



Edgar Zavala Pelayo

Another Pastoral Power:

Spiritual Salvation through Worldly
Integralism in Colonial Latin America

CAS - CENTER FOR AREA STUDIES



CAS Working Papers

Edited by the Center for Area Studies (CAS), Freie Universität Berlin, Germany.

The CAS Working Paper Series serves to disseminate first results of ongoing research about transregional and transcultural questions.

All papers are reviewed by two experts. They are published online and can be downloaded free of charge from the Document Server of Freie Universität (<http://edocs.fu-berlin.de>) as well as from www.fu-berlin.de/cas/forschung/publikationen/working-papers/.

Through publishing first results in this online paper series we aim to encourage the exchange of ideas. Inclusion of a paper in the CAS Working Paper Series should not limit publication in any other work. The copyright remains with the authors.

Further information at: www.fu-berlin.de/sites/en/cas/forschung/publikationen/.

Zavala Pelayo, Edgar: Another Pastoral Power: Spiritual Salvation through Worldly Integralism in Colonial Latin America.

CAS Working Paper Series No. 1/2016, Center for Area Studies, Freie Universität Berlin
Copyright für diese Ausgabe: © Edgar Zavala Pelayo

Titelfoto: © Getty Images



Center for Area Studies
Fabeckstraße 23-25
14195 Berlin
Germany
Tel. +49 (0)30 838-52881
Fax: +49 (0)30 838-452881
geschaeftsstelle@cas.fu-berlin.de
www.fu-berlin.de/cas/



Disclaimer:

CAS cannot be held responsible for errors in this Working Paper or for any consequences arising from the use of information contained in this Working Paper. The views and opinions expressed are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the CAS.

Another Pastoral Power: Spiritual Salvation through Worldly Integralism in Colonial Latin America¹

Edgar Zavala Pelayo

Abstract

The colonial period in Latin America (1500s-1800s) is usually addressed as a past reality that has obvious historical significance yet limited explanatory relevance. This historical period seems to be taken as merely anecdotal and eventually irrelevant to explain contemporary socio-political phenomena in Latin America. Liberalist-modernist historians and social scientists in this region of the world seem unwilling to go back to such a dramatic and presumably backward long gone past. Based on a critical review of Foucault's pre-modern pastoral power and his ambivalent statements on pastoral power in modern societies, I offer in this paper genealogical evidence about the governmentalities forged during three centuries of colonial rule and the persistence, within them, of *salvific and integralist rationales*. I will highlight both the other-worldliness of such a salvation and the *realist methodology* by which the latter was meant to be achieved. I conclude by suggesting the relevance of further genealogical analyses and the pertinence of exploring possible continuities between those rationales and messianic political characters, or *caudillos*, in 20th- and 21st-century Latin America.

Zusammenfassung

Die Kolonialzeit in Lateinamerika (1500er-1800er Jahre) wird in der Regel als eine vergangene Wirklichkeit beschrieben, die, obwohl offensichtlich historische Bedeutung, eine begrenzte Erklärungsrelevanz besitzt. Diese historische Periode oft nur anekdotisch oder sogar als irrelevant zur Erklärung zeitgenössischer sozio-politischer Phänomene in Lateinamerika betrachtet. Liberal-modernistische Historiker und Sozialwissenschaftler in dieser Weltregion scheinen nicht bereit zu sein sich auf diese dramatische und vermeintlich rückständige Vergangenheit zu berufen. Ausgehend von einer kritischen Diskussion von Foucaults Konzept der vormodernen pastoralen Macht und seinen ambivalenten Aussagen über der pastorale Macht in der modernen Gesellschaft, biete ich in diesem Beitrag einen genealogischen Nachweis über die Gouvernamentalitäten während drei Jahrhunderte der Kolonialherrschaft und der Verbreitung von *heilbringenden und integralistischen Rationalen*. Ich werde sowohl die Jenseitigkeit (other-worldliness) solcher Erlösung (salvation) als auch die *realistische Methodologie* durch die solche erreicht werden sollte aufzeigen. Der Beitrag reflektiert abschließend, wie wichtig die Erforschung möglicher Kontinuitäten zwischen diesen Gouvernamentalitäten und messianischen politischen Persönlichkeiten, oder Caudillos, des 20. und 21. Jahrhundert in Lateinamerika.

¹ I should like to thank Marianne Braig and Marco Estrada for their particularly helpful feedback on an earlier version of this paper.

Inhalt

1. Introduction	5
2. Theoretico-Methodological Guidelines	5
3. Foucault's Pastoral Power	7
4. Material and Spiritual Care: <i>Caciques</i> , <i>Encomenderos</i> and Missionaries	9
4.1 Post-conquest <i>Caciques</i> .	10
4.2 <i>Encomenderos</i> in the Americas	12
4.3 Catholic Missionaries	15
5. Colonial Pastoral Power: Salvation via Worldly Integralism	17
6. Conclusions	21
7. Bibliography	23

1. Introduction

In Michel Foucault's view there are three genealogical sources of the European modern governmentality²: a “diplomatic-military model”, the concept and praxis of police, and “the Christian pastorate” (2007: 110, 122). After the institutionalization process the Catholic church began in the 4th century, the Christian pastorate emerged gradually as a theological-managerial technique for the government of souls, individuals and whole communities. I have argued elsewhere that Foucault misses the Christian pastoralism that took place beyond Europe (Zavala Pelayo 2014). A similar, and different, pastoral power was developed in territories where the Catholic church shared with the Spanish empire the government and the colonisation of territories and populations. Based on a brief review of specialized literature, and countering Foucault's Eurocentric gaze, I have portrayed the relationships between Catholic priests and creole and indigenous populations in colonial Mexico as enactments of evangelising-pedagogical and legal-advocatory pastoral power (Zavala Pelayo 2014; cf. Foucault 2007: 165, 174-175).

In this paper I want to expand on those initial notes and offer a more comprehensive, though non-exhaustive, review of pastoral power and governmental practices during the colonial period in Mexico. In section 2 I will outline the theoretical and methodological tenets upon which the arguments I offer in this paper are based – including a non-secularistic stance on the study of past and present social phenomena, recognition of the problematic yet inescapable partiality of history and social science and the avoidance of condemnatory value judgments. In section 3 I will present a summary of Foucault's views on pastoral power. In section 4 I will review specialized literature about the governmental practices of three specific colonial institutions: pre and post-conquest *caciques*, *encomenderos* and Catholic missionaries. In the following section I will account for those practices by sketching out the basic characteristics of the integralist and salvific governmental rationales they were part of. I will conclude by underlining the worldly and methodical rationality of these colonial-pastoral logics. At the end I will suggest the need to conduct further genealogical exercises in Mexico and other Latin American societies as well as the relevance of exploring possible continuities between those genealogical backgrounds and messianic characters (Lafaye 1997; Blancarte 2000), or so-called “modern caudillos” (Castro 2007), in 20th- and 21st-century Latin America.

2. Theoretico-Methodological Guidelines

I side with Foucault's conception of the genealogical exercise. The following lines are not presented as notes on the “origin” of pastoral power in Latin America. This is not because there would be an insufficiency of comprehensive historiographical sources on the matter – which could be said to prevail to some extent; but because the search for origins is misguided. Seeking the origin of phenomena – reason and pastoral power included – would imply, as Foucault notes, the prevalence of essential, pure and “immobile forms that precede the external world of accident and succession” (1977: 142), or, in the worst cases, the existence of “a primordial truth” that likely arose out of “the

2 In Foucault's words governmentality is government as power, that is, “the ensemble formed by institutions, procedures, analyses and reflections, calculations, and tactics [...] that has the population as its target, political economy as its major form of knowledge, and apparatuses of security as its essential technical instrument” (2007: 144).

hands of a creator” (1977: 142-143). In fact, what I offer below is not necessarily an instance of Foucauldian “relentless erudition” built upon “a vast accumulation of source material” (1977: 139-140). What I present below instead is a rather modest review of primary and mostly secondary sources on the emergence of pastoral power in colonial Mexico as a complex result of dispersions, ruptures, sincretisms and continuities. At this point I must add a caveat.

Although the reader will not find here a teleological history of “ancient continuities” (Foucault 1977: 167), I will insist below in the fractional, limited continuities that mainstream strands of secular historiography, or modern “scientific’ history” (Asad 2003: 42) tend to overlook aprioristically, and sometimes altogether, in order to contribute normatively to a taken for granted secularism that is likely by now an “epistemic knowledge regime” (Casanova 2009: 1051). I will explicitly analyse the interplays between broadly conceived religious phenomena and “secular” power logics (Hearn 2012: 152-170, 214). In other words, I will dwell upon the worldly, the rational and the pragmatic, alongside the other-worldly, the spiritual and the transcendental. I will not take for granted the epistemic intertwining of the rational-spiritual and the temporal-transcendental, but I will not discard it in advance either.

Another theoretical assumption I will stick to is a definition of power phenomena that departs from reductionist views of dominant agents *versus* dominated subjects, or an invariably-oppressive structure *versus* an always-lacking agency. I will not rule out a priori the prevalence of hierarchies and “cryptic domination” (Hearn 2012: 210) but I will assume, in a Foucauldian-postcolonial fashion, that they are the cause and consequence of asymmetric relationships and interactions that take place, synchronically *and* diachronically (Costa 2011), in complex fields of individual, institutional, supra-institutional and epistemological forces. Moreover, I will assume that such complex fields of forces are best explored if questions about the ‘ought’ are left aside momentarily – value judgments, for example about the “greatest genocide” that the Spanish conquest meant (Sandoval 2006: 29; my translation), will not represent a priority in the following sections.

The sections below will be presented as genealogical descriptions that are not only shaped by the aforementioned theoretical assumptions but also by the inevitable partiality of the historiographical sources that are available. Different authors (Hemming 1984; Elliot 1984; Cervantes 1994) have pointed out, that what we know about the colonial and pre-colonial periods in Latin America comes from limited observations recorded by agents who had specific political-ideological agendas – the missionary, the cleric, the conqueror, the Spanish settler – which included the elimination of indigenous sources (e.g. codices) that could have been indeed greatly valuable in the reconstruction of pre-colonial and colonial realities. However, my aim is neither condemning the partiality of the available sources nor recriminating the destruction of indigenous codices and oral traditions by zealous Spaniards. Instead I do assume that the realm of the past and present realities cannot be apprehended entirely by the empirical-scientific knowledge (Sayer 2000) we are able to produce, as the latter is inescapably a mechanism to problematize realities but also to process and reduce complexities (Douglas 1986) through both shifting (Foucault 2002a, 2002b) and more resilient (Zavala Pelayo 2013a, 2013b, 2014) epistemic standards, which may or not be explicit. Next I offer Foucault’s unavoidably partial account of pastoral power.

3. Foucault's Pastoral Power

Two of the explicit prompts that lead Foucault to wonder about “the theme of the shepherd” (2007: 147), and its relation to modern governmentality and the control of populations in a territory, is the lack of such a theme in classic Greek political literature and the critical commentaries by Plato on the uselessness of the pastoral model for the governance of city-states (see also Foucault 2011). Unlike Plato would have stated, Foucault suggests that the model of pastoral guidance institutionalised by the Catholic Church can be taken as a “prelude to [modern] governmentality” (2007: 184). Foucault wants to bypass conventional approaches by offering a view of the entanglements of politics and religion in the West that can be observed not in the often-discussed institutional interplays between church and state, but in the continuities between the *pastoral rationale* and the modern government's *power technologies*. He offers a genealogical account of “how the problem of government, governmentality, was able to arise on the basis of the [Christian] pastorate” (2007: 193). In Foucault's view, a series of key characteristics constituted the Christian pastorate as a set of governmental “techniques and procedures” (2007: 192).

Drawing on ecclesiastical texts from the 3rd to the 6th centuries³, Foucault underlines the characteristics that have been explicitly attributed to the Christian pastor, that is, guidance towards salvation, prescription of the law and the teaching of the truth (2007: 166-167). After this Foucault adds further distinctive attributes. One of this attributes is the “fully and paradoxically distributive” character of the flock-shepherd relationship (2007: 168), this means not only a reciprocity of responsibilities between the pastor and his flock, but also the fact that the pastor must guarantee both “the salvation of everyone” in individual terms – “[t]he salvation of each is absolutely [...] important” – and also, the salvation “of the community as a whole, as a unity” (2007: 168). Foucault problematizes this attribute by adding the paradox of the sacrifice by which the pastor is required both to cast away individuals that risk the corruption of the whole flock and, at the same time, to do whatever it takes to bring back “the stray and bleating sheep” (2007: 169).

Analytical responsibility and the principle of transferability are two complimentary characteristics also stressed by Foucault. The former requires the shepherd to know every member and collective action of his flock; for he, “at the end of life in the world” will “have to account for everything that every single sheep has done” (2007: 169-170). Transferability means that the sheep's “merit or fault” the shepherd has to be accountable for will be also considered the pastor's (2007: 170). After this Foucault throws to the mix two additional attributes of Christian pastoralism as an art of government – “sacrificial reversal” and “alternate correspondence”. The former entails both the pastor's resistance to the temptation generated by knowing his sheep's most inner thoughts through confession and the pastor's acceptance of risking his own life to save his flock. Alternate correspondence amounts to the inevitability and desirability not only of the pastor's virtuous actions, but also of his weaknesses; for the absence of the latter would bring arrogant perfection, whereas the pastors' working out of his faults and weaknesses “contribute to the edification of his sheep”

³ John Chrysostom's *De sacerdotio*, Saint Cyprian's *Epistles* Saint Ambrose's *De officiis ministrorum*, the *Liber Pastoralis* as well as John Cassian's *Conferences* and *Cenobite Institutes*, Saint Jerome' *Letters* and Saint Benedict's *Rules* (2007: 166).

and “the process of guiding them towards salvation” (2007: 172). After describing these principles, Foucault dwells on secondary specifications of the pastorship.

In a passage that seems to echo Weber’s distinction between legal and charismatic authorities (Weber 1978) Foucault states that Christianity is not a religion of the law, it is “a religion of God’s will” therefore “[t]he pastor is not fundamentally [...] a judge; he is essentially a doctor” (2007: 174) who heals souls (cf. Zavala Pelayo 2014) by applying individualised remedies through the “complete subordination” he has secured from his subjects. Foucault then expands on this particular kind of subordination, he defines it not as “obedience to a law, a principle or any rational element whatsoever, but subordination to someone because he is someone” (2007: 175). Such an institutionalised subordination has no end, neither materially nor strategically; it is permanent and leads only to further obedience. In statements that seem to counter his concept of episteme (2002a, 2002b), Foucault underlines the irrationality of such an act; it is “the test of absurdity”, it entails complying with illogical and pointless orders only for the sake of “the mortification’s of one’s will” (2007: 176-178).

Foucault also qualifies the teaching role of the pastor. The pastor’s teachings are his “primary and principal task” yet they are not only oriented towards revelation of the truth. Here I want to highlight one of the traits touched upon by Foucault. The pastor’s teachings are necessarily aimed at directing the individual’s “daily” and “total conduct” (2007: 181). In a somewhat clearer sentence earlier in this chapter, Foucault describes this peculiarity as the pastor’s effective jurisdiction upon the individual’s “spiritual matters [...] material things and [...] everyday life” (2007: 175). Thus “we have an integral teaching that [...] involves the pastor’s exhaustive observation of the life of the sheep” (2007: 181). This teaching is not only exhaustive in a thematic sense, it is also exhaustive in the time dimension. It is “a direction exercised at every moment and with the least discontinuity possible” (2007: 181); it is not episodic, but “absolutely permanent” (2007: 182).

The pastor’s governmental techniques were openly challenged throughout the Middle Ages by political struggles and parallel “revolts of conduct” (2007: 196), that is, orchestrated and to some extent successful oppositions that disputed the ways of being conducted and the strategies of directing individuals from a doctrinal-theological stance. Foucault suggests five doctrinal-theological “counter-conducts” (2007: 201): a) practices of ascetism, in which the individual combats with himself and so renders external authority “unnecessary” (2007: 205); b) the existence and formation of Christian communities – e.g., the Anabaptists, and earlier the Hussites – where alternative views of Christian theology and rituals challenged “the priest’s sacramental power” (2007: 209); c) personal experiences of mysticism that allow the individual to “escape examination” and live by “ignorance as knowing” instead of the pastoral truth (2007, 212-213); d) the return to the Scriptures and the putting aside of the pastor’s direct teachings – a move that preceded, and intensified during, the Protestant Reformation; and e) eschatological beliefs that put forward both the belief in Christ’s return and the individuals’ inner “spark of the Holy Spirit” – and hence the dispensation of pastoral guidance (2007: 214).

Foucault's depiction of the causal links between modern political governmentality and the pastoralism he dwelled upon in his lectures can be interpreted as ambivalent. On the one hand he asserts that pastoral power has been contested and transformed yet "has never been truly abolished" (2007: 148). This is the interpretation I have taken in a previous paper, in which I take Foucault's lectures as a statement on how pastoral techniques and procedures for the government of populations subsist diluted in the deep sediments of non-Western modern governmentalities (Zavala Pelayo 2014). This view is also supported by the shy links Foucault suggests between practices of salvation and the *Coup d'Etat*; and between the pastor's confessions and exhaustive knowledge of his sheep and the birth of the census and statistics as attribution of the state. In another publication Foucault (1982) distinguishes between the "institutionalisation" of pastoral power and "its function"; the latter, he asserts, has "spread and multiplied outside the ecclesiastical institution" in such a way that the modern state can be described as "a new form of pastoral power" (1982: 783) that does not seek spiritual salvation but a "worldly" salvation through the procurement of well-being and a welfare apparatus (1982: 784). However, Foucault also insists on the ruptures between the modern governmentality and Christian pastoralism.

A "pastoral government of the world" would imply an "economy of salvation" (2007: 235) in which the worldly goals of people's existence would be all aimed at earning other-worldly redemption. In statements that resemble Weber's again – and his distinction between a religiously-informed "ethic of ultimate ends" and a rational-instrumental "ethic of responsibility" (Weber 1948) – Foucault also describes this pastoral world as one of "[f]inal causes and anthropocentrism" (2007: 235) as well as "prodigies" and "marvels", inhabiting nature and speaking God's will (2007: 236). This is, however, a world that would no longer be today's. In Foucault's view such a pastoral government "disappeared [...] between 1580 and 1650" because of the aforementioned counter-conducts and the emergence of a "*ratio gubernatoria*" (2007: 232) – as opposed to a *ratio pastoralis*; a contested yet innovative *raison d'Etat*. However pastoral its genealogical origin is, such a *raison d'Etat* is now a rational device, a rational "form of reflection" and "calculation" (2007: 287) dissimilar to an irrational pastoralism that was based on obedience for the sake of obedience and necessarily "absurd" orders with no end (2007: 176).

If Foucault suggests that the Christian pastorship is a key element – whether currently active or not – in the genealogy of the Western *ratio gubernatoria* that developed after systematic counter-conducts and an intense Protestant Reformation, what can be said of territories whose government was actually shared between a colonial empire and an evangelising Catholic Church from the early 1500s up to the early 1800s? What can be said of territories, like colonial Mexico, which were theologically guarded by a Catholic inquisitorial body up to the 1820s (Chuchiak 2012; Mayer 2010), whose population was still described in the 1950s by reference to a Catholic devotional symbol (Wolf 1958) and whose socio-political dimensions have been linked to an "economy of salvation" (Lafaye 1997: 98)?

4. Material and Spiritual Care: *Caciques*, *Encomenderos* and Missionaries

I will start by presenting some notes on post-conquest *caciques* and will then move on to an account of colonial *encomenderos* – or Spanish colonial trustees. I will conclude this section with a description of Catholic missions and missionaries. I will point out both the differences between these institutions' governmental practices and a common trait: the simultaneous procurement of material and spiritual care.

4.1 Post-Conquest *Caciques*.

Schwerin (1973) notes that the *cacicazgo* was a hierarchical and centralized political institution that ruled a variable number of villages within a territory, administered the goods produced by the collectivity, managed tributes and executed judiciary acts – though did not necessarily had “a monopoly of force” (1973: 6). Gibson (1973) points that indigenous *caciques* in Mexico after the Conquest⁴ developed an adaptation strategy based on an opportunist behavior (see also Rubial 2002: 29). They addressed the Spanish crown and asked for favours and privileges regarding the concession of lands and indigenous work force, though without success. Schwerin (1973) offers a different picture. In his view, *caciques* after the conquest played a key “liaison” role between the newly-arrived Spanish and the Indigenous population; moreover, they were granted royal permission to use their titles, keep their lands, and manage “tribute in kind, labour and cash from [...] their subjects” (1973: 15). *Caciques* in the first colonization period were also slave traders and were in charge of supplying indigenous forced labor to the Spanish colonisers (Schwerin 1973; Elliot 1984). *Caciques* governed their subjects pragmatically and to their traditional profiting through tributes soon it was added the eager interests of the newly-arrived Spaniards. The latter obviously had not only a vested interest in collecting tribute in kind and labour but, first and foremost, an interest in expanding their lands. Indeed Spanish historian Francisco Lopez de Gomara (ca. 1511-1566) stated that “[w]ithout settlement there is no good conquest” (cited in Elliot 1984: 149). Another patent interest was the search and accumulation of gold by the explorers and the Spanish Crown. In Lopez de Gomara's words, Hernan Cortes had declared that he and his companions suffered “from a disease of the heart which can be cured only with gold” (cited in Elliot 1984: 180). In fact, the conquest of America was not the first enterprise of its kind led by the Spanish Crown. Elliot notes that the *de facto* (re-)possession and exploitation of the Canary islands by the Spanish in the late 15th century proved an useful laboratory to test early mechanics of occupation. There the Spanish crown would rehearse the negotiation of public and private interests since it

“would reserve for itself certain rights in the territories to be conquered, while guaranteeing specified privileges and rewards to the commander [in charge of the occupation] and those who enlisted in his company” (Elliot 1984: 159).

⁴ The ruptures and continuities between pre- and post-conquest *caciques* represent yet another study subject. It is worth mentioning here that Aztec rulers were not priests but they received religious training and governed their subjects by instructing them on “how the gods must be worshipped” (Soustelle 1961: 43). On the other hand Schwerin points that the cacique's house was used at times as a temple because the cacique could “serve as both civil ruler and priestly leader” (1973: 11). Unlike Soustelle's differentiated description of Aztec priests and rulers, Schwerin notes that “not infrequently” (1973: 12) the same person in the *cacicazgo* did play the role of both priest and *cacique*.

The re-conquest of Granada from the Moors in the south of the Iberian peninsula promoted by king Ferdinand and queen Isabell constituted yet another useful opportunity for the Crown to rehearse a “process of controlled settlement” whereby re-conquering likely meant, in Elliot’s view, “to raid, plunder and move on” in order to acquire land, power and wealth (1984: 149-152). By the time Columbus returned to Spain from the Antilles for the first time, the Spanish empire knew how to proceed in old and new territories. Lands and gold, geographic expansion and economic profiting-exploitation were the drivers and aims of the conquest as a whole. And yet these drivers were not the only ones.

Elliot notes as well that conquistadores did believe in “the providential nature of their enterprise”; their victories over the Indians who resisted the invasion were “proof of God’s favour” (1984: 180). Historian Jacques Lafaye (1997) reminds us that the very juridical rationale for the conquest of the Americas was the evangelization of those lands, as stated in the bulls issued by pope Alexander VI in the late 15th century, whereby the American territories were donated to Spanish king Ferdinand and queen Isabella (1997: 57). In fact, the full quote by Lopez de Gomara I cited above reads “[w]ithout settlement there is no good conquest *and if the land is not conquered, the people will not be converted*” (cited in Elliot 1984: 149; my emphasis). A religious-spiritual explanans cannot be underestimated if we also take into account what Lafaye calls “the triptych sent by God” to the Spanish crown – an ideological tool devised by Jesuit historian Juan de Mariana (1536-1624). The first part of such a “triptych” was the aforementioned re-conquest of Granada overlooked by Ferdinand and Isabelle; the second part was the expulsion of the Sephardic Jews from the Iberian peninsula and the third part was the arrival and “discovery” of America by Columbus. The three events took place in 1492 and were made by the Crown to be interpreted as an unmistakable mystic sign: Spain and Spaniards had to fight always against “infidels”, either in their own land or overseas (Lafaye 1997: 49). In the ‘New laws’ issued by the Spanish Crown in 1542 to correct and adjust early governmental institutions in the Americas (i.e. the *Consejo de Indias*, the *audiencias*, the *encomiendas*), the candid prologue by the King Charles V opens up as follows:

“Do know that, for many years, I have meant to address things from the *Indias* that are greatly important: the service to God our lord, and the growth of his holy Catholic faith, as well as the preservation of the indigenous and their good government and conservation, yet I have had no time to attend [these] given the many and continuous business that have occurred [in Spain]...” (cited in Zavala 1935: 95-96; my translation⁵).

It would be inaccurate to say that the conquest of the Americas was only a “spiritual” one (Ricard 2000). It would be misleading, too, to state that the *ultimate aim* of the Conquest was exclusively the conversion of the Americas’ indigenous population and the fulfillment of Spain’s “transcendental visions of history” (Lafaye 1997: 54). It seems more appropriate to think of the invasion and colonization of the Americas as an expansionist enterprise whose rationale was at once pragmatic, politically-motivated and exploitative, as well as spiritual, providential and salvific; in short, an “integral” (Foucault 2007: 175, 181) colonial-governmental quest.

⁵ The citations I have included from Zavala’s *Encomienda Indiana* were all translated by myself.

But conquests are not necessarily absolute and complete transpositions of incoming regimes upon pre-existing ones (see for instance Cervantes 1994, Cuello 1988, Diaz-Cayeros 2011, Masferrer 2000). The partly-religious colonial governmentality of the Spaniards likely found a fertile soil in the already political-religious management of chiefdoms and complex societies in the Americas. In a passage that does remind the political-religious functions of pre-Conquest *caciques* as described by Schwerin, Gibson notes that the government of colonial towns in the Americas included the provision of land and indigenous workforce to build churches, and the donors, according to Gibson, were often the *caciques* themselves (1973: 21). In a passage that is reminiscent of Soustelle's (1961) on the religious education of Aztec rulers, Gibson states that *caciques* by the late 16th century were usually trained at colleges established for the "Indian upper class", for instance, a Franciscan Colegio de Santa Cruz at Tlatelolco or a Jesuit school at Tepozotlan (1973: 22). Although by the end of the colonial period in Mexico these *caciques* "had ceased to exist altogether" (Gibson 1973: 26), they were part of the governmental apparatus that ruled towns and communities during the early colonial stages. Statements by Bartolome de la Casas in his *Memorial de Remedios para las Indias* (1516) describe such an apparatus as including the Spanish King in a nominal sense as well as the *cacique*, a foreman (*estanciero*) and an *encomendero* in practical terms (cited in Zavala 1935: 92).

4.2 *Encomenderos* in the Americas

Jimenez (2005) states that the *encomienda* in the Americas was not the first institution of its kind ran by the Spaniards. During the re-conquest of southern Granada in Spain from the Moors, the Spanish Crown assigned *encomenderos*, or trustees, the task of guarding small territories and the right to receive "economic benefit" from it (Jimenez 2005: n.p.; see also Elliot 1984: 165; Ramos 1999: 23; cf. Zavala 1935). In Yeager's words, the *encomienda* in the Americas was "a system of forced labor"; it was an arrangement that gave Spanish first settlers "property rights over Indian labor", which included the right to levy tribute "in the form of goods, metal, money or direct labor services" (1995: 843). According to Ramos (1999), the first *encomenderos* were mostly Spanish soldiers who had participated in the wars against the indigenous populations. The obligations of the *encomendero* included the payment of taxes to the crown and the defense of the territory he was assigned to. *Encomiendas*, in theory, were not instances of slavery (cf. Cuello 1988; Yeager 1999). Zavala (1935) describes the tension between the royal decree on the freedom of the Americas' indigenous population and the Spanish crown's need to govern a population literally perceived as unruly "barbarians" and "talking animals" (Zavala 1935: 17-18). The conceptual-theoretical solution consisted of regarding *encomiendas* as a necessary "intermediary form of government" based on an Aristotelian notion of "natural servitude" (Zavala 1935: 17-18). Here I want to highlight the practical-political function of *encomiendas*. In Yeager's view (1995), these institutions were not necessarily cost-effective because they ended up decimating the indigenous population and lowering the rate of revenues. However, they were considered by the crown an appropriate strategy to consolidate the ruling of the new territories and the presence of the crown by intermediaries who were not entitled to medieval aristocratic prerogatives such as the owning of the land, but merely to profit

from the *encomendados*' tribute and labor (Elliot 1984; Jimenez 2005; cf. Lockhart⁶ 1969). In Yeager's words, the Spanish crown "guarded its [political-territorial] security at the expense of creating a poor-institutional framework for productivity and investment" (1999: 857).

Zavala (1935) distinguishes two "periods" in the *encomiendas*, the Antillean and the Continental (see also Jimenez 2005). The Antillean *encomienda* begun in the first decade of 1500s with an initial *repartimiento* [partition] of the Indigenous population among the Spanish settlers who used, or rather exploited, the indigenous work force in crop fields and gold mines. Conflicts soon emerged given the factual slavery the Indigenous groups were subjected to. The solution by the crown, according to Jimenez (2005), was the *encomienda* and the *guerra justa* [just war] – the latter consisted of the Spanish settlers' right to capture and use the native population who attacked the Spaniards "without motives" (Jimenez 2005: n.p.). The Antillean *encomienda* was almost identical to the *encomiendas* the Spanish crown had established in Granada, except for a key difference. The colonisers found problematic the legal and anthropological status of the Indians. As stated above, the solution was the *encomienda* as a form of "middle government" (Zavala 1935: 87) that gave Indians freedom in theory and forced labor in practice. This was not a smooth process. The Spanish crown and colonisers did take time and struggled to discuss ways to negotiate the particular economic interests of the settlers with the political and financial needs of the Spanish empire. Several trials and errors on tribute policies, *encomiendas*' inheritance rights and Indian labor's rating took place. One of the earliest global colonial governmentality was unmistakably unfolding.

The "Continental" *encomienda* begun in the 1520s and was not entirely different. Jimenez (2005) highlights the aristocratic desires of Cortes and his companions, who saw themselves as medieval lords living a "properly aristocratic" life, living off a territory and an indigenous work force and fulfilling their duties as vassals of the Spanish King. As said above, this did not necessarily occur because the *encomienda* did not include, in theory, ownership of the land by the *encomendero* (cf. Lockhart 1969). Jimenez (2005) states that the total number of *encomenderos* only in middle America amounted to 480 by 1560. Yeager (1995) reports nearly 550 *encomiendas* in middle America by 1550. Bolton (1917), on the other hand, reports 9,000 *encomiendas* and 4,000 *encomenderos* by 1547 in all the Spanish colonial regions. Yeager asserts that the number of *encomiendas*, particularly in Mexico and Peru, decreased significantly between the 17th and 18th century. I want to underscore next a particularity of *encomiendas* that is not usually explored in depth (e.g. Lockhart 1969, Cuello 1998, Jimenez 2005, Diaz-Cayeros 2011).

The duties of the first *encomenderos* in Granada, Spain, included the payment of a wage to the friars in charge of the inhabitants' (re-)evangelization. The *encomendero* had to "overlook" the indoctrination of the population and make sure the process ran smoothly (Jimenez 2005). In this sense, *encomiendas* in the Americas were not different in principle (Ramos 1999). *Encomenderos* in the Americas "provided the Indians [...] instruction in the Catholic faith" (Yeager 1995: 843). This instruction was certainly not carried out by the *encomendero* himself, yet it had to be supervised by him, and, it included an obligation to provide friars and missionaries a wage (Bolton 1917; Jimenez

⁶ Lockhart insists on the advantageous economic consequences of *encomiendas*; this author notes that *encomenderos* had created relatively successful "networks of enterprises in almost all branches of economic activity" (1969: 527).

2005). In a brief statement, Lockhart notes that “each *encomienda* was supposed to have its doctrinero to minister to the Indians”; this individual, Lockhart adds, would also serve as the *encomendero*’s “private chaplain” (1969: 527). The procurement of indoctrination required the construction of ad hoc sites, therefore the procurements for the construction of chapels and small friaries nearby the *encomienda* was also part of the *encomendero*’s functions (Bolton 1917). Ramos (1999) points that the *encomendero*’s obligation in Venezuela included “above all” those regarding the evangelization and the labor of the Indians; the aim, in this author’s words, was to oversee “the spiritual and the secular wellbeing” of the Indigenous (1999: 30; see also Foucault 2007: 175, 181). Further details about this governmental rationale can be found in the controversies that took place previous and after the attempts to introduce the “New Laws” by the Spanish Crown in the 1540s.

One of the targets of the “New Laws” was the *encomiendas*’ reform. During a hearing in the early 1540s Bishop Bartolome de Las Casas, a former *encomendero* in fact, appealed to the King for the ban of the *encomiendas* in the Americas. De las Casas stated that the management of the indigenous population’ and its conversion to Catholicism could only be carried out by the crown given that *encomenderos* were “little interested in the souls of the Indians” and privileged “material interests over the spiritual end” (Zavala 1935: 90) of the *encomiendas*. The bishop reminded the king that the crown “had to establish a government in such a way that the Indians received temporal and spiritual benefits” (Zavala 1935: 91; Foucault 2007). In 1542, the King issued the “New Laws” whose chapter 30 stated the prohibition of both new *encomiendas* and the inheritance of existing ones (Zavala 1935: 97). In a letter written in February 17th, 1564, a group of settlers and *encomenderos* addressed the king and reminded him that his royal revenues depended on the *encomiendas*; to this reason they added that “their sons and descendants” will make sure the natives “will be instructed in the matters of our holy Catholic faith” so the latter leave behind “vices and idolatries” (cited in Jimenez 2005: n.p.). Bartolome de las Casas, on the other hand, was keen on stressing that the vices were spread by the *encomenderos* themselves and their “little Christian” habits (Zavala 1935: 90). In a brief passage on the *encomiendas* in the northern part of what is now Mexico (New Vizcaya by then), Cuello (1988) reminds us that there were occasions when not even the parisher in charge fulfilled his obligations – in 1643 in the northern town of Saltillo, *encomenderos* decided to stop paying the parisher because he “was neglecting his duties” (1988: 690).

Encomenderos’ integral(ist) duties, however, were by all means advocated. Religious orders certainly supported the usefulness of *encomiendas*. Interestingly, the reasons advocated by the latter were both spiritual and pragmatic-material. The Dominicans, for instance, did not only stress that *encomiendas* eased the conversion of the Indians and kept them in peace, they also claimed that *encomiendas* were more profitable than *corregimientos*⁷ and eventually more beneficial for the King and his treasury (Zavala 1935: 103). The reasons put forward by the Franciscans in a letter in 1544 were similar. They emphasized both the importance of *encomenderos* for the Indians’ “Christian instruction” as well as the social “stability” (Zavala 1935: 105) that would emerge in the colonies from the permanence of the *encomiendas*. They also portrayed the *encomenderos* as characters sent to the Americas by God Himself as they had arrived first “so they could, with their industriousness and joy,

⁷ *Corregimientos* were territorial divisions managed by an appointee of the Spanish Crown, as opposed to the *encomendero* and his private venture.

pave the way for the evangelization” of the Indians (cited in Zavala 1935: 105; my translation). The *encomiendas*’ economic and political advantages recalled by these religious orders could have been a discursive strategy to secure the sympathy, and the funding (Bolton 1917: 48-49), of the crown. But the work of the Catholic missionaries confirms, once again, that the procurement of spiritual and material needs – either of the natives’, the settlers’ or the colonial enterprise’s as a whole – were imperative principles throughout the colonial regime.

4.3 Catholic Missionaries

In his analysis of colonial pictorial vestiges in a rural parish in Pitiquito, Sinaloa, Gutierrez (1997) reminds us that one of the “instruments” of the Spanish colonisation was the Catholic “mission”. These missions were carried out by members of religious orders – Franciscans, Dominicans, Jesuits and Augustinians (Elliot 1984; Ricard 2000) – and were meant not only for converting the indigenous population to Catholicism. In Gutierrez’ words, the religious in charge of the missions had to “educate” the indigenous and settle them in manageable communities with *ad hoc* “social and political institutions” (1997: 352). In other words, the daily life work by religious orders during such missions comprised interventions in the communities’ spiritual *and material* dimensions. Additional to the “fatherly love” the religious orders had to keep as the driving principle of their spiritual procurement, the orders were also in charge of “persuading” the indigenous to abandon their straw-made huts and live in proper adobe houses. According to Gutierrez, these houses were arranged by the missionaries with “order, proportion and community” (1997: 355).

In Bolton’s view this kind of spiritual and material missions thrived particularly in the north of the Spanish colonies – the area which today corresponds to the north of Mexico and south of the United States – because the *encomiendas* there were not as successful as in the central regions. The *encomiendas*’ failure was the consequence, according to this author, of the nomadic life style, the defiant attitude and the “wild” nature of the northern tribes, or *Chichimecas* (Bolton 1917: 44-45). As a result, northern missions were in charge not only of the natives’ conversion but also of their “protection and civilization” (1917: 45). The Indians were first and foremost converted and then “civilized” – or *viceversa* (cf. Cervantes 1994). In a style that seems rather distrustful of the very theological precepts on the Catholic shepherd (Foucault 2007), Catholic historian Zephyrin Engelhardt (1851-1934) once stated that Spanish missionaries

“had to introduce, teach, and supervise [...] arts, trades, and occupations, before they could expect to make any headway with the truths of salvation.... As an absolutely necessary means to win the souls of the savages, these [...] men accepted the disagreeable task of conducting huge farms, teaching and supervising various mechanical trades, having an eye on the livestock and herders [...]” (cited in Bolton 1917: 57).

The training of the natives in agriculture, Spanish-style craftsmanship and livestock farming were also determinant in the planning and construction of the mission. “While the church was ever the centre of the establishment”, Bolton asserts, the “fully developed” missions also included “a

great industrial school [...], weaving rooms, blacksmith shop, tannery, wine-press, and warehouses” as well as “irrigating ditches, vegetable gardens, and grain fields;” together with “thousands of horses, cattle, sheep, and goats” (1917: 57). And yet the actualization of pragmatic logics and material procurement was not only a step previous to the teaching of religious contents. Pragmatism was also part of the evangelical work itself. However docile or truly faithful to the literal doctrine (cf. Estrada 2011; Marquez 2008) the indigenous convertees eventually turned out, Bolton notes that religious conversion implied a religious teaching “based on long experience, and administered with much practical sense” (1917: 55). For instance, three already-converted Indian families were brought to some missions to increase the chances of successful conversions in the future. A religious source cited by Bolton notes that the use of related families was even more advantageous because that insured the permanence of the newly-converted in the missions “while if they do flee it is easier to recover them by means of their relatives than through strangers” (1917: 54). Although Bolton’s study objects are the northern missions in the Americas, other historians have portrayed missions in central regions in similar terms. Historian Robert Ricard’s accounts (2000) reveal as well an early integralism in the management of the indigenous flocks by the missions in central regions. Ricard points out, for instance, that Dominican Francisco Marin in the Mixteca region taught the indigenous “to dress, feed themselves properly and live in communities”; additionally he “set up a common chest for the expenses of a general nature” and “directed the construction of churches and public buildings” (Ricard 2000: 137). Ricard’s accounts also include a Franciscan friar who reportedly founded “towns and villages [...] laying out the squares and streets and marking the locations of the principal buildings” (2000: 137). And yet it was the Augustinians who “seemed to be masters [...] of founding villages and policing and administering them”. In a region within Michoacan, this order “laid out squares and streets, brought in water, erected a hospital and a convent” (2000: 138) and built houses with chapels within them. Furthermore, the construction of such a town also included the procurement of means for transportation to the towns nearby. These villages, in Ricard’s words, “were entirely in the hands of the religious, even their temporal affairs” (2000: 139).

Missionaries were indeed stationed in temporary workplaces. After ten years of the mission’s establishment and operation, the missionary had to leave and hand in the management of the place to regular priests. Further historiographical evidence, however, points that these regular priests, in and out of the missions, did not necessarily abolish the logic of spiritual and material procurement, but rather went on with it (Zavala Pelayo 2014: 97). In 1745, a Catholic priest excused some missionaries for not having learnt “the native languages”; his reason was, in fact, that missionaries were “occupied with ministering to the spiritual and temporal needs of the Indians” (cited in Bolton 1917: 56). From a clearly prejudiced stance, Bolton (1917) and Ricard (2000) refer to these activities throughout their texts as “the civilizing” of the indigenous⁸. I want to stress instead that these activities were the

8 The missionary as a “civilizing agent” in Mexico was a metaphor and an actual practice meant to last. In 1922, after the turmoil of the 1910s Mexican revolution, the country’s minister of education Jose Vasconcelos issued literally a “call for missionaries” for the Ministry’s “cultural missions” (1923). The similarities go beyond the use of the same nouns. The cultural missions’ aim was to recruit “intellectuals and teachers” as “missionaries of civilization” willing to embark on “a holy crusade against ignorance” (Vasconcelos 1923: 177). Vasconcelos’ was not a calls to arms that would “kill men”, it was a call meant to “save men” and “wake up souls”; the chosen would “imitate [Catholic bishop Bartolome] de las Casas, the creator, not [Hernan] Cortes, the destructor” (1923: 177-178). It has been noted that these revolutionary 20th-century missions were based on a “messianic-redemptive” scheme and that the missionary-teacher was an “ideological apostle”, a “true incarnation” who had an “evangelising task” (Hicks 1984: 28).

practical manifestation of the integralism – everyday procurement of both material and spiritual care (Foucault 2007) – that constituted the *ratio pastoralis* in the colonial missions in Mexico, institutions that Bolton qualifies as “well-nigh universal” (1917: 45) by the 17th and 18th century in the Americas. Sociologist of religion Blancarte (2000) states that no “true Indian pastoral” was developed after the 1550s neither by the Catholic church nor the Spanish crown. It would be the Creole population which received a more effective indoctrination, whereas the natives were “more and more [...] excluded from ecclesiastical influence” (2000: 597). However, this author offers no empirical evidence to support such a claim (cf. Estrada). On the other hand, the specialized texts above (Bolton 1917; Elliot 1984; Gutierrez 1997; Ricard 2000), except for Cuello (1988), do not suggest that missions turned out to be weak and inefficient institutions in their integral evangelizing of the indigenous population. And even if they were so, it is also important to recall what specialized authors state as to the composition of the population in New Spain: although the indigenous population was obviously the majority at the beginning of the colonial period, it was the Creole population which predominated from the late 16th century (McCaa 1997). As I will explain in the section below, there is evidence which suggests that Catholicism, or rather popular Catholicism (Blancarte 2000), was effectively extended beyond the indigenous population and the Catholic church *per se*.

The three colonial institutions I have briefly reviewed above diverge in nature and ultimate purpose. The pragmatic and profits-based logic of the Spanish *encomenderos* may not have been necessarily equivalent to the (contested) right of the *caciques* to levy tribute from his subjects. Missionaries and *encomenderos* might have grown up in, and sailed to the Americas from, the same Spanish cities across the Atlantic but they indeed had diverging colonial projects in mind. And yet there was a shared task, which was either imposed upon them or carried out willingly: *the direct or indirect spiritual and material procurement of their “flocks”*. The similarity between the religious-political role of indigenous *caciques* and the spiritual-material functions of missionaries and *encomenderos* was certainly an accident (Foucault 1977); however fortuitous, this convergence was certainly highly productive in spiritual (Cervantes 1994) and material-exploitative terms. On the other hand, *encomenderos* and missionaries, by both royal and papal decrees, had to supply directly or indirectly spiritual sustenance to the natives they were in charge of. The satisfaction of religious needs was an inescapable matter in both institutions. Interestingly, both institutions combined as well the procurement of the spiritual dimension with the procurement of the material dimension. The latter took the form of an exploitative institution in the *encomiendas*, and a more “civilizing” (Bolton 1917; Ricard 2000), organization in the missions. In any case, both institutions governed their subjects by paying attention simultaneously to religious-spiritual and material-pragmatic affairs. Last but not least, historian Rubial’s states (2002: 29-30) that the “indigenous elites”, likely *caciques* among them, played a “helpful-collaborator” role in the evangelization of the indigenous flocks. Next I want to go beyond the aforementioned institutions and their *integralist practices* (Foucault 2007) and dwell upon both the *salvific governmentality* they were part of and the *pervasiveness* of such a colonial *ratio pastoralis-gubernatoria*.

5. Colonial Pastoral Power: Salvation via Worldly Integralism

As I have discussed in the section above the colonial governmental rationale of the Spanish Empire, as seen through the post-conquest *caciques*, missionaries and specially the *encomenderos*, was an ever-unfolding, trial-and-error constitutive process, yet it was consistently equivalent to an expansionist logic that sought by all means – *de facto* slavery included – economic profits and political power and prestige at a global scale. However, as stated above, other governmental logics, in this case particularly religious and salvific, cannot be underestimated. If we take into account the mystic and eschatological vision of the Spanish kingdom previous and after the invasion of the Americas (Elliot 1984; Lafaye 1997), the systematic procurement of both material and spiritual care *in this world* appears consistent; the zealous integralist procurement of the spiritual and material dimensions in the colonies represent the means to attain the Spanish kingdom's (and its colonies') *otherworldly, transcendental salvation* (Foucault 1982). Documents by the Catholic church and clergy shed more light on this integralist and salvific governmentality.

As early as 1555, during the first Concilium organized by the Catholic Church in Mexico City, archbishop Alonso de Montufar commanded the archbishopric's physicians to "heal the bodies of the sick men" and, at the same time, urge the latter to properly confess before a priest. His logic, parallel to the governmental logic of the missionary and *encomendero*, included two constitutive elements: the body and the soul⁹. These were not necessarily discreet components, the constitutive relationship between both was such that, in Montufar's words, "bodily sickness comes from spiritual indisposition" (n.a. 1769: 56; my translation); the body's health was intertwined with the soul's health. Both components could be addressed separately in Montufar's literal commands but the distinction was just for the sake of clarity, the soul and the body were, or had to be, one and the same reality¹⁰. This logic of two organically interrelated ontological constituents was not only applied to the idea of the human being. During the second Concilium in Mexico City in 1565, archbishop Montufar put forward the existence of two churches, a "triumphant" and a "militant" church. In Montufar's words the former was the place reserved for those who "triumphed in this world and over the Demon and the flesh" and thus can "live forever in perpetual joy and bliss", enjoying perpetual "friendship" with God. The militant church was the place for "all the Christians" preoccupied by material and spiritual matters alike, that is, those fighting a "continuous war against the Demon, the World and the Flesh", (n.a. 1769: 185-186; my translation). The Sacraments in this war represented "efficacious medication", for both the body and the soul. Unsurprisingly, the target was "*to be brought from the Militant Church to the Triumphant Church*" (n.a. 1769: 187; my emphasis). The access to a "triumphant" heaven through and from an integral militancy in earth was not only part of the high clergy's discourses. The linking of heaven and earth, or the-other-world and this-world, was also a brief yet systematic reference in the prayers priests by all means had to teach to the converted and in the Catholic rites all together had to perform.

⁹ See Sahlins (1996) for an anthropological discussion of the Judeo-Christian genealogy of this dualistic conception of human nature.

¹⁰ Interestingly, sociologist of religion Christian Parker, while discussing the possible conceptual categories that sociology in Latin America could devise and add up to Western theories, pointed that the "Western modernising rationalism made us believe for a long time that we were [constituted by] reason alone"; in Parker's view the contemporary "man is reason and heart unitarily; spirit and body holistically" (1994: 231).

Chapter one of the first Mexican Council's decrees (1555) insists that the converted indigenous had to know "well and definitely" (n.a. 1769: 41) the Pater Noster – besides the Hail Mary, the Creed, and the Salve Regina. According to historian Carrillo's translation, the *Pater Noster*, in the "abbreviated Catechism" recommended by the Third Mexican Council's decrees (Carrillo 2009: 840-841), does not only read as "Your kingdom come" but actually as "Your kingdom come to us" and this is then followed by the well-known "Your will be done / On earth as in heaven". The *Pater Noster* was not the only piece in official Catholic discourses that succinctly yet explicitly joined this and the other world. As mentioned above, sacraments were integral "medication" during the war against "the Demon" and "the Flesh" but also additional bridges for bringing salvation to this world, that is, integral connections between a coarse earth and a blissful heaven. Baptism for instance was addressed as the sacrament which first and foremost allowed the converted "to enter [...] Christ's sheepfold" and be "stripped" from his "old humanity" and "mortal and miserable life" so "he" could access a "new humanity", one "invoked" by the Holy Trinity, one of "life and incorruptibility" (Carrillo 2009: 518). According to the first Mexican Council's proceedings, the Eucharist was another sacrament that momentarily yet significantly joined together a transcendental God and a worldly believer and also involved a key historical character that was simultaneously human and divine (or integral-like), – "[...] Jesus Christ, true God and Men" (n.a. 1769: 139). It was not a coincidence that the Mexican Conciliums insisted with such an eloquence and frequency on the importance to administer those sacraments extensively and "properly" (n.a. 1769: 188-193; Carrillo 2009: 518-528). In the third Mexican Council's proceedings (1585) it is clearly stated that those who "wish now to obtain the grace and eternal life" were "obliged to know the ten commandments" of the Church (n.a. 1769: 519-520; my emphasis). The aim, as this statement suggest, was to link an integral "here and now" with a transcendental "there and then"; to pave the way to spiritual salvation through an integral (material-spiritual) militancy. As Cervantes notes, Mesoamerican Christianity was "objective and realist", its ultimate aim, however, "was outside history and beyond time" (1994: n.p.). Next I want to portray the pervasiveness and extensiveness of these transcendental-salvific and worldly-integral logics by accounting for their actualization beyond the clerical and doctrinal fields.

Over the decades such an insistent salvation-oriented integralism had to had an effect in governmental practices beyond the clerical and missionary spheres. Brading notes that there came a time when the Catholic Church decided to organize the population "in smaller groups" and "include them in the participation, provision, and maintenance of the Catholic liturgy" (1997: 37). These groups took the form of *cofradías* or religious guilds. Here I want to give an account of *cofradías* as a non-clerical instance of governmental integralism and a salvific rationale. In Garcia Ayuardo's words (2002) religious guilds represented "corporations" of devotees, mostly merchants, who accumulated "variable amounts of capital" through the member's payments of fees and the management of loans. Guilds, however, were not only financial enterprises, they became trusts "with devotional and charitable purposes"; their funds covered "charitable, spiritual, ceremonial, liturgical and devotional needs" (2002: 1). Brading (1997) points that guilds covered the costs of solemn and ordinary masses in parishes, organized celebrations for Easters, Corpus Christi and "the most important Marian festivities"; and they also paid the expenses of members' funerals and supplied facilities to assist sick members. In short, they "visited the sick, buried the dead and carried out [...] charitable tasks" (1997: 39). These guilds represented networks of devotional groups competing for more members and

prestige; they were remarkably active in economic and charitable terms. And yet economic gains and charitable pride were not their only drives. They also had “spiritual and material obligations” (Garcia Ayuardo 2002: 10) and the latter included indeed services that can be described today as functions of health care agencies and welfare systems (Foucault 1982: 784). Compared to the Catholic church’s, this material-pragmatic care may have been “soft”, but it was certainly extended beyond strictly spiritual matters. In a territory where souls, chapels, friaries, religious conversions as well as bodies, households, hospitals and farming skills were procured alike by a pragmatic Catholic clergy – either through the work of missionaries, *encomenderos* or *caciques* –, integralist governmentalities became also an effective practice beyond the clerical field.

Garcia Ayuardo’s account of guilds are particularly relevant too because it also portrays these organizations as “eternal communities” which united society and, more importantly, “helped to achieve celestial life” and “salvation” (2002: 10) while working on their worldly integral tasks. In this author’s view, believers needed “a worldly institution” (2002: 11) that endorsed their spiritual needs and secured their access to salvation. In other words, religious guilds represented material and experiential bridges between this world and the other world, an institutional-spiritual path to access salvation from the here and now. In addition to their integralist functions, *cofradías* can be also described as multi-dimensional institutions which put into practice moneylending “calculations” (Foucault 2007: 144), local politics, and the achievement of other-worldly salvation from worldly deeds, beyond clerical rituals and discourses. Both the integralist and salvific governmental logics push forward by the Church and materialized differently in *encomiendas* and missions was also having an effect in the civil sphere of colonial Mexico.

It is this blend of pragmatic and religious thought that anthropologist Lomnitz (2001) has pointed out as well. The discursive and practical synthesis of body and soul, matter and spirit, and the access to the-other-world in/from this-world, which could be readily described today as irrational or absurd (e.g. Foucault 2007: 175-178), embeds a style of reasoning that was variable yet usual throughout colonial Mexico. Anthropologist Claudio Lomnitz notes that in the late 18th century, there was a “genre of writing” he calls “the scientifically marvellous”. According to this author, the *Gazeta de Mexico*, “a paper whose dedication to useful things was decreed by the king himself”, is a documentary source “replete” with examples of this genre (2002: 201). By citing a passage on a sick child whose right side of his body was reportedly “pocked by measles” whereas his right side was “filled with smallpox”, Lomnitz suggest that the underlying rationale was a “combination between the infinite and the exact”, a type of rationality which upheld that “natural phenomena” are “motivated by a divine order” (2001: 201); in other words, “*natural* harmony revealed *heavenly* intervention” (2001: 202; my emphasis). The scientific discourses of this late colonial period had a double function: to instruct “reasonable people” and to reveal God’s hand in nature. The “reasonable people” category included religious and secular intellectuals opposed to a backward Catholic church and those who, rather unsurprisingly, saw in “God’s ways” ad hoc instruments “for the improvement of the living conditions of the public” (2001: 202). This group of people comprised civically-engaged priests, some of them as prominent as priest-army general Miguel Hidalgo (2001: 202), and others as ordinary as the hypothetical priest that is depicted in one of the quotation Lomnitz inserts from a 1784 *Gazeta*:

“In the town of Cozotlan [...] there resided a curate who combined a satisfactory level of comprehension with great diligence, because of which he remained unsatisfied with mere devotions to his obligations, and sought always to be instructed in the useful natural sciences, which were not incompatible with his office [...]” (quoted in Lomnitz 2001: 202-203).

Lomnitz’ argument in this chapter aims at offering a historical account of government and the space for intellectuals in Mexico. He in fact refers to Foucault’s concept of governmentality (2001: 202, 210-211) as a useful term to understand “the strategies with which intellectuals represented national sentiments” (2001: 210). Here I want to use Lomnitz’ documentary evidence to account instead for the everyday-life blend of practical reason and “God’s ways” and its contribution to the integral and salvific governmental logics I have sketched out in this section. If Miguel Hidalgo himself (Lomnitz 2001: 202), as well as imaginary Catholic priests in the late 18th century had a pragmatic interest in nature and science additional to their clerical and sacramental duties, it was because they had to combine first the practical and the spiritual in this world and then link it to an ideal of a coming salvation in the other world. Like the religious who organized and governed missions with an integralist zeal in the 16th and 17th century, Catholic priests of the 18th century were still actualizing the integralist and salvific rationale the whole colonial enterprise had been founded upon and which had also been extended, though differentially, beyond the strictly religious field in institutions such as *encomiendas* and, later on, religious guilds. Although changing, ever-transforming, and at times even scientific, integralist and salvific governmentality had successfully spread in multiple dimensions of colonial Mexico.

6. Conclusions

Countering his own concept of episteme, Foucault (2007) argues that the European pastoral power’s pastor-sheep subordination was plainly absurd and irrational; neither a practical nor a theological end was discernible in that asymmetric relationship. The plastic pastoral power that developed in the colonial Americas, or at least in the then New Spain (today’s Mexico, south of United States and central America), had a clear theological objective: salvation – the salvation of the colonial flock and its masters. But salvation in a new territory, and for an unknown population, did not come easy. It was necessary to implement a series of practical tasks I have preliminarily sketched out above: the planning of towns and missions, the gathering of the Indigenous, the translation of the flock’s and the master’s languages, the teaching of agricultural, farming and craftsmanship skills to the natives, the construction of ad hoc teaching premises – in short, *a realist methodology of salvation*. However absurd the final aim of such a methodology appears today, it involved a carefully planned pragmatic thinking, a reasonable, if not “rational” (Flyvbjerg 1998), set of steps and procedures. Both the process and its ultimate aim were Spain’s transcendental mission in this world. This methodology of salvation included the *encomenderos* and the *caciques* as well. Both had to contribute to the same theological aim by carrying out on their own integralist tasks of material and spiritual (indirect) care. After an intense first stage of exploitation and evangelization through *encomiendas* and missions,

colonial governmentalities adapted to the unavoidable changes of colonial development yet did not left behind their worldly-integralism and spiritual-salvation logics. Mexico's Creole population, certainly steered by high and low Catholic clerics, also contributed to these rationales with organizations like religious guilds. Even after the arrival of scientific discourses, priests and non-religious "reasonable people" were keen on contemplating at the same time the infinite and the exact, the divine and the worldly. At times the frontier between these two, usually contradictory, logics seems to merge into one single temporal-transcendental rationale, which simultaneously upholds a spiritual salvation in the other world *together with* an *ad hoc* pragmatic-integral methodology in this world. Foucault argues that the 18th-century European modern state broke away with spiritual salvation and implemented instead a rationale of "worldly" salvation (1982: 784). The Bourbonic reforms in Spain in the 18th century apparently brought an influx of liberalism and modernization to the colonial Americas (Guerrero 1994); however, late 18th century *Gazetas* in Mexico City (Lomnitz 2001) tell of the prevalence of scientific-marvellous rationales and rational-transcendental mentalities. Broadly speaking, spiritual salvation in 18th-century colonial Mexico was not replaced by a worldly salvation; it was rather accompanied, flanked, guaranteed by different versions of the latter, as it had been since the 15th century. Doubtless more specific attributes or "procedures" (Foucault 2007: 144) of this colonial-pastoral governmentality are yet to be explored.

This paper has mostly focused on colonial-pastoral logics that were enforced with more or less flexibility in New Spain – a territory which today comprises Mexico, southern United States and Central America. I do not deem it advisable to overlook regional contingencies and extrapolate to other Spanish colonial territories in Latin America the type of colonial-pastoral logics I have merely introduced above. Further and more specific genealogies of colonial governmental (meta-) institutions in Mexico and in the Peru, Rio de la Plata and New Granada viceroyalties would be necessary to speak of pastoralism/s in Latin America. However, a *preliminary* general account of such pastoralism/s could well include the transcendental salvific power and the worldly integralist logics described above. Promising research questions could also emerge if we ponder the extent to which such a colonial salvific-integralist rationales were de facto fractured by the colonies' 19th century independence movements (cf. Krebs 2002) and the constitutional separations church-state which took place as early as the 1850s in the case of Mexico or as late as the 1920s in the case of Chile (Tagle 1997). If we take into account the lack of *major* theological-political counter-conducts (Foucault 2007) in the religious history of countries like Mexico (Zavala Pelayo 2014; cf. Bastian 1981), the possibilities of finding continuities from colonial to modern governing logics and techniques in Latin America do appear high. In this sense historian Lafaye's (1997) observations are also suggestive. In his view, it is not that religious references have been destroyed in modern Latin American societies; rather those references could be "no longer conscious, or explicit" (1997: 96). These implicit references may account for the transference of a "religious faith" into a "political faith" (1997: 98) and the resulting "messianic Latin American movements" (1997: 22; see also Blancarte 2000: 599; Perez-Rayon 2004: 146) led by salvific figures, or "modern *caudillos*" (Castro 2007), such as Emiliano Zapata, Camilo Torres, *Che* Guevara or, more recently, Hugo Chavez.

7. Bibliography

- Asad, Talal* 2003: *Formations of the Secular. Christianity, Islam, Modernity*, Stanford, Ca: Stanford University Press.
- Bastian, Jean-Pierre* 1981: Protestantismo y política en México, *Revista Mexicana de Sociología*, Vol. 43, Special Number, 1947-1966.
- Blancarte, Roberto* 2000: Popular religión, Catholicism and socioreligious dissent in Latin America, *International Sociology*, Vol. 15, No. 4, 591-603.
- Bolton, Herbert* 1917: The Mission as a Frontier Institution in the Spanish-American Colonies, *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 23, No. 1, 42-61.
- Brading, David A.* 1997: La devoción católica y la heterodoxia en el Mexico borbónico, in: Garcia Ayuardo, Clara/Ramos Medina, Manuel (eds) *Manifestaciones religiosas en el mundo colonial americano*, Mexico: Universidad Iberoamericana, 349-360.
- Carrillo, Alberto* 2009: *Manuscritos del concilio tercero provincial mexicano (1585)*, Primer tomo, Vol III, Mexico: Universidad Pontificia de Mexico.
- Castro, Pedro* 2007: El caudillismo en América Latina, ayer y hoy, *Política y Cultura*, Vol. 27, 9-29.
- Cervantes, Fernando* 1994: The Devil and the Saints in the Conquest of Mexico, *History Today*, Vol. 44, No. 4, in: <http://www.historytoday.com/fernando-cervantes/devil-and-saints-conquest-mexico>; Access: January 20th 2015.
- Chuchiak, John F.* 2012: *The Inquisition in New Spain, 1536–1820: A Documentary History*, Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Costa, Sergio* 2011: *Researching Entangled Inequalities in Latin America. The Role of Historical, Social and Transregional Interdependencies*. *Desigualdades.Net*, Working Paper Series, No. 9, Berlin.
- Cuello, José* 1988: The Persistence of Indian Slavery and Encomienda in the Northeast of Colonial Mexico, 1577-1723, *Journal of Social History*, Vol. 21, No. 4, 683-700.
- Diaz-Cayeros, Alberto* 2011: *Indian Identity, Poverty and Colonial Development in Mexico*, Paper Presented at Conference *The Impact of Colonial and Post-Colonial Independence Institutions on Economic Development in Latin America*, Columbia University, March 3-4, 2011.
- Douglas, Mary* 1986: *How Institutions Think*, Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Elliot, John H.* 1984: The Spanish Conquest and Settlement of America, in: Bethell, Leslie (ed) *The Cambridge History of Latin America*, Vol. 1, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 149-206.

- Estrada, Marcos* 2011: Teocracia para la liberación: la disputa por la hegemonía estatal desde la fe. La experiencia de la diócesis de San Cristóbal de las Casas y el pueblo creyente en la selva lacandona, in: Agudo Sanchíz, Alejandro/Estrada Saavedra, Marco (eds) (Trans)formaciones del estado en los márgenes de Latinoamérica. Imaginarios alternativos, aparatos inacabados y espacios transnacionales, Mexico: Colegio de Mexico and Universidad Iberoamericana, 87-121.
- Flyvbjerg, Bent* 1998: *Rationality and Power*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Foucault, Michel* 1977: Nietzsche, Genealogy, History, in: Bouchard, Donald F. (ed) *Language, Counter-memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 139-164.
- Foucault, Michel* 1982: The Subject and Power, *Critical Inquiry*, Vol. 8, No. 4, 777-795.
- Foucault, Michel* 2002a: *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, London: Routledge Classics.
- Foucault, Michel* 2002b: *The Order of Things*, London: Routledge Classic.
- Foucault, Michel* 2007: *Security, Territory, Population, Lectures at the College de France 1977-78*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Foucault, Michel* 2011: Omnes et Singulatim: Towards a Criticism of Political Reason, in: McMurrin Sterling (coord) *The Tanner Lectures on Human Values*, Vol. 2, 1981, Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 224-254.
- Garcia Ayuardo, Clara* 2002: De tesoreros y tesoros. La administración financiera y la intervención de las cofradías novohispanas, Working paper, Vol. 21, Centro de Investigación y Docencia Económicas.
- Gibson, Charles* 1973: Caciques in Post-Conquest and Colonial Mexico, in: Kern, Robert (ed) *The Caciques. Oligarchical Politics and the System of Caciquismo in the Luso-Hispanic World*, Albuquerque: The University of New Mexico Press, 18-26.
- Guerrero, Omar* 1994: *Las raíces borbónicas del Estado mexicano*, Mexico D.F.: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
- Gutierrez, Edgar* 1997: El apocalipsis de Pitiquito, una advocación de Maria para la evangelización en Sonora, in: Garcia Ayuardo, Clara, Ramos Medina, Manuel (eds) *Manifestaciones Religiosas en el mundo colonial americano*, Mexico: Universidad Iberoamericana, 349-360.
- Hearn, Jonathan* 2012: *Theorizing Power*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hemming, John* 1984: The Indians of Brazil in 1500, In: Bethell, Leslie (ed) *The Cambridge History of Latin America*, Vol. 1, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 119-144.
- Hicks, Eva* 1984: Las Misiones Culturales Rurales: Un proyecto de alfabetización para la integración, *Revista Educacion de Adultos*, Vol. 2 , No. 3.
- Jimenez, Francisco* 2005: La encomienda indiana: Del sueño señorial a la legitimidad de la Corona: El Centro de la Nueva España (1521-1560), in: <http://www.adghn.org/confe/2005/encomienda.pdf>; Access: January 25th 2015.

- Kern, Robert* (ed) 1973: *The Caciques. Oligarchical Politics and the System of Caciquismo in the Luso-Hispanic world*, Albuquerque: The University of New Mexico Press.
- Krebs, Ricardo* 2002: *La iglesia de America Latina en el siglo XIX*, Santiago: Ediciones Universidad Catolica de Chile.
- Lafaye, Jacques* 1997: *Mesias, Cruzadas, Utopias. El judeo-cristianismo en las sociedades iberoamericanas*, Mexico D.F.: Fondo de Cultura Economica.
- Lockhart, James* 1969: *Encomienda and Hacienda: The Evolution of the Great Estate in the Spanish Indies*, *The Hispanic American Historical Review*, Vol. 49, No. 3, 523-530.
- Lomntiz, Claudio* 2001: *Deep Mexico, Silent Mexico. An Anthropology of Nationalism*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Marquez, Zacarias* 2008: *Misiones de Chihuahua, siglos XVII y XVIII*, Mexico D.F.: Consejo Nacional para la Cultura y las Artes.
- Masferrer, Elio* 2000: *La configuración del campo religioso latinoamericano. El caso de Mexico*, in: Masferrer, Elio (ed) *Sectas o Iglesias. Viejos o nuevos movimientos religiosos*, Mexico D.F.: Palza y Valdez.
- Mayer, Alicia* 2010: *La Reforma Católica en Nueva España. Confesión, disciplina, valores sociales y religiosidad en el México virreinal. Una perspectiva de investigación*, in: Martinez Lopez-Cano, Pilar (ed) *La Iglesia en Nueva España. Problemas y perspectivas de investigación*, Mexico: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 11-52.
- McCaa, Robert* 1997: *The Peopling of Mexico from Origins to Revolution*, in: <http://www.hist.umn.edu/~rmccaa/mxpoprev/cambridg3.htm>; Access: February 2nd 2015.
- N.a.* 1769: *Concilios provinciales primero y segundo. Celebrados en la muy noble y muy leal ciudad de México. Presidiendo el Illmo. y Rmo. Señor D. Alonso de Montúfar en los años de 1555 y 1556*. México, Imprenta del Superior Gobierno, Dn. Joseph Antonio de Hogal.
- Parker, Cristian* 1994: *La sociología de la religión y la modernidad: Por una revisión crítica de las categorías durkheimianas desde América Latina*, *Revista Mexicana de Sociología*, Vol. 56, No. 4, 229-254.
- Perez-Rayon, Nora* 2004: *El anti-clericalismo en Mexico. Una visión desde la sociología histórica*, *Sociologica*, Vol. 19, No. 55, 113-152.
- Ramos, Elvira* 1999: *La posesion de la encomienda y otros rituales coloniales españoles en las provincias americanas*, *Boletin Antropologico*, No. 46, 22-38.
- Ricard, Robert* 2000: *La conquista espiritual de Mexico*, 2nd ed, Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Economica.
- Rubial, Antonio* 2002: *Ángeles en carne mortal. Viejos y nuevos mitos sobre la evangelización de Mesoamérica*, *Signos históricos*, No. 7, 19-51.

- Sahlins, Marshall* 1996: The Sadness of Sweetness. The Native Anthropology of Western Cosmology, *Current Anthropology*, No. 37, 395–428.
- Sandoval, Eduardo* 2006: La diversidad religiosa y los estudios para la paz, *Ra Ximhai, Revista de Sociedad, Cultura y Desarrollo Sustentable*, Vol. 2, No. 1, 27-44.
- Sayer, Andrew* 2000: *Realism and Social Science*, London: Sage.
- Schwerin, Karl* 1973: The Anthropological Antecedents: Caciques, Cacicazgos and Caciquismo, in: Kern, Robert (ed) *The Caciques. Oligarchical Politics and the System of Caciquismo in the Luso-Hispanic World*, Albuquerque: The University of New Mexico Press, 5-17.
- Soustelle, Jacques* 1961: *Daily Life of the Aztecs, on the Eve of the Spanish Conquest*, California: Stanford University Press.
- Tagle, Matias* 1997: La separación de la iglesia y el estado en Chile. *Historiografía y debate, Historia*, Vol. 30, 383-439.
- Vasconcelos, Jose* 1923: Invitación a los intelectuales y maestros para que se inscriban como misioneros. In *Boletín de la Secretaría de Educación Pública*. Mexico City: Secretaría de Educación Pública, 177-178, in: <http://icaadocs.mfah.org/icaadocs/THEARCHIVE/FullRecord/tabid/88/doc/734623/language/en-US/Default.aspx>; Access: January 28th 2015.
- Wolf, Eric* 1958: The Virgin of Guadalupe: A Mexican National Symbol, *The Journal of American Folklore*, Vol. 71, No. 279, 34-39.
- Weber, Max* 1948: Politics as vocation. In Gerth H.H. and Wright Mills C. (Eds. and Trans.) *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, New York: Oxford University Press, 67-128.
- Weber, Max* 1978: *Economy and Society. An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Yeager, Timothy* 1995: Encomienda or Slavery? The Spanish Crown's Choice of Labor Organization in Sixteenth-Century Spanish America, *The Journal of Economic History*, Vol. 55, No. 4, 842-859.
- Zavala Pelayo, Edgar* 2013a: Religion and "Secular" Social Science: The Neglected Epistemological Influences of Catholic Discourses on Sociology in Mexico, Doctoral Dissertation, Sociology Department, University of Edinburgh.
- Zavala Pelayo, Edgar* 2013b: Unearthing Durkheim's Buried Thesis: Religions and Scientific Classifications, *Estudios en Ciencias Sociales y Administrativas*, No. 3, 65-85.
- Zavala Pelayo, Edgar* 2014: Pastoral Power Outside Foucault's Europe: Public Education and the 'Epistemic Authority' of Social Scientists in Mexico, *Journal of Political Power*, Vol. 7, Issue 1, 87-106.
- Zavala, Silvio* 1935: *La encomienda indiana*, Madrid: Centro de Estudios Históricos.

About the author



Edgar Zavala Pelayo is a postdoctoral researcher affiliated to the Center for Area Studies of the Freie Universität Berlin and based at the Freie Universität's Lateinamerika Institute and the DesiguALdades.net Research Network. He is author of the research articles 'Nominal Openness and Epistemic Endogamy in 'Global' and 'Provincialised' Sociologies' (2015) and 'Pastoral Power Outside Foucault's Europe: Public Education and the 'Epistemic Authority' of Social Scientists in Mexico' (2014). His current research project is aimed at analyzing pastoral logics in the political rationalities of Mexico's elite political youth. The project is sponsored by the Freie Universität's POINT fellowships program.

Email address:

ezavalap@zedat.fu-berlin.de

Website:

http://www.fu-berlin.de/en/sites/cas/ueber_uns/Postdoctoral-Fellows/cas-postdocs/Edgar-Zavala-Pelayo/index.html



Das Center for Area Studies (CAS) bündelt die an der Freien Universität Berlin in unterschiedlichen Forschungsverbänden aktive geistes- und sozialwissenschaftliche Regionalkompetenz. Nordamerika, Lateinamerika, Osteuropa, Ostasien und der Vordere Orient sind traditionelle Forschungs- und Lehrschwerpunkte der Freien Universität. Im Blick sind heute aber auch die übrigen Weltregionen wie Westeuropa und Afrika. Wissenschaftliche Aufgabe des Zentrums für Regionalstudien ist die interdisziplinäre Erforschung transkultureller Phänomene und Prozesse.

Weitere Informationen finden Sie unter: www.fu-berlin.de/cas/