

An interview of Raquel
Varela and Roberto Leher
with Carlos
Fernández Liria*

"Teaching is a relationship, and children and young people have been convinced not to learn."

We interviewed Carlos Fernández Liria¹, one of the most original and thought-provoking thinkers in education. In this interview, he attacks the notion of competencies, presented with a leftist veneer that he considers "delusional," questions a school emptied of scientific subjects, and recalls how all this aims to disqualify students (depriving them of the possibility of a profession) to serve as a precarious, flexible, and alienated workforce that characterizes present capitalist society. He argues that school is not for feeding moral preachings, whether of citizenship or entrepreneurship, as the intellectuals of capital want. He advocates that teachers return to fighting for their academic and teaching freedom, affirming their status as intellectual organizers of science, art, and culture at all levels – against governments, corporations, the OECD, the World Bank, and UNESCO, which turn schools into laboratories for adapting young people to the market, destroying the teaching profession. He is a staunch advocate for a transformative, egalitarian, and democratic school system that is public, free, and universal, truly committed to the systematic rigor of teaching and learning processes capable of ensuring the historical and critical education of new generations.

* Carlos Fernández Liria (born 1959) is a Spanish philosopher and professor at the Complutense University of Madrid. Interview conducted via Zoom by Raquel Varela and Roberto Leher in February 2025. Raquel Varela is a professor at the Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities of the Nova University of Lisbon (FCSH-UNL), a historian and researcher. Roberto Leher is a professor of public policy in education and former rector of the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ)

Raquel Varela (RV) Carlos, in your book *Escuela y Libertad* (Ed. Akal, 2024)¹, you argue that school is not a daycare or a social assistance setting, but rather a place of teaching and learning. You also state that school should not be left-wing or right-wing, but a state school. In Portugal and many other countries, the left, which calls itself progressive, advocates, for example, the teaching of citizenship, as if the historical struggles for civil, political, and social rights were not systematic concerns of history, sociology, and philosophy—disciplines that are losing space in the curriculum to the so-called teaching of citizenship. The far right, in turn, condemns the subject of citizenship, thus establishing a superficial controversy that obscures the emptying of the aforementioned disciplines of History, Sociology, and Philosophy. How does your book discuss these different views?

Carlos F. Liria (CFL): This latest book is an attempt to create a tool for the left to think about an appropriate education programme. The idea came from our intervention in the Education Group of the Sumar coalition. There was an education group we participated in, and we were horrified because they were trying to develop a left-wing program – creating a left-wing school! We tried to make them understand that state schools were an invention of the working classes that had to be defended tooth and nail, but that there was no need to defend the school as left-wing. What the left has to do is defend state schools and defend the plurality that characterizes these state schools. Because if the left falls into the trap of trying to defend a left-wing school, it is actually opting for a model that is very good for the right, because if the left creates left-wing schools, the right creates right-wing schools. And then Opus Dei can create an Opus Dei school, and Jehovah's Witnesses too.

And this is the model that in Spain is called a “concerted school” (*escuela concertada*). This school has private management but is financed by the state. The left must defend a public-school model against the concerted school, whether left or right. (...) So, if someone has Opus Dei parents, they will put their children in an Opus Dei school with gender segregation, making us believe that the whole world belongs to Opus Dei, in such a way that the child will think like those in Opus Dei, will have Opus Dei teachers and Opus Dei classmates, and this is locking the children in an ideological, also totalitarian, prison, (...) and the young people completely confuse the limits of the universe with the limits of Opus Dei. (...) What we want with state school is to protect the right of children to free themselves from their parents to free themselves from the sectarian ideological dictatorship of family indoctrination they receive in their family, and this right can only be guaranteed by the state school.

RV: In your books, including your discussion on the teaching of philosophy, you go a little further and argue that there is, so to speak, a universal knowledge, enlightenment, and understanding – teaching as a universal legacy of the Enlightenment referenced in the idea of universalism. As you say, this also goes against the thinking that has remained dominant in the parliamentary left, which is the idea of the isolation of identities, of the fragmentation of social subjects, as if society were an aggregate of individuals each with their own particular knowledge.

Roberto Leher (RL): Carlos, you speak of a disinterested school,

which is precisely not a doctrinaire school. Does your reflection resemble Gramsci's elaboration on the disinterested (or formative) school?

CFL: Absolutely. I believe that the main right of a citizen is to know that objective things exist, that there is a horizon of objectivity. Of course, nobody has the truth in their hands. Nobody has received divine enlightenment. But in the public sphere, things are discussed – debated and counter-argued. And there is an effect of objectivity. Not everything is relative; this idea that everything is relative is a postmodern ideology that suits neoliberal flexibility.

I always tell my students this: when Einstein wrote his famous formula on the board: $E = mc^2$, that is, energy (E) equals mass (m) times the speed of light (c) squared, a student raised his hand and said: “And what is that good for? Will it be used?” And Einstein supposedly replied: “I hope not. But it's beautiful!” Subsequently it served a purpose, and also an atrocity – to build atomic bombs. But in principle, science must aim to know in order to understand in a disinterested way. As you stated, Roberto, as Gramsci said.

There is a scientific objectivity to which young people in school are entitled – disinterested knowledge. This is not the definition of philosophical knowledge; it is the philosophical definition of knowledge in general. Disinterested theoretical knowledge in general.

RV: In 2018, the Essential Learnings Law in Portugal², which is the same one applied in several countries due to the influence of the OECD, EU, etc., aimed to reduce the curriculum, fragmented and distorted the History curriculum and, conversely, offered alienating guidelines on how teachers should teach children not to be racist, to promote tolerance and good coexistence among peoples. I tell my students: “So we're not going to teach Nazism and imperialism, because they aren't good coexistence between peoples?” It's like changing the teaching of history into a moral sermon. An allegedly progressive mass. Should I teach the history of colonialism and imperialism, contextualizing that biology, and its so-called scientific pretension about the differences between the black brain and the white brain, were functional for imperialism to colonize peoples? No, I must teach students that they should be good people, tolerant, and not racist, as if racism could be overcome by moral preaching, a reality detached from imperialism.

CFL: Absolutely true. The same thing happened to us here. These citizenship education subjects started to emerge. They say the function of the school is to form good citizens. I believe that's not the role of the school. School has to ensure knowledge, and that has an effect on the formation of good citizens. We are teachers in schools or universities, not preachers. We leave that to religious sects or communities that, in one way or another, have their ethical prescriptions. We, mathematics teachers, I think we have to explain mathematics, and that is very formative. That's very good for having good citizens. A History teacher or professor has to explain history. A Philosophy teacher has to explain philosophy. No teacher needs to transform their subject into

¹ Co-written with Javier Mestre, *Escuela y Libertad – Argumentos para defender la enseñanza frente a políticas educativas y discursos pedagógicos demenciales* (Ed. Akal, 2024).

² Decree-Law No. 55/2018, of July 6.

some kind of indoctrination or moral training for their students. That kind of training is done by religious sects or families at home. At school, students will learn that there is a disinterested perspective, an objectivity that transcends different relativisms, different familiar, sectarian, religious viewpoints, etc. No, we must not lose sight of the connection between state school and objectivity.

These subjects are, in fact, a fatal trap. It started with the formation of good citizens and ended up being replaced by subjects that, in reality, aim to create good customers and good businesspeople, good entrepreneurs. The subject of Education for Citizenship in Spain, when the right wing began to govern, was replaced by the formation of an entrepreneurial spirit, entrepreneurship.

In other words, it's no longer about forming citizens aware of their rights, but entrepreneurs, being flexible in the jungle of the job market. It's about forming a human capital that is functional for the needs of the business market – an entrepreneur is a self-employed businessman, but in reality, he is nothing more than a worker who has lost his rights. They are employees who have no union or professional association behind them, nor a collective agreement to protect them. And, for that, they must have a very flexible life. If a company needs you on the other side of the world, you must be able to go to the other side of the world, regardless of whether you have certain rights as a citizen – those rights disappear. You simply become flexible human material at the service of business needs, which, incidentally, are completely insane business needs – it's a suicidal job market. A disposable job market that transforms state schools into disposable schools through these subjects.

RV: Leonor, the daughter of the King and Queen of Spain, went to study at a prestigious school in England that prohibited the use of cell phones or iPads, even during recess, and the curriculum was unified until Year 13, with greater emphasis on exact sciences, humanities, and social sciences in the morning and experimental teaching, arts, sports, theater, and community involvement in the afternoon. After three years, she had to take a critical philosophical essay exam. The ruling classes put their children in this type of school and, at the same time, flood state schools with iPads and cell phones, where children are being prepared to operate machines.

CFL: In Spain, we experience this in a frightening way. The most recent example is something called DUA (*Diseño Universal para el Aprendizaje*, or Universal Design for Learning), an educational system developed by the Bill Gates Foundation. It's no coincidence that Microsoft has a lot to do with it. It's the most postmodern and neoliberal conception of school imaginable. Each student, they say, is a different world; there's no need to pay attention to diversity because we are all different. Diversity is the norm. There is nothing common, and therefore, the ideal would be for each student to be in front of a computer with an algorithm that adapts to their special needs and mentality, but which, in reality, moulds the student's profile, enclosing them in a bubble and separating them from the rest of the class.

The teacher's role would be simply to walk around among the students to see if they have any problems with their comput-

ers. In other words, the teacher effectively disappears. I can't conceive of anything more dystopian and crazier. Their parents desperate, because our children won't stop consuming Instagram and TikTok and arrive at school and get locked in a computer bubble in front of a screen! To such an extent that they no longer have contact with other students or teachers.

There are always new pedagogical “methods,” trying to reinvent the wheel. However, what do the best studies and research say about what works best in school? That the best approach is a teacher who explains knowledge by interacting with their students, that is, what is usually called exposition, a teacher who simultaneously dialogues with students about the content they are teaching (...) and without cell phones or computers. We spend a fortune replacing schools, but they are nothing special: with a blackboard and a piece of chalk, a teacher can be sufficient and more than sufficient to teach mathematics, history, philosophy, or languages.

Meanwhile, the elites send their sons and daughters to old-fashioned schools because they know perfectly well that they are good. This is because, naturally, private schools [aimed at the elites] did not obey the orders of the World Bank and the World Trade Organization.

RL: In the OECD and also in the World Bank, it is possible to observe a central axis in the construction of educational policy, which is the right to learning. But is it possible to learn without teaching, without teachers, without intentional directive guidance or instruction? Another point is the existence of think tanks, such as the World Bank, whose ideas about teacher training and the nature of teaching reach the university, spreading the notion that teachers and professors do not need to carry out intellectual work of organizing culture, of intentionally organizing culture, of critical dialogue with their students.

CFL: I totally agree, Roberto. In the book on school or barbarism, we analyse the plans made by the OECD, the World Bank, the World Trade Organization, and UNESCO since the 1970s, at the primary, secondary, and university levels (Bologna, for example). The most important documents forged in this sense at the OECD are those from the 1990s. Capitalists realized that there were billions of dollars/euros sitting idle that had no commercial profitability and began a process of commodification of education that hasn't stopped. It started in primary and secondary education. It became very clear that it was necessary to transform the Enlightenment school, committed to the socialization of knowledge, into a kind of primary education to prepare students for the job market. So, what's the point of degrees? And for that, it was also necessary to modify the university, making courses increasingly shorter.

People would graduate with a moderate level of education, trained to work in anything, to be flexible, and to be willing, as they say, to engage in “lifelong learning”. All this means you have no title – qualification, profession – to defend in the market, because you simply are nothing. Everyone has to adapt to what is demanded at all times, according to the whims of the job market, right? And then it was international organizations, such as the OECD, the World Bank, and the GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade³), that began working on the concept of a

³ Predecessor to the WTO.

school that would teach not knowledge, but skills and abilities. It was the Bologna Process. What was called European convergence – the propaganda was that the university was being put at the service of society. But whenever the school is placed at the service of *this society*, it is effectively placing itself at the service of *this society*, that is, at the service of the business world.

The goal of putting the university at the service of society was to put it at the service of the market, that is, to commodify it. And, for that, the entire network of degrees and academic qualifications had to be dismantled. All that feudal rigidity, they said... Departments and professorships were disintegrated into research units, whose members have to go to the market to sell their labour every four or five years. Furthermore, you don't receive public money unless you have previously obtained private funding. If Bayer, for example, puts 10 euros into your research project, then the State will give you 100 euros, because it's a project that has private interest for a pharmaceutical company. Which means that Bayer is receiving 100€ in state funding for this research, that is, 100€ of taxpayers' money, plus the researchers who will work at Bayer and will be paid with taxpayers' money, that is, with the money of other workers. It's a masterstroke to use public universities as ATMs so that companies can siphon off public money and finance themselves with taxpayers' money. This puts money intended for education at the service of the business world, both at the secondary and higher education levels. It's a plan that has existed since the 1970s, but it only began to be implemented in a truly serious way in the 1990s.

RL: Today in Brazil, 60% of new students starting higher education begin their studies through distance learning, and the majority of those enrolled are from the working class. This represents a process of concentration and significant monopolization of the education of the working class. There are approximately 2,500 higher education institutions in Brazil. However, only 10 groups controlled by investment funds and with shares traded on stock exchanges, including the NASDAQ in New York, hold 60% of student enrolments in higher education. There is a monopolization of the education of the working class by these companies, and I believe this is a very important point to consider when reflecting on the meaning of public education. Could Gramsci's ideas about the unitary school, which rejects the separation between those who think and those who execute, help us reflect on the university?

CFL: The best way for the market to get rid of all those—professional associations or unions—that can control it is to say that there are no more degrees. This fundamentally happened with the Bologna Process. The ultimate goal was that there would be no university degrees. There was talk of a card with a magnetic stripe where each person would have a personalized curriculum of the courses, degrees, and master's degrees they had taken in their life. Each worker would have to negotiate their working conditions face-to-face with their curriculum with employers; in other words, it's a way for union struggle to disappear.

RL: Is it possible that the left would defend a project like this? What is happening?

CFL: The issue is that this commodification of the university has been disguised as a wonderful educational revolution with leftist pedagogical connotations. There would be no more dictatorship, no more authority of the professor. These things we've heard

since 1998 simply mean that international organizations intended to get rid of professors because there are supposedly pedagogical methods that no longer require them. Or else they are trained in these new pedagogies (gamification, projects, etc.) that are apparently the latest fad of the left. This comes disguised as anti-authoritarianism, as anti-discipline.

Everything is turned upside down because, to begin with, it presupposes that school was a disciplinary institution of surveillance and punishment. A kind of Foucauldian total institution, on the same level as barracks, asylums, or prisons. School was not that. School was the opposite. It was a great achievement of the working classes, a beautiful institution. The best contribution of the working classes to the history of humanity, the right of children to free themselves from their parents and to know scientific objectivity, and to know that the world extends beyond the limits of their family. In the famous Pink Floyd song from the album *The Wall*, where it says "Hey, teacher, leave them kids alone," the school was presented as a penitentiary institution. We're already starting off on the wrong foot. It's very easy for some gentlemen who call themselves pedagogues to appear destroying this disciplinary institution, to remove the figure of the professor and academic authority from the path.

RV: For us, as for a lawyer or a doctor, academic freedom is freedom over the real of work. It has already been almost completely destroyed in high school education, and now they are doing it in universities, with the State determining course content, essential learning, and curricular flexibility. And the replacement of career paths, of the professorship, with managerial professors. For this, an entire anonymous evaluation system was structured without any dialogue being foreseen, in the form of "the customer is always right." This opened space for grade inflation, turning the university into a company selling certifications (the courses do not correspond to real knowledge). The postmodern left, which denounces the school as a space of class domination, defends these mechanisms as "defence of the student," instead of defending pre-Bologna courses, democratic management, and career paths. Furthermore, they defend that research should follow what the EU dictates, the 2030 Agenda, and the content to be investigated, opening the flank to the far right to determine what is taught. It is not normal for the UN agenda to dictate what a university professor does, no matter how progressive they may be.

CFL: Since the 1990s, the teacher has become an enemy, a suspicious, lazy, criminal, corrupt, and, in any case, authoritarian person. This [post-modern] left would be there to defend us from the teacher or professor. Thus, the backbone of the state school system is mortally wounded – without academic freedom and job security, without the guarantee that teachers are effectively public employees, there is no state school. And this goes against flexibility, which is a word that the left has also bought into. What we want is not this flexibility, but what is called academic freedom. For this, stability in public service is necessary, which must be guaranteed because a teacher or professor cannot be dismissed while exercising their profession. They do not need to comply with any government plan because they have academic freedom. This academic freedom must be defended as something sacred. Hence this idea of transforming the teacher/professor into a character suspected of some kind of crime.

Secondly, there's the idea that if the school is doing poorly, it's because the teachers/professors don't know how to do their

job and therefore need to be taught by pedagogues. This is also presented as a very leftist notion – you have to put the student at the centre, they say. But of course, putting the student at the centre means removing the teacher from the centre. And above all, eliminating the distance between those who know and those who don't. And this seems very democratic, very good, but for the school it's disastrous. So, naturally, if there's no longer a difference between teacher and student, the teaching and learning processes fall apart. In this supposed equality, the best thing is for everyone to give very good grades, so we look very good in research and prestigious school and university rankings. But, of course, this is the end of academic freedom. Academic freedom must be based on respect for the figure of the professor, and what we have completely lost is respect for the figure of the professor. It was a preconceived plan.

RL: The far-right program in Florida and Texas advocates for schools to be institutions subordinate to the family. Trump's program argues that in the election of school principals only families vote, without the participation of teachers and students, and that parents can freely hire and fire teachers. Meanwhile, in the districts of these states, “families” demanded the removal of 5,600 book titles between 2022 and 2023, including authors such as Tolstoy, Hemingway, García Márquez... As we can see, the weakening of the supposedly authoritarian role of teachers brings “progressive” thought closer to the proposals of the far right in the United States.

CFL: It's the complete opposite of what state schools should be, that is, a system, an institution to free citizens from the totalitarianism and ideological indoctrination of the family. State schools must be safe from family dictatorship, because that's why they were invented. Otherwise, religious sects, or others to which the parents belong, own the children until they turn 18. This is simply destroying the spirit of what this public institution we call school means. And the key is academic freedom. It is fundamental that professors and teachers can truly have academic freedom, which means that they do not depend on any private sect, any private company, or any governmental control, any governmental ideological control.

RV: Many intellectuals no longer want to be teachers or professors. On the other hand, if the teacher is boring, if he is a bit monotonous, distracted, makes a mistake, he is already a bad teacher. The class must be a performance. This is the first issue. Children are inattentive – with the use of cell phones that make them flexible and (supposedly) multifocal. The second is that the teacher is in a degrading position. Children don't read. It's like a destruction of productive capacity, a war, that destroys educational cultural work. Many people are demotivated with the profession because this process of expropriating children's knowledge also means expropriating the teacher. Teaching is a relationship, and children and young people have been convinced not to learn.

CFL: I know many disappointed professors and teachers, abandoning the profession, increasingly depressed, even undergoing treatment for depression, taking pills to cope until they can't anymore and change professions. Their work is far from being respected. It's constantly said that the content is the least important thing because it's already on the internet, which leaves the teacher practically without any function, because they can already look for them on the internet. And then the teacher becomes just a kind of trainer who also has to perform. In principle,

a math teacher should be prepared to teach math. Or a language teacher – they can't perform a circus act while the students learn the language from a YouTuber on the computer.

RV: So, a school that talks more and more about inclusion excludes more and more people.

CFL: School also functioned relatively well as a social elevator, as an equalizer of social differences, where rich and poor are treated equally. On the other hand, the more discredited the state school system becomes, the greater the gap with private education. Thus, each elite aspires to have its own school.

RV: And that means segregation. If the school is in the city centre, it has one program, but if it's in a suburb, it has another. They call this curriculum adaptation. The children have watered-down subjects.

RL: Gramsci said that the more types of schools there are, the less democratic a society is. A society that has schools for poor children, children from working-class backgrounds, separate schools for urban and rural areas, is not a truly democratic society.

CFL: Gramsci was right. I once jokingly suggested, because I knew it was unattainable, that anyone holding public office, from the Prime Minister to the highest-ranking city councillor or the cabinet minister's son, should send their children to a state school assigned by lottery within a reasonable range. Because, of course, if what happens is that the most impoverished social classes, where students don't have space to study, can't be helped by their parents because the parents are working, if all this human contingent goes to state school, while the middle and upper classes go to subsidized, private schools, that's pure segregation and pure racism. In the end, it becomes social racism where the poor experience a completely different educational reality than the wealthy classes. Let's look at the case of Finland. Why does it work so well? There are very few private schools. About 90% of the population attends state school.

RV: My hypothesis is that Finland borders Russia and has a very small population; they need well-trained personnel to survive as a country. In Madrid or Lisbon, you can send thousands to degraded schools because there are specialized private schools to train leaders.

CFL: I think they'll have plenty of money for education because they can afford certain luxuries that we should also be able to aspire to. But, of course, to begin with, don't segregate between private and state schools.

RV: There are two widespread ideas: one is that school is to help people find jobs – to prepare them for the job market – and the second is that nothing can be democratic and of high quality if it is mass-produced. Raymond Williams argued the opposite. If there is no scale, millions, there is no quality. There are only geniuses of philosophy in Germany because there was a lot of philosophical elaboration in that country. Ultimately, not even private education will be of high quality if there is no quality in public education, because there is no scale.

CFL: I completely agree. Public healthcare has worked much better than private healthcare, and state schools much better than private schools. In fact, when I was a high school teacher,

the public system was much better. State universities have much more prestige than private universities.

RL: It's very interesting that in the schools of revolutions, like in the Paris Commune, workers practiced a school of knowledge where children, for example, not only had to learn what production is, but also how to produce it themselves. Therefore, in the revolutionary process, there were workshops with Manet "on the production process" of art for working-class children, and also workshops where children had to learn the technical and scientific fundamentals of the production process so that the children of the working class could be the leaders and not the followers in the production process.

There is another very interesting point in your reflection on objectivity. Objectivity does not mean ethical neutrality. Racism is inseparable from the formation of capitalism and imperialism, and this allows us to better understand the foundations of racism in today's world. In Brazil there was the "school without political parties" movement, and in the US they persecute Marxist teachers and professors accused of lacking objectivity and being indoctrinators.

The critique of racism is scientific. Biology shows us very forcefully that races do not exist in the biological sense. Race is a political construct. There are no biological races in the human species; there is polymorphism. And there is also a historical, philosophical, and ethical education about the meaning of racism. Therefore, racism is part of the agenda of science, ethics, and philosophy, where we can develop knowledge that radically critiques the foundations of racism. It is necessary to mention that very recently, until the 19th century, and later with Nazism, there was a construction of "racism" based on "scientific evidence," which supposedly was science. The Latino and Black population was considered less intelligent, and the population of European origin was more intelligent. Well, it was science that criticized these foundations; it was the vigorous, ethical, and objective production of science that did so. It is about fighting for good science and not for bad science with scientific fraud, and I believe that this is a fundamental point for the left. We have a historical interest as a class in developing rigorous knowledge in school because rigorous science has an ethical commitment to approaching the truth. As Gramsci said, truth is revolutionary.

CFL: I agree. In other words, I've been saying that schools shouldn't educate in a moral catechism of any kind, neither left nor right. It's true, science has moral and political effects. Does scientific rigor have moral and political effects on the formation of citizens? Yes, of course. That's to begin with what I said, because, naturally, to be racist you need ridiculous scientific foundations, because you can't defend racism from a scientific position. Science has always introduced a political tension into this world that had something to do with a proto-Enlightenment. From the very first moment we have to think, for example, when Meno's slave deduces the Pythagorean theorem in front of Meno and Socrates, and he deduces it on his own, I think the question is posed from the very first moment: whether, in the face of the Pythagorean theorem, slaves and citizens are equal. It has an immediate moral effect, an important political effect. The fact that, in the face of scientific objectivity, we are all equal: the rich, the poor, men, women, black people, white people. This, in a way, introduces into this world a political tension that the Enlightenment and the French Revolution called equality.

RL: There's a very beautiful passage in Brecht's text about Galileo where he talks about the knowledge he was developing. And he says that he wished the butcher's son also had access to that knowledge.

RV: The only thing I wanted to add on this issue is that even when I look at History curricula, the curriculum says that good coexistence between peoples must be taught, and this entails a double problem. The first is that Nazism is not good coexistence between peoples. And that is history. The second is that it places school not only as a place of moral preaching, but in contradiction with the truth, because children, when they leave school, are not in good coexistence, because it is a society deeply divided by social classes and brutal inequalities. So, it's as if the teacher is called upon to lie. Children need to emancipate themselves. In fact, it's the opposite: to emancipate themselves, they need a clash with good coexistence, with the dominant classes. They have to confront the bourgeoisie to achieve good coexistence. So, it's as if the History teacher were a moralist preaching social resignation. It's not just obscurantist; it has a purpose that seems very, very progressive, but in reality, it's the opposite. The teacher becomes an actor. Not someone who tries to understand history in its complexities, but someone who becomes a propagandist.

CFL: When you explain history rigorously and objectively, you learn to form politically and morally. When we understand the true causes that were at stake in each battle, in each war, that shapes us politically. But what distorts it is the catechism of good manners, inspired by I don't know what ideological program from I don't know what party that won the elections ■

Translation by António Simões do Paço