Colonized Colonialism(s): A Calibanian Prosperity or a Prospering Caliban[1]

João M. Paraskeva, *University of Massachusettes, Dartmouth*

Abstract

This article examines how Portugal's colonial power was an informal colony of the British colonial imperial power. Paraskeva examines schooling's judicial record in the fabrication of a racial framework that allowed the political dictatorial regime to wisely accommodate a dichotic identity. This was a prosperous position with the colonies and a full blast Calibanian position amongst its 'allies'. Moreover, the articles examines how formal schooling is perpetually engaged in a 'saying the unsayable policies', a discursive philosophy of praxis participates in a convenient commonsensical commonsense colonial reality. The articles ends claiming the need to pay attention to critical race theory as a way to challenge a set of predatory discourses and practices that reproduces a twisted version of historical happenings, thus participating in a segregated social construction of reality.

Keywords: Colonialism, Neocolonialism, Identity, Race, Ethnicity

---

[1] A word of profound gratitude to Boaventura Sousa Santos, Donaldo Macedo, Paget Henry, Antonia Darder, Henry Giroux and Jurjo Tores Santome. Also, I express my gratitude to my doctoral students. Sousa Santos is today's most influent and powerful approach for those really concerned with a curriculum field that promotes 'social and cognitive justice'. The political idea of "Prosperous and Caliban" is anchored in the Boaventura de Sousa Santos rationale and based on *The Storm*, written by Shakespeare, arguably his masterpiece. *The Storm* is a complex multi-scale set of "happenings". It is a love story, and a story of opportunist conspiracies. Prosperous – Duque of Milan - was taken to an island by force and for political reasons, accused as a traitor. In the said inhabited island one could see the interplays between Prosperous, his daughter Miranda, Caliban, Ariel, and a Prince. Prosperous has at his service Caliban, a slave, portrayed by Shakespeare as an adult and deformed man, and Ariel, the servile and asexual spirit that can be metamorphosed in air, water or fire. It is a story of pain and compromise, a story that shoes an act of revenge. One can also see such terminology "Prosperous – Caliban" at the very base of one of the best anthologies of Brazilian literature "No Reino de Caliban" Volumes I, II, and III, from Manuel Ferreira.

To my mother

Introit

In one of his flamboyant and ostentatious remarks, the Portuguese dictator António Salazar claimed that "Portugal will always be an African nation." Such a despotic statement requires cautious consideration of two things in particular. First, it is important to understand in depth the reasons why António Salazar and "his regime[s of truth]" claimed such an identity; and, second, in understanding these reasons, one has to analyze how education in general and curriculum in particular has perpetuated what one might call a bizarre reracializing policy of racism without racists (Bonilla Silva, 2003), a refine eugenic policy engaged in des-othering praxis, that is to produce the colonized other as non-existent.

Since we will consider schooling's judicial record in this reracializing political framework in the following section, I invite the reader to adopt a radical critical perspective toward the arguments that underpin such a repressive policy. A good way to start this radical critical analysis is to clarify specific political particularities of the Portuguese dictatorship epoch. Thus, in this section I will unveil how and why António Salazar's political regime wisely attempted to frame Portugal beyond the Portuguese borders, an attempt that was anchored in the idea that "we" are a "nonracial" community of people, which is to say that "we" are all Portuguese.

Subaltern Informal Colonialism

In a remarkable analysis of the Portuguese repressive position in what "used to be peacefully understood" as a natural extension of the "Portuguese Iberian territory," Boaventura de Sousa Santos (2002) highlights the "differences between the Portuguese colonizing posture and the way too many other Western countries, such as England, position themselves within the

colonial ministry" (p. 23-85). Since it is precisely within the very marrow of this difference that the Portuguese scholar based his radical arguments of Portugal as a colonial and postcolonial reality, I will address the complexity of his analysis.

According to Boaventura de Sousa Santos (2002), any serious debate over Portuguese colonial and postcolonial cartography requires a careful analysis of "the identity processes within 'space-time' of the Portuguese [culture and] language" (p. 23) There is an immeasurable and multisecular zone of contact that involved both the Portuguese people and other people from "América," Asia and Africa. In order to understand this specificity, the Portuguese radical intellectual (2002,) put forward four ways through which one can understand the Portuguese empire:

> (1) Portugal has been a semiperipheral country within the capitalist system of the modern world since the seventeenth century, (2) this semiperipheral condition has continued to be reproduced and is based both on the colonial system, and by the way Portugal "joined" the European Union, (3) there is analytic value in the world system theory concerning the conditions which have been "imposed" by globalization and (4) the Portuguese culture is indisputably a border culture, without any contente. (p. 23-26)

In other words, while it is a culture with form, its form is that of a border, a perimeter zone.

Portugal can be defined, both diachronically and synchronically, as a semiperipheral country. As Boaventura de Sousa Santos (2002) argues, such a distinctive idiosyncrasy has been developed throughout the years in Portugal, with the particular characteristics of,

> (1) a having medium economic development and, consequently, a mediating position between world economic centers and peripheries and (2) being a state that, by and large, was never able to lay claim to the more vital characteristics of a modern state found in 'the countries'at the center of the capitalist colonial project. (p. 23)

The Portuguese colonial empire had a hugely different "torque" from other colonial empires, particularly the British Empire.

This particular (political) aspect points to another kind of peculiarity. This semiperipheral condition has been reproduced until today, anchored in a disturbing colonial framework, albeit covered with the mask of democracy that greatly impacted the way Portugal "joined" another imperial stratum in forming the European Union. One has to understand that "since Portugal is a semiperipheral country, the Portuguese colonialism should be seen as semiperipheral also" (Sousa Santos, 2002, p. 24). In this sense, we are before a "subaltern colonialism," with a double colonial subaltern position based both on the colonial discourses and practices. Since the seventeenth century the history of colonialism has been written in English, and Portugal was (and still is) an English subaltern dependent empire, a position that made Portugal "England's informal colony." (Sousa Santos, 2002, p. 26).

If the Portuguese colonial empire was created as a subaltern informal colonialism, influenced by England's imprimatur, one must ask what kind of interplay took place within the Portuguese processes of colonization. Following Boaventura de Sousa Santos's approach (2002), it is important "to understand whether the colonized people of a subaltern colonial country was subcolonized or overcolonized" (p. 26). According to this radical scholar (2002), one has to pay attention to what he calls the "mirror games" (p. 26) to understand Portuguese multifaceted dual subject positions both in Europe and within the "colonies." In so doing, we will perceive how Portuguese subject positions within the cartography of Western imperial colonialism was quite explicitly Calibanian, while Portuguese subject positions within "its colonies" were de-Prospering, gradually assuming a Calibanian position. By unveiling such an intricate subject position - positions that are deeply rooted in the multiple issues of identity - we begin to understand the real basis of António Salazar's claim.

The Portuguese subject positions within the Western imperial colonialism platform were that of a Caliban. As Boaventura de Sousa Santos argues (2002), the Portuguese empire "was never able to comfortably accommodate itself within the original space-time processes of the European Prospero" (p. 53). This argument becomes even more clear if one pays cautious attention to the way Portugal was seen from the outside. By anchoring his radical critical arguments in the analysis made by Lord Byron (1881), Frère Claude Bronseval (1970), Castelo Branco Chaves (1983), Richard Crocker (1981) and Charles Adam (1981) of the Portuguese empire, Boaventura de Sousa Santos' position becomes even stronger.

> In fact, Portugal was seen in a quite negative way:

> The Portuguese people are slothful, lazy, indolent, do not take advantage of their rich soil, and moreover they do not know how to sell the wealthy resources of their colonies; Portuguese people live exclusively from the gold that comes from Brazil; Without a doubt, the Portuguese people are the most ugly race of Europe; Their heritage is a complex result of Jews, Arabs, Blacks and French and it seems that they have assumed and incorporated the worst characteristics of such races; Like the Jews, Portuguese people are penny pinching, stingy, dishonest; like the Arabs, they are jealous, malicious and vindictive; like the people of color, the Portuguese people are rude, false, servile; and they incorporate from the French, vanity, arrogance, superiority; There is no Portuguese book that is worth reading; and finally it is a nation that is deeply fueled by ignorance and pride. (Sousa Santos, 2002, p. 23-85)

As one can see from these descriptions, Portugal was never viewed as of equal status to other colonial empires. Despite its colonial position, Portugal was never acknowledged, by its imperial counterparts, as a rightful member of the Prosperian platform. This particular imperial position has to be understood within the complex sphere of eugenic issues, issues that were deeply intertwined with economic, cultural, political and economic influences. To be more precise, the Portuguese empire - and its skewed subject positions - has to be contextualized within the interplay between a capitalist and

colonialist framework. Again, Boaventura de Sousa Santos' accurate claims (2002) deserve to be highlighted:

> If the modern capitalist power has always been colonial, in the case of Portugal and its colonies, that modern capitalist power was much more colonial than capitalist. [That is to say], while the British Empire was based on a dynamic balance between capitalism and colonialism, the Portuguese Empire was based on a deeply unbalanced relation between an excess of colonialism and a huge lack of capitalism. [Thus] the specificity of the Portuguese colonialism clearly shows a political economic reason—its semiperipheral condition [on one hand] was also overtly latent within the political, social, juridical, cultural, on the survival, oppressive, resistance, proximity and distance socializing daily life practices [on the other hand].(p. 24-48)

Race, Ethnicity, Class and Gender: The Colonial Conundrum

This point is crucial. Some reductive analyses tend to divorce race from gender and from economic categories within capitalist colonial political practices, as though the economy were the only realm for the genocidal processes described above. As Walter Rodney argues (1982), "people mistakenly connect inhuman slavery practices only with racial issues, even though eugenic racist policies were implicated in imperial governance" (p. 88-89).

European planters and miners enslaved Africans for *economic* reasons, so that their labor power could be exploited. Indeed, it would have been impossible to open up the New World and to use it as constant generator of wealth had it not been for African labor: There was no other alternative: the American (Indigenous) population was virtually wiped out and Europe's population was too small for settlement overseas at that time. Then having become utterly dependent on African labor, Europeans abroad found it necessary to rationalize that exploitation in racist terms.

Barbara Fields (1990), a relative orthodox Marxist, challenges radical critical approaches that contextualized "race as a historical explanation" (p. 8) by claiming race to be an ideological construct. She pushes her approach to a

kind of dead end (thus arguably falling into a contradiction) by understanding race "alone" to be at the core of capitalist and colonial exploitation "scientific" projects. The word "scientific" here is crucial and capitalist colonial "scientific" exploitation must be seen as set of strategies bumping against each other in quite dynamic ways. By highlighting just race or just economics, we will not uncover the real relational platform of capitalist colonial 'scientific' exploitation processes of profiting from "golden goods" such as cotton, sugar, rice, tobacco, among many others. Obviously, in order to achieve its purposes, the capitalist colonial strategy was based on race policies that are derived from "scientific" arguments. Despite their antagonist positions, both Steven Selden's (1999) and Richard Herrnstein and Charles Murray's (1994) analysis can well serve as a credibility check for our arguments.

While the former accurately denounces and criticizes the sickening eugenic racist policies that were conceptualized and developed within the United States (see, for example, Winfield, 2007, this volume), processes based on "scientific reason," the latter had the audacity to claim white superiority based on "scientific arguments" as well. Thus, as mentioned above, the word "scientific" cannot be erased from the capitalist colonial processes. It has a political ground that consequently paved the path for capitalist colonial exploitation practices. To borrow from David Gillborn's insightful analysis and terminology (1990), while Steven Selden (1999) blatantly denounces racism as a social construction, Richard Herrnstein and Charles Murray (1994) disgracefully defend race as a biologic fact, claiming, as William Tatte IV argues (1997), that "low intelligence is at the root of society's social ills, and policy formulation must take that in consideration" (p. 195-247). In fact, and as Steve Biko (2004) accurately highlights, capitalist colonial discourses and practices were able to place itself "on a path of no return" (p. 66).

Donaldo Macedo argues (2000) that, "oppressive dominant ideologies have throughout history resorted to science as a mechanism to rationalize

crimes against humanity that range from slavery to genocide by targeting race and other ethnic and cultural traits as markers that license all forms of dehumanisation" (p. 17). Undeniably, and as David Gillborn (1990) also stresses, one "cannot understand life in multi-ethnic comprehensives without reference to the economic, gender and 'race' inequalities at work in society as a whole" (p. 11).

In sum, Portuguese colonial positions among other colonial empires - such as England - were also "scientifically based." As it was "far from a link within a global hierarchy, [this] became a way of being both in Europe and overseas" (Sousa Santos, 2002, p. 28). Curiously, this particular sub-Prosperian position exhibited by the Portuguese empire - and to invite Althusser to our discussion - was an intricately overdetermined process - a position deeply related to a "Portuguese Calibanian Prospero" within its very colonies. As Sousa Santos (2002) alerts us, the weakness of Portugal in assuming a fully powerful Properian position among its counter-Prosperian colonial allies was due to Portugal's inability to conceptualize, design and foster a well-built balanced bond between capitalism and colonialism, and to Portugal's power in avoiding a Calibanian subject position within its colonies. Any radical critical analysis of the capitalist colonial discourses and practices comes to find that those discourses and practices are deeply overdetermined by race, class and gender categories. These categories do not exist in a social vacuum, but are the product of socially constructed segregation, instigated by those who maintain economic, cultural and political power.

From this perspective, one can identify the nonreversible de-Prospering processes within Portugal's colonies. One of the main issues for these processes was that of *cafrealização* and *miscesnação,* an embarrassing set of discourses and practices for Portugal's capitalist and colonialist allies. Given this colonial reality, Boaventura de Sousa Santos (2002) put forward the concept of "proto-Calibans".   As the Portuguese scholar states (2002), not

only the repressive Portuguese colonial discourses and practices were "based in a non-stop disqualification of, say, the African people", but simultaneously, those discursivities and practices were thoroughly and meticulously incapable of avoiding also a disqualification of a Portuguese's fully prosperus position, "since they mixed with the African people, adopting and incorporating their way of living and above all creating new beings" (p. 57). Again, this double incapability demonstrated by the Portuguese Empire had its roots in the unbalanced (and thus damaging) relation between capitalism and colonialism. As Boaventura de Sousa Santos (2002, p. 58) shows quite explicitly, the "apparitional character of [Portugal's] colonial power" has to be understood within the frames of a pale colonial state, unable to fully capitalize [on] their colonies, a fragile position that is crucial to perceive the interidentity itineraries that gradually emerged based on the interplay of the political, cultural, economic, ideological spheres and race, gender, and class categories."

On Being Raptor and Hostage Simultaneously

I am not claiming that the Portuguese colonial empire did not commit real genocide or was less sanguinary than other colonial capitalist empires. However, the Portuguese colonial empire was deeply incompetent and unable to win political, cultural, economic and social recognition from its close allies, simply because of its inability to play within the capitalist formula - sucking the maximum possible results from capitalist and colonialist practices. This lack of capacity and ability to put in place a well organized colonial structure placed Portugal in an uncomfortable colonial position: a Prospero assimilated by Caliban in its colonies, and a sub-Prospero or a real Caliban among its close colonial allies. Both of these processes were unavoidable resulting in an uncomfortable and painful paradox for a pretentious colonial power.

I am not claiming that those complex practices of *cafrealização* and *miscesnação* were based on superior human qualities such as respect, love, passion, admiration, equality and freedom. Frantz Fanon's (1967) analysis

helps justify this position. By allowing space in his analysis for the real voice of Mayotte Capécia's *Je suis martiniquaise* history, Franz Fanon (1967) strengthens his approach. According to Mayotte Capécia's own experience, "[a] woman of color is never altogether respectable in a white man's eyes, even when he loves her" (p. 42). Frantz Fanon's (1967) radical critical interpretation of Mayotte Capécia's relation with the white man saw that that relation was based on a complex stew of "submission, lactification, and physical attraction" (p. 42). As he argues, "Mayotte loves a white man to whom she submits in everything...he is her lord...she asks nothing, demands nothing except a bit of whiteness in her life" (Fanon, 1967, p. 42). Mayotte Capécia's (1967) understanding of this relation is solely anchored in the physical: "All I know is that he had blue eyes, blond hair, and a light skin, and that I loved him." (p. 42). It is clear from Frantz Fanon's (1967) analysis that the relation between the woman of color and the white man not only exhibits a kind of a cult of submission, deeply ingrained in economic, racial, gender, and power relations, but also shows an extraordinary attempt to subvert "the two poles of the world" (p. 44). To be more precise, this "genuinely Manichean concept of the world...white or black" (Fanon, 1967, p. 44) had to be challenged. And this was a kind of agenda for all "Mayotte Capécia's of all nations." (Fanon, 1967, p. 44). In bringing Michel Foucault's (1977) ideas to our argument, this dangerous dichotomy creates a powerful and intricate interplay, resulting in "the body of society [that is] a social body that needs to be protected" (p. 55) and challenged.

In this context, and complexifying Boaventura de Sousa Santos's (2002) approach, the Portuguese capitalist colonial empire was always in transition within a trinity, between Prospero's and Caliban's positions and a third sphere. The fight for a Prosperian recognition was doomed to fail since the Portuguese people were always seen by their capitalist colonial associates as a particular nonwhite race, with an amalgamated heritage based on Jews, Arabs,

Blacks and French, a "disgusting eugenic combination" that "incorporates the worst characteristics" of those races.

Along with Boaventura de Sousa Santos (2002), one might say that the Portuguese capitalist colonialist empire was fueled by such a remarkable paradox. It is precisely this idiosyncratic capitalist and colonialist illogicality that allows one to refute colonialism on the basis of a set of binary processes. That is, "Prospero" acting according to his superiority, on one side a bunch of nonhuman clumsy, disorganized and inferior Calibans resisting this superiority, on the other side. As Donaldo Macedo's (2000) accurately maintains, "one has to realize that ignorance is never innocent and is always shaped by a particular ideological predisposition" (p. 16).

In opposition, I claim that Portugal, given both its paradoxical capitalist colonialist imperial position and the powerful capacity revealed by the colonized people to subvert Portuguese colonial predispositions, allowed for the emergence of a set of intricate interidentity processes that were not merely a combination of opposites - Prospero and Caliban - and to show it as a singular achievement. In this set of processes, as Frantz Fanon (1967) reminds us, "the last *sequele* of a titanic struggle carried on against *the other* have been dissipated" (p. 42).

By showing its inability to act as an *ace* within Western male capitalist colonial hegemonic processes, the Portuguese capitalist colonial empire unintentionally opened the door for the emergence of counterhegemonic forms of agency, forms that the empire was not ready to deal with. In a way, the Portuguese capitalist colonial empire in its colonizing processes ended up being painstakingly and thoroughly colonized as well.

It is precisely at the core of the Portuguese capitalist colonial empire's paradox that António Salazar's repulsive statement has to be understood. And, in fact, the tyrannical António Salazar was very well aware of this paradox, fabricated from his own despotic dictatorship.

One of the factors that undergird this repressive position is based on the interplay between Portugal - as a sub-Prosperian intervenient within the capitalist colonial imperial exploitative logic - and the rest of its allies, particularly England, which was a full Prosperian actor(s) at the core of the capitalist colonialist "scientific" exploitation project. Portugal's paradoxical position within the "capitalist chessboard," drove this sub-Prosperian capitalist colonial country to another paradoxical position, that is its tenacious and odd resistance to joining and starting decolonizing processes along with its close allies. António Salazar's dictatorship was quite slow in understanding the urgent economic need to move forward to the capitalist colonial next step, which was "giving up the colonies" and concentrating all the possible resources - ideological, political, cultural, economic and religious - on a new form of colonialism: neocolonialism. António Salazar's tyrannical regime became a lethal blockage to this capitalist colonial exploitation upgrade. Somewhat ironically, this embarrassing blockage to its close capitalist colonialist allies was a result of its semiperipheral position. The Portuguese capitalist colonial empire was not ready for that step yet.

Its paradoxical position - a sub-Prospero among its European capitalist colonial counterparts and an assimilated Caliban within its own colonies - prevented Portugal from fully capitalizing on its colonies as its closest partners did (see Sousa Santos, 2002). In fact, the Portuguese capitalist colonial empire was taken by surprise and its reaction was a bizarre political strategy to reframe its capitalist colonial position within the colonies (in this particular context, it is interesting to remember the hilarious speeches made by António Salazar's minister of foreign affairs, Franco Nogueira, at the United Nations, as he tried to (re)frame Portugal outside the capitalist colonial political project).

Unsurprisingly, this strategy of proudly carrying on with an outdated model of capitalist colonialism led Portugal to another political dead end, and

attempts to whitewash the Portuguese capitalist colonial judicial record were also unsuccessful. However, in attempting to do so, Portuguese govermental leaders reracialized sets of discourses and practices. Ultimately, what we have is a sub-Prosperian semiperipheral anemic capitalist colonial state hitting its closest allies with new strategies, and extending "compulsory invitations" to "Portuguese people from the main land," but also all the people from "its colonies." In so doing, Portugal was surrendering to such a paradox, assuming a kind of inmate position.

In this manner, it attempted to rebuild and reframe a racial framework and, in so doing, wipe out racial segregation categories that had been highly valuable for the capitalist colonial empire but were "quite embarrassing now." It also created a new common enemy - the true Prospero. Ultimately, this new political strategy extended well beyond the wiping away of "the other" (the people from its colonies), and created a new "other" (real European Prosperian) common enemy. In so doing, Portugal was expressing "identity difficulties within its own essence" (Sousa Santos, 2002, p. 133).

It is precisely in this context that António Salazar's outrageous remark that "we'll always be an African nation" must be understood. What is really interesting is the fact that António Salazar's despotic regime not only was deeply aware of Portugal's sub-Prosperian, semiperipheral anemic capitalist colonial position, but was also profoundly sentient of being one of "the Other" within its closest allies' eyes. As Peter Rigby (1996) brilliantly stresses, "the dominant white, male culture is never placed as "the Other," whose peculiar "differences" need to explained to anyone…it is only 'minorities' that constitute the Other" (p 1). In yet another ironic turn, the Portuguese capitalist colonial empire was always much closer to the Other, yet pretentiously refused to admit it.

This odd reracializing process offers evidence of what Donaldo Macedo (1994) straightforwardly denounces as the capacity of those who have power

to constantly align and realign their position before a particular issue. The Portuguese colonial government was attempting to secure its position, but also to open a political space to build and crystallize the (common) sense that there was/is no such thing as racism in Portugal, since "we" symbolize the distinguished well-off product of a univocal political and cultural legacy. This inheritance has its epicenter within the concept of the judiciously coined as *Portugalidade*, which in essence is perpetuated by political and cultural discourses and practices. There is no space for the Other since there is no Other. Period. "We" are a nonracial community. Consequently "we" becomes a "peaceful" - yet putrid - commonplace as a concept of agency and practice, evidence of a reracializing political project.

In addition to the arguments just unfolded, there are two other issues that made António Salazar's tyrannical claim even more sordid and outrageous. First was his arrogance in coopting the Other, a category that was immediately "in use" the first time that the Portuguese white man touched the African soil, for its own political gain, as if this particular "racial category" was a monolithic group. Such pompous reracializing, "rearticulation" processes have to be seen as an effort to wipe out economic, cultural, gender and class dynamics - all at once.

As Deborah Youdell (2004, pp. 90-93) reminds us, it is a terrible mistake to assume that there is no "hierarchy within the other." In a very powerful and insightful radical critical analysis, she (2004) tried to "understand the continued inequities of school experiences and outcomes experienced by African Caribbean students" (p. 83). Deborah Youdell (2004) strongly argues for the need to see such a palpable hierarchy that "appears to be concerned, not only with the relationship between Black and White race identities, but with hierarchical relations between race and ethnic identities other than White" (p. 90).

A second outrage was António Salazar's attempt, not only to build such a despotic subject position - a "new synthetic" "we" - but also to try to gain legitimacy within the international strata. In fact, we were and still are incorporated in the "new synthetic" "we", but this was based on the "first person dictatorial singular." The capitalist colonial segregation and exploitation processes created "a new syntax form," one that introduced and sedimented a new way of using the pronoun, which was in fact the only way.

This reracializing policy is strongly denounced by Michael Omi and Howard Winant (2004). As Omi and Winant note, one has to be deeply cautious in recognizing that race is a dynamic category. Their own words deserve to be quoted at length:

> The main task facing racial theory, in fact, is no longer to problematize a seemingly "natural" or "common sense" concept of race—although that effort has not been entirely completed by any means. Rather our central work is to focus attention on the *continuing significance and changing meaning of race*. It is to argue against the recent discovery of the illusory nature of race; against the supposed contemporary transcendence of race; against the widely reported death of the concept of race; and against the replacement of the category of race by other, supposedly more objective categories, like ethnicity, nationality, or class. All these initiatives are mistaken at best, and intellectually dishonest at worst. (Omi & Winant, 2004, p. 7)

Based on David Gillborn's (2004) analyses, António Salazar's reracializing despotic strategy provides the conspicuous evidence that "race changes, [that is] it works differently through different processes, informs and is modified by diverse contemporary modes of representation, and changes with particular institutional contexts" (p. 45). Unsurprisingly, this ostentatiously political construction - "despicably by law" - of a new "we" challenging and challenged by a "new other," is another instantiation of an old capitalist colonial imperial strategy of silencing the voice of the all the African people that were subjected to the barbaric policies of capitalist colonial exploitation processes.

This is not a minor issue if one is deeply politically committed to a non-negotiable antiracist education. Dwight Reynold's (2001) insights concerning an autobiographer's approach in the Arabic literary tradition can teach us great deal here. As Reynolds documents, the Western literary tradition made a political effort to build and propagate the idea that autobiography - as a literary tradition - did not exist in the Arabic world, and also the pale forms of texts closest to what the Western imperial intellectuals "condescendingly" coined as autobiographical, were based in the cult of individual identity. Drawing from the earlier works of Georg Misch (1949-1969) and Franz Rosenthal (1937), Dwight Reynolds (2001) challenges the idea that there is no such thing as autobiography outside the Western cultural framework. Moreover, the author destroys this imperialist, arrogant position as a kind of intellectual dishonesty, since it consciously neglects, not only the powerful secular Arabic literary scholarship among which autobiography has a strong literary tradition, but also ample autobiographical material that was deeply influential within the Western literary tradition. In fact, it was an attempt to "portray the autobiography as a product of the West," (Reynolds, 2001, p. 17-35) but this, as Dwight Reynolds (2001, p. 17-35) claims, is an example of "the fallacy of Western origins," an erroneous belief that is anchored in three misconceptions. First, as Dwight Reynolds (2001) argues there is the "assumption that autobiography is extremely rare in Arabic literature" (p. 26), despite the real evidence showing precisely otherwise - as documented by Albert Hourani's work (1983). Second, and based on the first mistaken assumption, is that those few [autobiographical] texts "have been presumed to be, and have therefore been studied as, anomalies rather then as a part of a literary genre or historical tradition" (Reynolds, 2001, p. 27). Finally, there is the Western judgment that "these Arabic texts do not constitute 'true' autobiographies."

Curiously, such an arrogant Western position is currently visible in the United States with the English-only movement, which has to be seen "as a form of colonialism." (Macedo, 2000, p. 16-17). Donaldo Macedo's (2000) insightful analysis can teach us a great deal here.

> Colonialism imposes "distinction" as an ideological yardstick against which all other cultural values are measured, including language. On the one hand, this ideological yardstick serves to overcelebrate the dominant group's language to a level of mystification and, on the other hand, it devalues other languages spoken by an ever-increasing number of students who now populated most urban public schools. (p. 16)

Capitalist colonial segregational, exploitative discourses and practices in fact did (and do) commit real genocide, a genocide that not only crosses language issues, but also, as Donaldo Macedo (2000) fiercely argues, "rests on a full understanding of the ideological elements that generated and sustain linguistic, cultural, and racial discrimination, which represent, in my view, vestiges of a colonial legacy in our democracy" (p. 16).

The reader might claim that Dwight Reynolds (2001) is addressing a quite different reality - the Arabic world. However, the same analysis fits rather well within the African literary tradition. Taking Portugal as an example, until very recently, African literature was considered within Portuguese academia as "minor literature," or not even that. Similarly, Portuguese capitalist colonial genocidal practices were also written by a white man's pen and eyes. We all know quite well how the West persists in positioning Africa as a continent without human political solutions, and how the mainstream media builds Africa as a "Red Cross" problem. We all know how the mainstream media is acutely sensitive to highlighting, say, Israeli fatalities, while intentionally silencing the mass murderer conflicts within the African continent, conflicts that were and are instigated by Western powers. We all know what those who are profoundly committed to subverting this situation have to hear the real voices of the real African people, talking about their real lives, asking about their real struggle for survival, talking about the need to

"make babies to sell" in order to bypass inhuman life conditions. We all know that before such a reality—a result of capitalist colonial "scientific" exploitation processes—we still have to deal with some scholars talking about a "postmodern" era, while arguably more than two-thirds of the world did not have the chance to participate in the modern era, despite their direct contribution to the construction of wealth for a tiny minority in the modern era.

One of the cancerous residues of capitalist colonial discourses and practices in Portugal is protectionism of a common culture within a national curriculum. As I had the opportunity to challenge elsewhere (Paraskeva, 2001), "the national curriculum is a deplorable, unforgivable and a predatory historical mistake" (p. 8-16), a lethal mechanism that barbarously multiplies cultural and economic segregation. The Portuguese national curriculum has to be contextualized within the very core of the capitalist colonial epoch, an epoch that "tried to eradicate the use of African languages in institutional life by inculcating Africans through the educational system in Portuguese, only with the myths, and beliefs concerning the savage nature of their cultures." (Macedo, 2000, p. 16). In fact, the current Portuguese curriculum platform is not that different from Portuguese colonial epoch, at least with regard to such poisonous content.

In applying António Salazar's arrogant statement to the above analysis, I can claim that this was a reracializing strategy that not only coopted colonized exploited people but also reinforced and reused an old capitalist colonial strategy of silencing the voices of the colonized. Summing up, the pragmatic political strategy was devised to challenge the pressure that Portugal was facing from its closest allies to "give up its colonies," and to maintain its hegemonic power within its colonies as well. This was a suicidal political strategy, which regrettably remains in fashion currently.

Actually, this reracializing set of processes is still very influential within the current Portuguese social fabric. As Boaventura de Sousa Santos (2002) argues, Portugal's latest pretentious attempt to re-Prosperize its position - exhibited in its economic fever to join and stay in the European Union's frontline - gives real evidence that this is a nation deeply influenced by this intricate interidentity paradox, and the paradox has been refurbished for the contemporary world. "We" always will be an African nation creates space to claim that "we" always belonged within the European strata. It is a pathological fear of the Calibanian position that ironically ends up in a Calabanian situation. In the next section I will resume a radical critical analysis of the way schooling has intentionally helped perpetuate such illogicality. A good way to do this is to consider the way a particular part of the capitalist colonial empire (e.g., the discoveries) has been taught in schools throughout most Western nations, among which Portugal proudly maintains a sub-Prosperian seat.

Saying the Unsayable: How Schools Participate in a Convenient Commonsensical Commonsense

Up to here I have attempted to challenge and interrupt in a noneuphemistic way a commonsensical supercilious and profoundly dangerous claim, unfortunately among too many others, that crosses the Portuguese social epidermis, namely that there is no such "thing" as racism in Portugal since "we" symbolize the distinguished well-off product of a univocal political and cultural legacy. Let's now try to understand how this quite peculiar position has been perpetuated within Portuguese society, with the connivance of schooling practices. We need to understand such peculiar involvement contextually, though. Thus a truthful way to start this analysis is to contextualize it in the way particular discovery heroes have been distortedly portrayed in Western history, for example, U.S. history.

A good way to start digging is to consider Howard Zinn (1999, 2001), Noam Chomsky (1992, 2002), Tzvetan Todorov (1994), and bell hooks's (1994) critical analyses of the way Columbus is presented in schools. We will also invite Frey Bartolomé de Las Casas (1536-37, 1552) to our debate as a way to show that Columbus was already facing a lot of criticism during his 'golden epoch'. Furthermore, I will rely on the analyses of James Loewen (1995), Jean Anyon (1983), Patrick Brindle and Madelaine Arnot (1999). I will close this argument by comparing Michael Apple's insight to Bruno Latour's (1999) approach. In so doing, I will be able to trace and identify unquestionable similarities with the way the history of capitalist colonization has been portrayed in Portuguese history textbooks.

For centuries, Columbus has been portrayed as *the* discoverer, a real hero for Western civilization, and this is the message that dominates U.S. textbooks. However, as Howard Zinn, Noam Chomsky, Tzvetan Todorov and bell hooks stress, this message is a fallacy. In *Legitimacy in History*, Noam Chomsky (2002) refutes the Columbus hero concept, arguing that the American continent was really a stage for genocide. As the MIT-based radical intellectual claims, "Here in the United States, we just committed genocide. Period. Pure genocide. Current estimates are that north of Rio Grande, there were about twelve to fifteen million Native Americans at the time Columbus landed; [however,] by the time Europeans reached the continental borders of the United States, there were about 200,000 [which means] mass genocide" (Chompsky, 2002, p. 135).

The shocking reality Noam Chomsky (2002) reveals is "that throughout American history this genocide has been accepted has perfectly legitimate," notwithstanding the fact that Columbus "was a mass murderer himself" (p. 136). It is precisely this critical challenging of the legitimacy of history that one can trace in both Howard Zinn's and bell hook's perspectives. However, while for Noam Chomsky (1992) it constitutes a process of historical engineering,

for Howard Zinn (1999) and bell hooks (1994) we are embedded in a process of obliteration and a process that tends to perpetuate "white supremacist capitalist patriarchy" (p. 197).

Howard Zinn (1999) views the American past as a gendered history, a history mostly "done" by rich white men. As he maintains, U.S. history is a process of "sort of leaving 'it' out," an insidious process of obliteration in which the schools are not innocents (Zinn, 1999, pp. 47-75). As Howard Zinn notes, one can notice this process of obliteration in the way textbooks have portrayed the Vietnam War. To Howard Zinn (1999), this is a "central event for our generation in the US [since] as I've often commented, we only dropped seven million tons of bombs on 35 million people" (p. 3), and we only have two insipid paragraphs in the textbooks on the war in Vietnam. It is this process of obliteration that Howard Zinn identifies in the way the Columbus legacy has been reproduced, not only in society at large but also within schooling.

As Howard Zinn (2001) highlights, Columbus's history is a history of "masculine conquest" (p. 102). Despite the fact that in the indigenous people greeted Columbus and his armada in a friendly way (as one can document from Columbus's writing: "they are the best people in the world and above all the gentlest - without knowledge of what is evil - nor do they murder or steal they love their neighbors as themselves and they have the sweetest talk in the world always laughing [they] are very simple and honest and exceedingly liberal with all they have, none of them refusing anything he may possesses when he is asked for it" - quoted in Zinn, 2001, p. 99), this attitude was perverted (since Columbus saw the Indians "not as hospitable hosts, but as servants [they] could subjugate [and] make them do whatever we want" (Zinn, 2001, p. 99). Furthermore, the indigenous peoples in what is now the Americas could not escape the cruel process of genocide, murder, rape of the women and children who were "thrown to dogs to be devoured" (Las Casas,

quoted in Zinn, 2001, p. 101). As one can draw from Howard Zinn's (2001) words, glorifying Columbus is nonsense, since Columbus's legacy is one of conquering and subjugating native peoples. In fact, the very idea of conquering and subjugation suggests a broad assumption of the inferiority of indigenous peoples.

However, it is of utter importance to highlight here that even during the so-called "discovers epoch" Columbus faced a huge amount of resistance and criticism. In fact, Columbus's bloodshed colonial ministry was denounced during "his own majestic era" by too many people. On the very front line of such deep and powerful criticisms one can flag Frey Bartolomé de Las Casas. Las Casas was a great obstacle and a one of the great defenders of the Indian population. Borne in 1484 in Seville, Frey de Las Casas vehemently opposed the butchery of the indigenous populations before Columbus's armadas. While not overlooking that Las Casas believed in the need and importance of evangelizing to Native American populations, he was nonetheless totally against the genocide perpetrated by Columbus and his army. Las Casas "fought" for a peaceful approach to alienate the Indian population. In one of his crucial treatises *De unico vocationis modo omnium gentium ad veram religionem*, written in Guatemala, 1536-37, Las Casas argue over the need to a non-violent approach to the Indian populations, an approach that would respect their freedom.

The best way to convert, Las Casas believed, was by "persuasion", and not by the force of a gun, or by violence. In fact, for Las Casas it would be impossible to evangelise anyone using a strategy based on fear, injustice, and tyranny. Las Casas was so distressed by Columbus's slaughter policies in the so called Americas that he feel the need to write another treatise *Brevísima relación de la destrucción de las Indias*, published in 1552. According to Las Casas, (1552) the way the "admirable history of Americas discoveries" were portrayed were hiding and silencing the indiscriminate killings and murderer of innocent and

indefensible populations, provinces, and reigns. Las Casas (1552) descriptions about Columbus's armada quotidian practices is quite deplorable. According to him (1552), the Christians armed until the teeth butchered, and murderer the Indian population; they invade the Indian villages killing women and their little children, pregnant women, and elderly people; they do organize bets over which one was able to gut an Indian «in one shot»; they cover the Indians with oil and burn them; quite frequently they do a kind of barbecue with a mild fire so the Indians could die slowly; they release famine and wild dogs to tearing up and eating the Indians like pigs. As Las Casas (1536-37) questions perplexedly what kind of pleasure these miserable man have by murdering millions of human beings? What is the point of raping Indian women and killing their sons?

According to Las Casas (1536-37) those behind the scenes, those who were advising for the need of such genocide practices, those who send such colonial armada to conquer are much more guilty then anyone else. From such despicable and shameful description one could honestly think that it is really an insult, not only to carry on claiming Columbus as a hero, but also to hide such "happenings" from school content. Indisputably Las Casas explicit position over Columbus's butchery colonial entrepreneurship allows one to perceive and understand that both the discovery epoch and the political platform that fuelled such epoch was not a monolithical one. Las Casas texts are a critical evidence over the tensions of a non-peaceful strategy despite the fact that, oddly enough, school textbooks and curriculum programs keeps hiding such intricate and powerful tensions.

Columbus' history is based on a racist and a gendered rationale that perpetrated mass genocide. Moreover, and based on Todorov's (1984) analysis, Columbus demonstrated eugenic arrogance in his contact with the Indians. According to Tzvetan Todorov (1984), who based his analysis on a study conduct by Bernaldez of Columbus' letters, the Indians were portrayed by

Columbus as "although physically naked [they were] closer to men than to animals" (p. 35) one should not minimize the ideological meaning of the word "although" here. Oddly enough, Columbus was incapable of recognizing a new diversity of languages expressed by the Indians and accepting them as real languages (obviously quite different from Latin, Spanish, or Portuguese). Thus "already deprived of language [according to Columbus they are also] deprived of all cultural property [by] the absence of costumes, rites, religion." (Bernaldez quoted in Todorov, 1984, p. 34-35). This particular race–gender vision of Columbus's legacy is also made explicit in bell hooks' (1994) approach.

According to bell hooks (1994), "the nation's collective refusal to acknowledge institutionalized white supremacy is given deep and profound expression in the contemporary zeal to reclaim the myth of Christopher Columbus as patriotic icon" (p. 198). As she (1994) bluntly remarks, "embedded in the nation's insistence that its citizens celebrate Columbus's "discovery" of America is a hidden challenge, a call for patriotic among us to reaffirm a national commitment to imperialism and white supremacy" (p. 198). According to bell hooks (1994), this fallacious message is implanted with the classroom and deserves to be quoted at length:

> When I recall learning about Columbus from grade school on, what stands out is the way we were taught to believe that the will to dominate and conquer folks who are different from ourselves is natural, not culturally specific. We were taught that the Indians would have conquered and dominated the white explorers if they could have but they were simply not strong or smart enough. Embedded in all these teachings was the assumption that it was the whiteness of these explorers in the "New World" that gave them greater power. The word "whiteness" was never used. The key word, the one that was synonymous with whiteness, was "civilization." Hence, we were made to understand at a young age that whatever cruelties were done to the indigenous peoples of this country, the "Indians," was necessary to bring the great gift of civilization. Domination, it become clear in our young minds, was central to the project of civilization. And if civilization was good and necessary

despite the costs, then that had to mean domination was equally good. (p. 199)

As bell hooks (1994) argues, Columbus' history is one of murder, human atrocities, rape of indigenous woman, and it is precisely this horror that one should not forget and that one "must reinvoke as [we] critically interrogate the past and rethink the meaning of Columbus" (p. 202). bell hooks (1994) continues by arguing that "in our cultural retelling of history we must connect Columbus's legacy with the institutionalization of patriarchy and the culture of sexist masculinity that upholds male domination of females in daily life; [that is to say] the cultural romanticization of Columbus's imperialist legacy includes a romanticization of rape" (p. 203). In fact, as she (1994) bluntly asserts, "white colonizers who raped and physically brutalized native woman yet who recorded these deeds as the perks of victory acted as though women of color were objects, not the subjects of history" (p. 203). It is in this context that hooks (1994) reminds us that "any critical interrogation of the Columbus legacy that does not call attention to the white supremacist patriarchal mind-set that condoned the rape and brutalization of native females is only a partial analysis [since] it subsumes the rape and exploitation of native women by placing such acts solely within the framework of military conquest, the spoils of war" (p. 203). Whether it is "historical engineering," a "process of obliteration," or a process that prizes "white supremacist capitalist patriarchy," the fact is that Noam Chomsky, Howard Zinn and bell hooks are questioning precisely the kind of knowledge that has become legitimate - the central concern, say in Michael Apple's (2000) intellectual process. In so doing, they are actually challenging the social and political legitimacy of particulars segments of history. In fact, as Noam Chomsky (2002) argues, "there can't be anything more illegitimate; [that is to say] the whole history of this country is illegitimate" (p. 136). Again, Noam Chomsky's (2002) thought deserves to quoted extensively,

A few thanksgivings ago, I took a walk with some friends and family in a National Park, and we came across a tombstone which had just been put in along the path. It said: "Here lies an Indian woman, a Wampanoag, whose family and tribe gave of themselves and their land that this great nation might be born and grow." Okay, "gave of themselves and their land" - in fact, were murdered, scattered, dispersed, and we stole their land, that's what we're sitting on. Our forefathers stole about a third of Mexico in a war in which they claimed that Mexico attacked us, but if you look back it turns out that that "attack" took place inside of Mexican territory. And it goes on and on. So you know what can be legitimate?" (p. 136).

Individually and collectively, Noam Chomsky, Howard Zinn, Tzvetan Todorov and bell hooks claim there is an intentional fallacy based on the erroneous portrayal of Columbus as a hero. In so doing, they assert that U.S. society is based on a secular lie that has been reproduced in the school curriculum, through its textbooks, as seen in James Loewen (1995), *Lies My Teacher Told Me: Everything your High School History Textbook Got Wrong.*

In fact, James Loewen, a sociologist who spent two years at the Smithsonian Institute surveying twelve leading high school textbooks of American history, also challenges the way Columbus has been presented in school textbooks. As he documents (1995), 1642 is a date included in the twelve textbooks surveyed. However, he (1995, p. 29) notes that "they leave out virtually everything that is important to know about Columbus and the European exploration of the Americans." Loewen (1995, p. 29) stresses that Columbus' legacy is so broad and pivotal that mainstream historians use him to divide the past into epochs, making the Americas before 1642 "pre-Columbian." Notwithstanding Columbus's insidious motivation, the fact is that "textbooks downplay the pursuit of wealth as a motive for coming to the Americas" (Loewen, 1995, p. 30).

Following the same line of thought portrayed by Noam Chomsky, Howard Zinn, and bell hooks, James Loewen (1995, p. 35) argues that "the way American history textbooks treat Columbus reinforces the tendency not

to think about the process of domination [when in fact] the traditional picture of Columbus landing on the American shore shows him dominating immediately." Actually, as Loewen (1995, p. 35) highlights, "Columbus claimed everything he saw right off the boat." However, "when textbooks celebrate this process, they imply that taking the land and dominating the Indians was inevitable if not natural." (Loewen, 1995, p. 35). The fact is that "Columbus introduced two phenomena that revolutionized race relations and transformed the modern world [through] the taking of land, wealth, and labor from indigenous peoples, leading to their near extermination, and the transatlantic slave trade, which created a racial underclass." (Loewen, 1995, p. 50). Columbus's mark within the Americas is, in essence, one of murder, exploitation and rape - genocide.

As Jurjo Torres Santomé (1996) reminds us, the official culture in the vast majority of Western countries that is perpetuated through a common curriculum validates specific knowledge portrayed by a masculine world. As the Galego scholar (1996) highlights, a brief glance over the textbooks allows one to perceive disfiguration, silence and occultation of the working class. Jurjo Torres Santomé, like bell hooks, argues that textbooks promulgated a biased vision of society that prizes a while middle class heterosexual blond male.

It is in this context that both Jean Anyon's (1983) *Workers, Labor and Economic History, and Textbook Content*, and Patrick Brindle and Madeleine Arnot's (1999) *England Expects Every Man to Do His Duty: The Gendering of the Citizenship Textbook, 1940–1996* exhibit their pertinence. In an empirical study of seventeen well-known secondary school 'approved for use' U.S. history textbooks, Anyon (1983, p. 37) argues that the content expressed in the textbooks "despite the claim of objectivity serve[s] the interests of some groups in society over others." As the author (1983, p. 49) stresses, a mark of U.S. textbooks is their "omissions, stereotypes, and distortions" with regard to

Native Americans, blacks, and woman, "which reflect the relative powerlessness of these groups." Thus, as Jean Anyon (1983, p. 49) argues, "the school curriculum has contributed to the formation of attitudes that make it easier for those powerful groups whose knowledge is legitimized by school studies to manage and control society." That is to say, "textbooks not only express the dominant group's ideologies, but also help to form attitudes in support of their social position." (Anyon, 1983, p. 49).

In the same line of analysis although more focused on the gender issues, Patrick Brindle and Madeleine Arnot (1999, p. 108) identified three textbook frameworks; these include "exclusionary, inclusionary, and critical engagement." The authors (1999, p. 108) claim the exclusionary is the most common approach and "exclude[s] both the private sphere and woman from its construction of the political domain." In this set of textbooks, there is clearly "general inattention and lack of interest in the position of women; [actually] it is not unusual for women to receive no attention at all" (Brindle and Arnot, 1999, p. 110). A very small group of textbooks "sought to include woman and the private sphere in various different ways" (Brindle and Arnot, 1999, p. 108). That is to say, a small minority of texts sought to include representations of women as citizens, however (with one exception) none of them portrayed women "within the polity of active [agents]" (Brindle and Arnot, 1999, p. 112). In this kind of textbook, women are presented as mere 'add-ons.' And finally, there are textbooks with a critical engagement approach in which the women highlighted are both in the private and public spheres.

It is precisely this "wisely peculiar" vision of Columbus that we can find if we pick up casuistically a Portuguese history textbook from any bookstores shelve, library stack, any encyclopedia. In the textbook sections that deals with the "discoveries," one can perfectly notice a resemblance on the way Columbus and Vasco da Gama, and Pedro Álvares Cabral's heroic "discovers" has been taught in schools. Within the Portuguese school curriculum, all of

them are "naturally" treated has the great heroes of the Western civilization as well. Let me develop my arguments, since this politically perverted discourse and practice needs to be challenged and smashed.

First, in Portugal, students have to learn (or they fail) that "discoveries" was an Olympic moment in the great annals of world history, an historical moment that was anchored only (and this word is profoundly important) on two reasons: to expand the territory and to Christianize the "barbarian indigenous people." To invite Michael Apple (2000) to into this discussion, these are the "two official reasons" for the past 500 years that every single student in Portugal has to memorize, and that every single teacher had memorized already, for their own sake. After all, "discoveries" was a colossal enterprise - one that only the great Western white male was able to accomplish, yet quite simple to justify and to learn. Teachers just have to teach "that," and students just have to learn "that." Period. Quite simple. No reason to fail, right? However, such "official reasons" hide some crucial issues. One of those issues is that of language. Instead of a debate between teachers and students over "discoveries" as a critical pillar of the capitalist colonialist empire's exploitation project, and the way that genocidal political project was conceptualized and developed, students "learn" (after all, they go to school to learn) that "discoveries" intention was to expand the territory - a quite natural desire. In fact, such "official reason," not only becomes "legitimized" but also simultaneously erases the political "discoveries" reason(s) - power, an uncited desire that pumps up the capitalist colonialist machine, one that had (and still has) to rely on segregation, exploitation and genocide.

Another issue quite vital is the whitewashing of discourses and practices of race, gender and class segregation. Perplexedly, to expand the territory was a natural Olympic desire totally abstracted and completely naked of discourses and practices of exploitation, genocide, murderer, deeply anchored on race, gender and class categories. Thus, , this "official reason" not only has nothing

to do with that, but also was a peaceful event - one that the Portuguese great heroes, like Vasco da Gama, had only to confront some divinities to certify that they were ready for the enterprise.

Second, the religious issue. Here again we do have the same strategy. "Discoveries" had another majestic motive - to Christianize the "barbarian" indigenous people. Once more, language plays a key role. Instead of a debate between teachers and students over particular kinds of issues within this arrogant religious position (for example, why the tyrannical need to Christianize? Why the dichotomy "Christians-barbarians"? What happens to the religious beliefs of the indigenous people, since after all "God is everywhere"? If that was the case, what is the connection between expanding Christianizing and slavery and exploitation? If that was the purpose, how come 500 years later, say, out of 17 million Mozambicans close to 15 million are Muslims? Were "the indigenous people" Muslims before? Why do we only hear male voices? What happened to the language and cultural clashes between the Portuguese people and the African people? And how come we do not know anything about African's languages if "we" always were, and always will be an African nation? And what is the relation - I am quite positive that there is one - between such "Olympic accomplishment" and the current controversial policies of immigration?) what we really have is students "learning" the "official legitimate religious reason," one that pretentiously took civilization to a barbarian point of the world. Vasco da Gama and Pedro Álvares Cabral and Columbus and their laudable armadas took the light to that dark part of the globe when they in fact put that part of the world on the map—the map of the capitalist colonial exploitation's strategy.

Third, and this point is of utter importance, is the way the history of discoveries is narrated in any Portuguese history textbook. In fact, there is no space for such concerns. Instead of a powerful discussion among teachers and students over this peculiar issue, we have students "learning" a Portuguese

praiseworthy historical epoch - an epoch that compulsory established a belligerent interplay between the Portuguese people and "indigenous people" - without have any kind of access to the voices of the "indigenous people." Teachers and students are tied to a set of particular Portuguese "official" voices, and the "stories" of the Portuguese admirable era are coined by those voices. I am not claiming here that one cannot find within Portuguese social fabric other kind of analysis. What I am denouncing here is that this non-mainstream and radical critical analysis (case in point the work of Boaventura de Sousa Santos, James Lowen, Jack Gody, Bartolome de Las Casas, and others) does not have space within the school curriculum, since students do not have the need to know otherwise - but to the "official reasons" - for the national tests.

As one could perfectly perceive language did and does play a critical role within the vast capitalist colonial project, a project that conceptualized and developed an egotistical cult of the "westernization" hegemony, a cult that was (and still is) portrayed as the only best way of human existence. Such a cult was (and still is) deeply rooted on an intricate set of predatory discourses and practices.

Even the way the decolonization process appears in the history textbooks is hilarious. This process is learned by students has a result of a coup d'état in Portugal. Wisely and intentionally, no such connection is made, say, with the African liberation movements that were seen as outsiders on the process. Thus, it is quite normal in the Portuguese social fabric (from teachers, students, to politicians, to the President of the Republic) to hear bizarre statements such as, "When we gave independence to Mozambique," "When we gave up Angola," "When we negotiated the independence Cabo Verde or Guiné Bissau, or Mozambique." This is the official curricular discourse in the huge majority of Portuguese schools. There is no "legitimate" space for both teachers and students resuming a serious debate over the real reasons that

instigate the revolution in Portugal in 1974. "We" (Western capitalist colonial males) expand the territory and Christianize the indigenous people, "we" decolonized because "we" were tired of António Salazar and Marcelo Caetano's tyrannical regime, "we" gave up our land, and "we" neocolonize now, because, poor people, "they" are not ready to govern themselves yet. The stories of Portuguese history carry on with the same glorious undefeatable author(s) and the narrator(s). Perhaps not surprisingly, this flamboyant "we" was also (and still is) an ace in helping Portugal becoming a member (and cement its position in) of the European Union - "we" "we" is an endemic lethal practice, to say the least.

Carefully Reading one of the government approved textbooks - built by Marinho, Cardoso e Rothes (1999) - that we borrowed from a twelfth grade student, it is interesting to notice the total absence of words as "genocide," "human exploitation," and so forth. Conversely we can perfectly see in the said textbook (1999, p. 36) words such as "acculturation," "cultural integration," "discoveries," "expansion," and so on. We do notice the use of words like "slavery traffic," "commerce monopoly," "colonial empire," and "colonization" in the textbook (Marinho, Cardoso and Rothes, 1999, p. 36). However, such words are just there, in a thoughtful, naked way. Oddly, the traffic of slaves is treated not as a disgusting capitalist colonial practice but as a huge damage to capitalist colonial intentions, since it "originates the de-population of vast territories." (Marinho, Cardoso and Rothes, 1999, p. 36). So, hilariously, slavery - and its traffic - was not a problem for the slaves, but actually a dilemma for the Portuguese regime. Sordid to say the least.

Another peculiarly squalid perspective is the official use of words such as "acculturation" and "cultural integration." Such practices are treated as an "important phenomenon that created profound alterations in the way of living of the populations, since they were before a much more powerful culture." (Marinho, Cardoso and Rothes, 1999, p. 36). So, instead of "colonized" we

have the words "populations," and "acculturation" and "cultural integration" which are not an expression of a butchering set of genocidal practices, but is a notorious phenomenon driven by a superior culture - What can "we" do? "We" are superior. Period. It is interesting to observe that students and teachers not only have to deal with such an epoch in a wisely distorted way - regrettably reproducing it - but also have to deal with Portuguese empire expansion problems. And yet, incidental as it may be, a total absence of any analysis with regards the damage that such an epoch create to those "populations," is thoroughly laudable. This is, pure and simple, intellectual dishonesty. Moreover, this particular textbook (1999) - 17,000 copies, a remarkable number for a small country like Portugal - is undeniable evidence of the way the capitalist colonial era is authored and narrated by Portuguese voices.

Michel Foucault's (2001) analysis of fearless speech is towering. Anchoring his analysis in the etymology of the word *parrhesia*, Foucualt (2001) argues "the one who uses *parrhesia*, the *parrhesiastes*, is someone who says everything he has in mind [and] he does not hide anything, but opens his heart ad mind completely to other people through his discourse [that is to say] the word *parrhesia* refers to a type of relationship between the speaker and what he says [for] in *parrhesia* the speaker makes it manifestly clear and obvious that what he says is his own opinion"(p. 12). So according to Michel Foucault's (2001) understanding "in *parrhesia* the speaker emphasizes the fact that he is both the subject of the enunciation and the subject of the enunciandum - that he himself is the subject of the opinion to which he refers"(p. 13). Moreover, the *parrhesiastes* "says what is true because he *knows* that it is true [and] he knows that it is true because it is really true [hence] the *parrhesiastes* is not only sincere and says what is his opinion, but his opinion is also the true because it is really true" (Foucault, 2001, p. 14).

Before such an interesting analysis - one might ask - where are the indigenous "parrhesia" and "parrhesiastes"? What happen to them? By recapturing Dwight Reynolds's (2001) claims over the fallacy of Western origins (one that I unpacked previously) - we can understand the pretentious Western position that there is no such scientific (and thus credible) indigenous "parrhesia" and "parrhesiastes" tradition. By combining this arrogant position - one that has the frightening audacity to even argue that the notion of a "scientific" text, such as autobiography, was well beyond the Other's imagination, let alone practices - with the hard reductive and positivistic way of framing the teachers-students under just a "learning memorized" peaceful interplay - it is quite easy to perceive how the school curriculum has a criminal record by perpetuating a Western arrogant vision of the world. Dwayne Huebner (1966) straightforwardly and supremely illustrates, the reductionism of the learning theory in this superbly achieved example:

> For centuries the poet has sung of his near infinitudes; the theologian has preached of his depravity and hinted of his participation in the divine; the philosopher has struggled to encompass him in his systems, only to have him repeatedly escape; the novelist and dramatist have captured his fleeting moments of pain and purity in unforgettable esthetic forms; and the [man] engaged in the curriculum has the temerity to reduce this being to a single term - learner. (p. 10)

In fact, such a perfidious understanding of students and teachers, combined with a school that wisely "shows by hiding," makes the curriculum a powerful device to perpetuate a distorted vision of history, a curriculum that, as Michael Apple (2004) argues, is selective with a vengeance, in other words, is not a simple selection, [but] a selection that reproduces dominance and subordination. Underneath such a shamefully and shockingly accomplishment belies a pathetic need to keep claiming the nonexistence of particular lethal realities. This argument becomes arguably more powerful when articulated with Bruno Latour's (1999) position. In Bruno Latour's *Pandora's Hope*, he (1999) askes, "Where were microbes before Pasteur?" (p. 122). Latour (1999)

bases his approach in what he calls "three trials"; namely "(a) the thing itself, soon to be called ferment, (b) the story told by Pasteur to his colleagues at the Academy of Science, and (c) the reactions of Pasteur's interlocutors to what is so far only a story found in a written text," (p. 122) three trials that, according to Bruno Latour (1999), should be "first distinguished and then aligned with one another"(p. 122). However, as Bruno Latour (1999) highlights, "despite what the metaphor of 'trials' implies, phenomena are not 'out there' waiting for the researcher to access them" (p. 139). That is to say, "lactic acid ferments have to 'made visible' by Pasteur's work" (Latour, 1999, p. 139). Wisely Bruno Latour (1999) pushes the reader for a cautious understanding. That is "the optical metaphor may account for the visible but not for the 'making' something visible; [in other words] the industrial metaphor may explain why something is 'made,' but not why it has thus become visible" (Latour, 1999, p. 139).

Thus, before the apparently simple question: "Did ferments exist before Pasteur made them?," the answer must be "no," they did not exist before he came along" (Latour, 1999, p. 145). It is quite important to understand that the complexity of such a question does not "reside in the historicity of ferments" but in the little expression "to make up" (Latour, 1999, p. 145). Thus, as Bruno Latour (1999) argues, "if we meant by 'historicity' merely that our contemporary 'representation' of microorganisms dates from the mid-nineteenth century" (p. 145) the concern is trivial. Conversely, if "we meant by 'historicity' merely that the ferments 'evolve over time' like the infamous cases of the flu virus or HIV, there would not be difficult either" (Latour, 1999, p. 146). As for the former case, it "entails that we should be able to say that not only the microbes-for-us-humans changed in the 1850s, but also the microbes-for-themselves [and] their encounter with Pasteur changed them as well; [in other words] Pasteur, so to speak, 'happened to them'" (Latour, 1999, p. 146). For the latter, "like that of all living species . . . the historicity of a ferment

would be firmly rooted in nature [and] instead of being static, phenomena would be defined as dynamic" (Latour, 1999, p. 146). Clearly, according to Bruno Latour's (1999) analysis, the question "did ferments exist (or not) before Pasteur?" could really signify two distinctive things, depending on the articulation human–nonhuman and subjectivity–objectivity.

What can we draw from Bruno Latour's (1999) analysis? To be more precise, what is the connection between Bruno Latour's (1999) approach and our radical critical scrutiny over (school and curriculum) knowledge? In comparing these approaches, we see that Bruno Latour's (1999) insight becomes even more fragile. Notwithstanding the fact that one can find overlapping nuances between our position and Bruno Latour's (1999) approaches (e.g., "reality" is not out there waiting to be discovered, or as Michael Apple (2000) commented, reality "doesn't stalk around with a label"(p. 43), the fact is that for Bruno Latour "microbes," "phenomena" "reality," or "knowledge" only exist if one theorizes them. Accepting this could lead to a dangerous trap or intellectual ambush, since, if one does not theorize, say, poverty, segregation, racism, sexism, genderism, starvation and so forth, it means that they do not exist. To put it more bluntly, if these "particular" painful social sagas do not "happen" to someone, to use Bruno Latour's own words, this does not mean that they have no "reality."

It is precisely here, where Michael Apple's (2000) approach proves more powerful. The very fact that textbook curriculum knowledge valorizes specific kinds of social "phenomena," "reality," or "knowledge," while distorting and even obliterating many others, does not mean that those "many others" do not exist. Unfortunately, for a vast majority of the human population, realities such as poverty, starvation, racism and sexism are the very real underpinnings of their daily lives. For Michael Apple (1990), reality is a social construction and the real issue is trying to understand who participates in the construction of such realities. By being knowledgeable about this particular argument, one

will be able to understand in a deep sense, how realities such as HIV or the floods in Latin America - as Michael Apple (2000) reminds us - and South Africa are social constructions, not only in the way they "happened" but also (and this is of utter importance) the way the dominant societal power articulates the political, economic and cultural mechanisms that deal with and address those realities. Notwithstanding the fact that, say, epidemics should be seen as a dynamic phenomena as Bruno Latour (1999) points out, the issue is to not only how it is "made up" but who is being targeted and who gets the benefits from such a reality. One would be naive to minimize (or even ignore) the relation of pollution damaging the ecosystem and floods (which destroys the premise of "natural disasters") and not consider who those floods target and what policies are put in place to address these dramatic problems.

For both Michael Apple (2000) and Bruno Latour (1999) a key concern is how "phenomena," "reality," and "knowledge" are made up. For Michael Apple, (1990, 2000) "phenomena," "reality," and "knowledge" are social constructions "overdetermined" by economic, cultural, ideological and political practices, yet based on a selective tradition. For him, (2000) the issue is trying to see who benefits from "particular" social constructions. One of Michael Apple's (2000) central questions is who benefits if we believe in specific social constructions. It is important to think about why racism "happened" (to use Bruno Latour's (1999) terminology), say, to Paul (portrayed in Michael Apple's *Official Knowledge,* 2000) or Joseph (portrayed in Michael Apple's, *Educating the 'Right'* Way, 2001) or Mayotte (quoted in Frantz Fanon's, *Black Skin, White Masks*, 1967) in such humiliating ways but "happened" in quite different forms, say, for many of Paul's peers.

The real issue is to perceive not only why the invasion of capitalist colonial segregation and exploitation practices "happened." We also should not be naive and neglect the media's role here. We need to question why mainstream media express particular kinds of arguments while obliterating so

many others. We must ask why particular kinds of arguments "happen" to be prized, not only by the mainstream media but also by textbooks. Moreover, and taking as an example, say the war in Afghanistan and in Iraq - where again Portugal unambiguously denounced and assumed its paradoxical interidentity in supporting Bush, Blair and Aznar's lunatic vision, one needs to challenge why such antiwar positions are twisted or absent from the mainstream media, which presented the war as something inevitable and not as an invasion. Why has the mainstream media not denounced the "motive for the war" (there was no such thing as weapons of mass destruction till now) and shifted the focus, say to Laci Peterson's murder? It is precisely this kind of "happening" that makes Michael Apple's (2000) question - who really benefits from them - more pertinent.

The same concerns are true for textbooks. According to Michael Apple (2000), the issue is to understand who benefits from the fact that particular views of reality are prized while too many others are continuously silenced. Why do particular happenings never receive notable space in textbooks, and when they do, why is it something that is added on and often distorted? Why do specific happenings (which compose the daily life of so many individuals) only occur to particular minorities, and why are they absent or distorted in textbooks? These questions remind us of Jenks's (1977) approach toward the making of (an unequal) social reality. As he (1977) stresses, "We should attempt to reject the assumption that the individual as a social being has in some way been placed into society, that consists of a preestablished static set of pattern relations, which he then comes to know [or to use Bruno Latour's terminology, 'happens' to him or her] by virtue of his common membership, that is, through the process of socialization" (p. 2). Conversely, "we should pose as our problematic concern the possibility that the individual, through the ongoing process of 'knowing,' or being-in-the-world, has constructed and continues to construct for himself in concert with others, a 'sense' of his social

existence and his social environment as patterned and ordered" (Jenks, 1977, p. 2). As Jenks (1977) argues, the task is "not to make statements about the 'real' forms of the world, but rather examine the meanings and the possibilities provided by these forms as constructed within a particular social order" (p. 2-3).

Until this point, I have tried to lay out how curriculum knowledge - a regulated, compromised commodity—participates in a distorted vision of the "discoveries." I have scrutinized particular critical approaches (Noam Chomsky, Howard Zinn, bell hooks, Tzvetan Todorov, James Loewen, Jean Anyon, Patrick Brindle and Madeleine Arnot, Jurjo Torres Santomé, Michael Apple and Bruno Latour) with the aim of making our political and pedagogical arguments more powerful. It seems clear, as I have demonstrated elsewhere (Paraskeva, 2004), that the notion of curriculum is not limited to a power and social control device, but should be seen as a regulated compromised commodity which (and this is crucial) participates dynamically in the construction of political, economic and cultural identities. The notion of curriculum is one of identity.

Critical Race Theory: A Critical Option to Debunk the Endemic Western "We"

In this article I have attempted to achieve several goals. (1) I analyzed in a radical critical way the political reasons that underpin António Salazar's tyrannical claim, and in so doing I argued that such a statement needs to be contextualized within a broader analysis of the Portuguese capitalist colonial and postcolonial platform, an analysis that discloses the paradoxical inter-identity set of processes. (2) I determined that such a paradox - or a complex of mirror games - has to be seen as an overdetermined set of processes, which pushed the Portuguese capitalist colonial empire into a continuing transitory position, ending up in a Calibanian position. (3) Consequently, I highlighted how such an intricate position was a conscious assumption of Portugal's

capitalist colonial semiperipheral position. (4) I also examined how school curriculum perpetuates such a puzzling identity (5) which, in so doing, persistently instigates and promulgates a set of predatory discourses and practices that reproduces a twisted version of historical happenings, thus participating in a segregated social construction of reality.

Now I wish to call the reader's attention to the particular discourses and practices that position themselves as antiracist radical alternatives fighting for a more culturally and economically democratic and just society. In so doing, I will highlight and confront critical race theory as a powerful antiracist device to understand, interrupt and destroy such dangerous racial commonsense assumptions.

One of those antiracist discourses and practices is that of multiculturalism. In fact, most multicultural curriculum approaches are the result of pale add-ons of a culture of tolerance, which, in reality erase and silence other cultures, languages and ways of seeing and being in the world. To be more precise, most multicultural curriculum approaches -such as the ones that the national Portuguese school curriculum has adopted - are a subtle form of cultural genocide. This kind of cultural genocide is more lethal than the explicitly racist approaches portrayed, say, by Richard Herrnstein and Charles Murray (1994) or even by Jean Marie Le Pen,[2] Jörg Haider,[3] and in the late Eugene Terreblanche.[4] At least Richard Herrnstein and Charles Murray, Jean Marie Le Pen and Jörg Haider do not hide their racist views. Notwithstanding the fact that one should not minimize such explicitly racist claims - after all they were able to galvanize support from millions of people, as documented in Austria, France, South Africa and the United States - we consider gray approaches such as some multicultural curricula as even more lethal.

---

[2]. Leader of the neo-Nazi party in France.

[3]. Leader of the neo-Nazi party in Austria and the governor of Carinthia.

[4]. Leader of the neo-Nazi Afrikaner party in South Africa.

Donaldo Macedo (2000, 2005) offers one of the most powerful radical critical arguments. According to this radical critical scholar (2005), multicultural educational platforms failed to achieve a just cultural and economic democracy, given two main critical issues:

> 1) the teaching of cultural tolerance as an end in itself and 2) the lack of political clarity in the multicultural education movement which, in turn, prevents even the most committed educators from understanding how the school of positivism which many of them embrace, informs and shapes multicultural program and curriculum developments, often neutralizing the possibility for the creation of pedagogical structures that could lead to an authentic cultural democracy. (pp. 43-54)

By assuming a "paternalistic cult of cultural tolerance," most multicultural approaches not only end up "fracturing cultural identities" but also go well beyond this and sink into policies of "integration" and "acculturation," thereby participating in expunging the cultural capital of particular minority cultures. This cultural tolerance becomes one of the vital organs of the arrogant Western predatory pedagogical apparatuses. Current examples of multicultural education in schools, Ladson Billings and Tate (2005, p. 61) argue, "often reduce it to trivial examples and artifacts of cultures such as ethnic or cultural foods, singing songs or dancing, Reading folktales and other less than scholarly pursuits of the fundamentally different conceptions of knowledge or quest for social justice". While the "ever-expanding multicultural paradigma follows the traditions of liberalism - allowing the proliferation of diferente - [unfortunately] the tensions between and among these diferences is rarely interregoated, presuming a 'unity of difference' that all difference is both analogous and equivalent" (Ladson Billings & Tate, 1995, p. 62).

As Donaldo Macedo argues (2005),

> if we analyze closely the ideology that informs and shapes the present debate over multicultural education and the present polemic over the primacy of Western heritage, we can begin to see and understand that

the ideological principles that sustain those debates are consonant with the structures and mechanisms of a colonial ideology designed to devalue the cultural capital and values of the colonized. (p. 45)

In essence, what most multicultural approaches seem to intentionally disregard is that, as David Gillborn (1990, p. 147) reminds us, "policies based on the assumptions of assimilation/integration were ill-conceived, partial and often racist." It is in this context that Donaldo Macedo (2005) claims, "before we can announce a more democratic pedagogy around multiculturalism based on a truly cultural democracy (this obviously would involve languages as factors of culture), we need to denounce the false assumptions and distortions that often lead to a form of entrapment pedagogy whereby dominant values are usually reproduced under the rubric of progressive approaches" (p. 49).

Recapturing David Gillborn's (2004) antiracist approach, what most multicultural approaches seem to neglect is that "racism changes [and] anti-racism must recognize and adapt to this complexity" (p. 45). Race is not a monolithic category. In order to understand, interrupt and destroy racist xenophobic discourses and practices, especially in a moment paced by an "ethnic and cultural war," (Macedo, 2000, p. 15) we need, as many radical critical antiracist scholars suggest, to avoid the traps of most mainstream multicultural approaches and rely on critical race theory. This approach views race as an endemic issue within society that does not exist in a neutral vacuum. There is a need, not only to interrupt what Jeffrey Milligan (2001) felicitously calls the "idolatry of inclusion," (p. 31-48) but also to develop critical race theory lenses. It is precisely this challenge that I am putting forward. Following William Tate IV's (1997) antiracist approaches and deconstructing António Salazar's dictatorial claim, it is crucial to challenge how such a claim has to be seen as a truthful expression of "traditional interests and cultural artifacts [that] serve as vehicles to limit and bind the educational opportunities of students of minorities" (p. 234). It is also important to question the shameful obliteration of particular events from the Portuguese capitalist

colonial era, and in so doing I have pushed for a "contextual/historical examination [that recognizes] the experiential knowledge of people of color" (Tate IV, 1997, p. 235) in analyzing society, which will help debunk the xenophobic and predatory endemic "we." As a weapon against that "racial minority groups have experienced throughout history since the onset of European colonialism and the transatlantic slave trade" (Kumasi, 2011, p. 200) critical race theory, helps us "to get real about race and the persistence of racism in America" (Bell, 2001, p. 2) and beyond.

While the historical precursors and intellectual origins of critical race theory showed multiple origins and "can be traced back to the historic battles against white supremacy that were recorded in the mid 1700s – since the life and works of Tupac Amaru (1742–1781) and Toussaint-L'ouverture (1743–1803), Sojourner Truth (1797–1883), John Brown (1800–1859), Frederic Douglass (1818–1895), W. E. B. Du Bois (1868–1963), Mahatma Gandhi (1869–1946), and Carter G. Woodson (1875–1950)" (Kumasi, 2011, p. xx) in the academy, in general and in the field of education, in particular is undeniably connected with a body of legal scholarship that was initiated by a group of lawyers during the civil rights movement in the 1960s" (Kumasi, 2011, p. 206) and with the seminal work of Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995) entitled "Toward a Critical Race Theory of Education" (Kumasi, 2011). Critical race theory allows one to understand not only "how whiteness holds material and symbolic property" (Kumasi, 2011, p. 213; Ladson Billings & Tate, 1995), but also it can helps us understand race as a substantive category in the politics of everyday life framed within what Bonilla Silva (2003) called racism without racists.

Critical race scholarship provides us with a huge array of tools to decomplexify the intricacies of racial power in school settings. Salazar racial narrative needed to be seen with a particular eugenic hegemony that legitimized cultural politics of genocide on one hand, and fuelled

simultaneously class and gender segregation as well. Critical race scholarship allows one to situate Salazar's claim within a complex hegemonic - counterhegemonic web of intersectionality dynamics (cf. Kumasi, 2011, p. 209). Salazar's claim cannot be examined in a circular manner, excluded from the foundation or structure of the social system or even a static phenomena, as well as psychological phenomenon to be examined at the individual level (cf. Bonilla Silva, 1997). Despite its foci in the US context, critical race theory apparatuses speaks volume to challenge Salazar's racial claim, revealing the close connections between race and capitalism, as well as how racism needs to be seen as endemic to society and a mutandi social construction (Ladson Billings and Tate, 1995).

References

Anyon, J. (1983). Workers, labor and economic history, and textbook content, in M.W. Apple and L. Weis (Eds) *Ideology and practice in schooling.* (pp. 37–60.) Philadelphia: Temple University Press,

Apple, M. W. (2001). *Educating the "right' way: markets, standards, god, and inequality.* New York: Routledge.

Apple, M.W. (1990). *Ideology and curriculum.* New York: Routledge.

Apple, M. W. (2000). *Official knowledge: democratic education in a conservative age.* New York: Routledge.

Apple, M. W. (2004). interview, in J. Paraskeva (Ed.), *Here I stand: a long [r]evolution: ideology, culture and curriculum.* Braga. University of Minho, Portugal.

Bell, D. (2001). Racial Realism – After We're Gone: Prudent Speculations on America in a Post-Racial Epoch. In Ricard Delgado (Ed) *Critical Race Theory: The Cutting Edge* (pp., 9-14). Philadelphia: Temple University Press

Biko, Steve (2004) *I write what I like.* Johannesburg: Picador Africa.

Bonilla Silva, E. (1997). Rethinking Racism: Toward a Structural Interpretation. *American Sociological Review, 62 (3),* 465-480

Bonilla Silva, E. (2003). *Racism without Racists.* Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Brindle, P. & Arnot, M. (1999). England expects every man to do his duty: The gendering of the citizenship textbook, 1940–1996, *Oxford Review of Education, 25(1),* 103–123.

Chomsky, N. (1992). *Chronicles of dissent: interviews with David Barsamian.* Monroe, ME: Common Courage.

Chomsky, N. (2002). Legitimacy in history, in P. Mitchell and J. Schoeffel (Eds) *Understanding power: the indispensable Noam Chomsky,*(pp. 135-137) New York: New Press.

Fanon, F. (1967). *Black skin, white masks.* New York: Grove.

Fields, B. (1990). Slavery, race, and ideology. *United States of America*, *New Left Review 181*, 95–118.

Foucault, M. (2001). *Fearless speech.* Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).

Gillborn, D. (1990). '*Race', ethnicity, and education: teaching and learning in multi-ethnic schools* London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Gillborn, D. (2004). Anti-Racism: From Policy to Praxis, in Gloria Ladson-Billings and David Gillborn (Eds.) *The RoutledgeFalmer Reader in Multicultural Education (pp. 35-48).* London: RoutledgeFalmer

Gordon, C. (ed) (1977). *Power/knowledge: selected interviews and other writings—1972–1977—Michel Foucault.* New York: Pantheon.

Herrnstein, R. & Murray, C. (1994) *The bell curve: intelligence and class structure in american life.* New York: Free Press

hooks, b. (1994). *Outlaw culture: resisting representations.* New York: Routledge.

Huebner, D. (1966). Curricular language and classroom meanings, in J. Macdonald and R. Leeper (Eds) *Language and meaning* (pp. 8-26). Washington, DC: ASCD.

Jenks, C. (1977) *Rationality, education, and the social organization of knowledge: papers for a reflexive sociology of education*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Kumasi, K. (2011). Critical Race Theory and Education: Mapping a Legacy of Scholarship and Activism. In B.A.U. Levinson (Ed.), *Beyond Critique: Critical Social Theories and Education,* (pp. 196-219) Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers

Ladson-Billings, G. & Tate, W.F. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education, *Teachers College Record, 97*, 47–68.

Latour, B. (1999) *Pandora's hope: essays on the reality of science studies*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Loewen, J. (1995). *Lies my teacher told me: Everything your high school history textbook got wrong.* New York: New Press.

Las Casas, F.B. (1552). *Brevísima relación de la destrucción de las Índias*. Sevilla: Sebastián Trugillo.

Las Casas, F.B. (1875-76). *[De unico vocationis modo omnium gentium ad veram religionem] Historia de las Indias, ahora por primera vez dada a la luz por el Marqués de la Fuensanta del Valle y D. José Sanchez Rayón*. Madrid: M. Ginesta.

Macedo, D. (1994). *Literacies of power: What Americans are not allowed to know.*Boulder, CO: Westview.

Macedo, D. (2000). The colonialism of the english only movement, *Educational Researcher, 29(3),* 15–21.

Macedo, D. (2005). Multiculturalismo - para além da ditadura do positivismo, in J. Paraskeva (Ed) *Políticas educativas e curriculares: um século de estudos curriculares* (pp. 43-54), Lisboa, Portugal: Didáctica.

Marinho, A., Cardoso, F. & Rothes, L. (1999). *História 8*, Porto Portugal: Areal Editores.

Milligan, J. (2001). Multiculturalism and the idolatry of inclusion, in S. Steinberg (Ed) *Multi-intercultural conversations: a reader (pp. 31-48).* New York: Peter Lang.

Misch, G. (1949-1969). *Geschichte der autobiographie*, 4 vols. Bern: A. Francke.

Omi, M. & Winant, H. (2004). On the theoretical status of the concept of race, in G. Ladson-Billings and D. Gillborn (Eds) *The Routledgefalmer reader in multicultural education* (pp. 7-15). London: RoutledgeFalmer

Paraskeva J. (2001). El currículo como práctica de significaciones, *Kikiriki, Revista Cooperación Educativa, 62–63*, 8–16.

Paraskeva, J. (2004) *Here I stand: a long [r]evolution: ideology, culture and curriculum.* Braga: University of Minho, Portugal.

Reynolds D. (2001) *Interpreting the self: autobiography in the arabic literary tradition.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Rigby, P. (1996). *African images: racism and the end of anthropology.* Washington, DC: Berg.

Rodney, W. (1982). *How Europe underdeveloped Africa.* Washington, DC: Howard University Press.

Selden, S. (1999). *Inheriting shame: The story of eugenics and racism in America.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Sousa Santos, B. (1994). *Pela mão de alice: o social e o político na pós-modernidade.* Porto, Portugal: Afrontamento.

Sousa Santos, B. (2002). Entre prospero e caliban: colonialismo, pós-colonialismo e inter-identidade, in , M. I. Ramalho and A. S. Ribeiro (Eds) *Entre ser e estar: raízes, percursos e discursos da identidade (pp. 23-85).* Porto, Portugal: Edições Afrontamento

Tate IV, W. (1997). Critical race theory, *Review of Research in Education* 22, 195–247.

Todorov, T. (1994) *The conquest of america: the question of the other.* New York: Harper & Row.

Torres Santomé, J. (1996). The presence of different cultures in schools: possibilities of dialogue and action, *Curriculum Studies*, *4(1),* 25–41.

Youdell, D. (2004). Identity traps or how black students fail: the interactions between biographical, sub-cultural, and learner identities, in G. Ladson-Billings and D. Gillborn (Eds) *The Routledgefalmer reader in multicultural education* (pp.84-102). London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Zinn, H. (1999). *Reflections on history, the future of history: interviews with David Barsamian*. Monroe, ME: Common Courage.

Zinn, H. (2001). *On history*. New York: Seven Stories.

João M. Paraskeva is Full Professor at the University of Massachusetts, Dartmouth, where he is founder and Chair of the Department of Educational Leadership and Program Director of the EdD/PhD in Educational Leadership and Policy. He was recently appointed Director for the Center for Portuguese Studies and Culture at UMass Dartmouth. His latest books are *Transformative Educators and Researchers for Democracy—Dartmouth Dialogues* (co-edited with Thad Lavallee, 2015) and *Conflicts in Curriculum Theories: Challenging Hegemonic Epistemologies* (2011/2014).