The practicality of Mexican philosophy being responsive to Mexico’s political affairs limits the relevance of this philosophical production to other global areas. In addition, UNAM’s disadvantages are mainly of a resourceful nature, signaling socio-economic inequalities for a university belonging to what is considered a Third World Country. As previously mentioned, the country’s global standing in terms of socio-economic productivity has negatively affected possibilities of applying and marketing its philosophical creations to a larger audience. Mexican philosophy and UNAM’s philosophy knowledge production are applicable in subject matter and physically available within its own nation, however it is constrained from being globally relevant and concretely available.
In contrast, UCSD’s philosophy department has been at the forefront of the scientific philosophical current since the 1980’s and continues producing renowned philosophical scientific discoveries that are applicable where technology is available. Historical antecedents and the philosophy department’s limited scope of study, in comparison to UNAM’s diverse philosophical research areas, are counterproductive for the development of student research interests and the philosophical discipline at large, which affects research opportunities for scholars. As courses and faculty interests reflect, the department caught on to the scientific philosophical current and has remained less varied since. Without diversity in their breadth of coverage and expansion onto other philosophical currents the department is weakened with continued emphasis on two main branches. For example, several UCSD philosophy students have expressed their experiences such as Paulina Pineda Severiano, an undergraduate philosophy major that has provided her perspective on this issue and her struggle to fulfill her Latin American Philosophy research interests that are unsupported in the philosophy department. Severiano was told the following comments from philosophy professors: “there is not a lot of research in Latin American Philosophy,” “it is inferior,” “you cannot do philosophy of people,” and “philosophy is logical while Latin American Philosophy brings emotion.” The department has evaded the opportunity of developing diverse philosophical currents by prioritizing its scientific evolvement that mirrors the university’s

research tendencies; meanwhile the singularity of departmental interests is disadvantageous for undergraduate students. This evasion especially makes an impression on UCSD’s philosophical study as irresponsible to other socio-cultural philosophical advancements.

UNAM and UCSD each project an image that is beneficial for the university, student body, and audiences at large that situate each university as a leading research institution. Since its inception, UNAM’s endeavor for autonomy and liberty aims to diverge from the influence of national political powers and continues this struggle today. However, its historical European antecedents prevalent in the philosophy department and university structure are irreversible. UNAM instills its autonomous ideology onto students; however one may question if the university’s historical structure and philosophy department were based on a university model without European influence, would political insurrections be a feature of its historical trajectory? If UNAM’s university model without European influence were to exist, would political authorities within and outside the university provoke the need to constantly establish its autonomy and liberty? To what ends does UNAM’s autonomous character help achieve: the creation of a false sense of autonomy and liberty or politically active student citizens?

For UCSD, the progressive scientific image reassures its audience, such as students and civilians, that future technology is guaranteed achievement at UCSD. UCSD follows its own profit driven model to insure academic prestige and replicate standards that perpetuate the hegemonic production of knowledge. Each university projects an image onto audiences: UNAM’s sense of autonomy and
UCSD’s scientific progress reassures their respective audiences their objectives will be a success. UNAM and UCSD’s relation to each other also reveal discrepant differences in historical, political, and socio-cultural power relations among what are considered First and Third World countries. There are few universities in Latin America as influential and resourceful as UNAM, meanwhile several other universities with UCSD’s assets and facilities exist throughout the US. Inflated possibilities of attaining a higher education in the US additionally demonstrate educational and economic disparities.

In short, each university determines its philosophy discipline as constituent to its priorities and functions for the benefit of promoting each university’s purpose to uphold the interests of its philosophical traditions, its role as a producer of knowledge, and available recourses. For UNAM, the nature of its historical narrative of questioning and constantly metamorphosing to match current political insurrections and social movements is the fundamental quality of its character as reflected in its philosophical disciplinary content and research interests. For UCSD, its notoriously scientific integrity since its inception is advantageous for obtaining funding and attracting reputable scholars to the philosophy department and university at large. The types of advancements, whether political or technological, are characteristic of each university. Taking into account the disparities between UNAM and UCSD and the variety of knowledge productions each university is compelled, entitled, and responsible in fulfilling also provides insight into the student population affected by such priorities.
Conclusion

This thesis investigates a case study between UNAM and UCSD’s philosophy departments that articulate a critique against university curricula that are irresponsible to student interests and restrictive of global philosophies. The possibility of promoting a post-continental philosophy between the US and Mexico demands an inter-cultural dialogue between these nations and their knowledge productions. Considering UNAM and UCSD as potential sites for the execution of post-continental philosophy and inter-cultural dialogue, both universities may interchange from each other’s philosophical currents and knowledge forms. In doing so, a pluri-versal model would exist, that is a multi-dimensional university that acknowledges all knowledge productions that can alter ways of thinking toward a multi-dimensional subject and philosophical findings. If world history courses are taught at the college level and are required in some instances, why not teach world philosophy courses? A philosophy course addressing global philosophies that introduces students to a variety of philosophical currents is a stimulant for post-continental philosophy, an intercultural dialogue, and pluriversal model.

To arrive at these conclusions, the theoretical foundation in Chapter One focuses on the Frankfurt School and Critical Theory along with the conceptual framework of Decolonial Theory opens the dialogue and intervention this thesis promotes. The theoretical foundation has guided the objectives of this case study and culminates in a critique of the university and promotion of possibilities of what the pluriversity can be. In Chapter Two, the analysis of the historical, socio-
cultural, and political events of each university and philosophy department maps the philosophical currents, unique character, and academic market each university is likely to propel. The comprehensive view of each university situates the context of their knowledge productions to provide a detailed analysis on the philosophy curricula. Chapter Three comments on the philosophical interests and priorities of each department to confirm the denial and recognition of philosophies as well as the form and level of philosophical legitimization, the analysis of student and faculty knowledge productions, along with a curricular comparison that pinpoints the discrepancies between departments. Ultimately, the nation, student body, and individuals are representative or reactionary to these philosophical inclinations through knowledge productions or student movements.

Although one may argue there is insufficient concrete evidence to draw such conclusions, the philosophy texts themselves created by philosophers from each university is telling of the knowledge production belonging to each national community. Given more time, for future study the possibility of an additional chapter elaborating on the notable philosophical readings of each philosophy department that are representative of their research inclinations would further prove the limits of each knowledge production and the interests of the academic market. Rather than analyzing the scholars and their texts that hold a stake on these knowledge productions, to prove my conclusions an investigation on the historical context and philosophy curricula serve as necessary evidence at the moment.
This thesis serves as a testament to the possibilities of conducting an investigation when inquiring on marginalized philosophies for research. For future reference, when students inquire about Latin American Philosophy or marginalized philosophical currents, this thesis articulates a case study, along with ethnographic experiences from my perspective as a student, as well as a representation of others’ learned experiences. Whether the inclusion of global philosophies is viable or not depends on the academic market, but the act of carrying out this study symbolizes and responds to academia’s inadequate treatment of philosophy and situates the possibilities for intervention.
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