

Tempo & Argumento

e-issn 2175-1803

History teaching: temporality, post-truth and poetic truth

 **Marcelo de Mello Rangel**

Professor at the Graduate Programs in History and Philosophy of the Federal University of Ouro Preto (UFOP).

Mariana, MG - BRASIL

lattes.cnpq.br/2419520606896435

mmellorangel@yahoo.com.br

 orcid.org/0000-0002-5822-4969

To cite this article (ABNT):

RANGEL, Marcelo de Mello. History teaching: temporality, post-truth and poetic truth.

Tempo e Argumento, Florianópolis, e0110, 2021. Special issue.

 <http://dx.doi.org/10.5965/21751803ne2021e0110>



History teaching: temporality, post-truth and poetic truth¹

Abstract

Listening to undergraduate students in the 4 supervised internships available at the Department of History of the Federal University of Ouro Preto (UFOP), I have noticed that 2 themes frequently appear and reappear: a) a certain lack of interest, at least initially, of basic education students in the past, in history, and in History teaching, especially with regard to a specific way of relating to the past times: the epistemological-critical-pragmatic; and also b) a certain questioning by the students (sometimes even more energetic/violent) of certain interpretations proposed by teachers. We have been thinking about these challenges throughout our courses, so this article addresses part of our discussions on the themes of *temporality* and *post-truth*, especially concerning a certain lack of interest in history and in History teaching. And, finally, we thematize an epistemological behavior through which a certain re-enchantment of history and History teaching could be possible, what I call *poetic truth*.

Keywords: temporality; post-truth; poetic truth.

Ensino de História: temporalidade, pós-verdade e verdade poética

Resumo

Ouvindo alunos da graduação nos 4 estágios supervisionados que temos no departamento de História da Universidade Federal de Ouro Preto (UFOP), percebi que 2 temas têm aparecido e retornado com frequência: a) certo desinteresse, ao menos inicial, dos estudantes do ensino básico pelo passado, pela história e pelo ensino de História, especialmente no que diz respeito a um modo específico de relacionamento com passados: o epistemológico-crítico-pragmático; e, também, b) certo questionamento dos alunos (às vezes até mais enérgico/violento) de determinadas interpretações propostas pelos professores. Temos pensado sobre esses desafios ao longo de nossos cursos, de modo que este artigo aborda parte de nossas discussões sobre as questões da *temporalidade* e da *pós-verdade*, especialmente naquilo que diz respeito a certo desinteresse pela história e pelo ensino de História. E, por fim, tematizamos um comportamento epistemológico a partir do qual seria possível certo reencantamento da história e do ensino de História, o que denomino *verdade poética*.

Palavras-chave: temporalidade; pós-verdade; verdade poética.

¹ I thank Rogério Rosa for the invitation to participate in the “IV International Seminar on History of the Present Time” (UDESC, 2021), where I presented the conference paper that originated this article

Temporality, history and History teaching

Our meeting had a sweetness that still lingers, that lasts for a lifetime: even if you never speak to the person again, never see that face again, you can always go back, in your heart, to that moment when you were together and feel renewed – it is a deep solidarity.
Bell Hooks (2017, p. 82)

I may not know now what risk I am taking, but I know that, as a *presence* in the world, i am a risk taker. Risk is a necessary ingredient for mobility without which there is neither culture nor history. Hence the importance of an education that, instead of seeking to deny the risk, encourages women and men to take it.
Paulo Freire (2000, p. 30)

A significant part of my students in the supervised internship disciplines, in the History course of the Federal University of Ouro Preto (UFOP), have reported a lack of interest, at least immediately, in History classes in basic education. They have noticed a certain apathy, indifference, and even antipathy (detachment, separation) when basic education teachers propose the lesson's topic and present certain contexts and characters. A large part of elementary and high school students are attentive to their cell phones, talk to each other, showing a certain boredom and even annoyance. And they comment: "*What're we going to do after class?*"; "*What's that for?*"; "*This has nothing to do with us!*"; "*The teacher is nice, but this subject is boring!*"

We have been thinking together about supervised internship classes and some considerations and explanations have appeared more frequently: basic education students have been impatient, preferring to spend most of their time on the internet, on social network services; a part of the teachers are also not so patient and they insist on taking a rather central and even authoritarian position

that may no longer be adequate or feasible. The teachers themselves are exhausted, they need to move between schools that are often far away, facing long traffic jams, violence, and are not recognized or well paid. The market may be more interested in professions that do not relate so closely to history, at least not so apparently. Fathers and mothers might be concerned with History teaching, with humanities as a whole, as they could be 'ideological' and provoke their children, somehow, towards a somewhat uninterested and even skeptical relation to History classes, and that not to mention the negative approach that history (and humanities as a whole) has received due to a certain advance either from the far right wing or from a certain technique, logic, and the productivist rhythm (from what we can also call neoliberalism and self-entrepreneurship), which are rather short-term and selfish. Finally, we have a number of reasons that help us to understand this considerable lack of interest and even antipathy towards History teaching (and the humanities); however, we have applied ourselves to thinking about it, at least initially, by tackling a specific issue: temporality and, more especially, contemporary temporality.

Our view is that there may be something in contemporary temporality that can make History teaching, at least initially, uninteresting, and this might be at the basis of a certain impatience on the part of basic education students and also at the university (especially in other courses that have themes related to history) concerning the thematization and careful discussion of a large part of the contexts and characters addressed by teachers, considering the possibility of a more intimate relationship between the present and past times, especially in order to approach more reasonably and creatively the issues and possibilities inherent to our world (epistemological-critical-pragmatic mode of relationship)².

Let's start with the issue of historical consciousness, so what we realize is that we all move, necessarily, between past and future times, and more, that given certain deadlocks and possibilities proposed by our world, we may tend to relocate more consciously between the past and future times in order to deal in at least a rather reasonable way with social, political, cultural, and economic

² See: ABREU, Marcelo Santos de; RANGEL, Marcelo de Mello. Memória, cultura histórica e ensino de história. *História e Cultura*, [s.l.], v. 4, p. 7-24, 2015.

changes³. So that history (time) is marked by the need for change and each one of us experiences critical contexts as well, and especially from the more conscious reorganization of our relationships with past and future times, with more or less available traditions and having certain expectations, projects. Through this view of history (of time) and of ourselves as a significant part of the movement of reorganization, of differentiating history, we arrive at an important perception for our professional activity, for historical thinking, for the historiographical practice, and for History teaching: we all need and relate more

³ Regarding historical consciousness, Rüsen (2001, p. 54) explains that: “it is the generic and elementary situations of men’s practical life (experiences and interpretations of time) that constitute what we know as historical consciousness. They are phenomena common to historical thinking both in scientific and general terms, as operated by each and every man, and they generate certain cognitive outcomes.”

“These are ‘thinking and teaching processes that structure consciousness,’ which are generally ‘behind the content and usually hidden from the learner’s view,’ ‘mental acts that determine behavior, which underlie history teaching’” (RÜSEN, 2011, p. 42).

“The procedural nature of historical learning in history narrative(s) may be described as follows: the stimulus and driving force of historical learning lie on the guidance needs of agents and patients, needs that arise for these individuals along with bewildering time experiences. Historical learning can be set in motion, therefore, only through relevant actions in the present. Then, such lacks of guidance are turned into (inquiring) perspectives on the past, which apprehend the experiential potential of historical memory” (RÜSEN, 2011, p. 44).

“[...] history is rooted in social needs to guide life within the framework of time” (RÜSEN, 2011, p. 25).

What Rüsen calls historical awareness, this necessary, more immediate, and also conscious (re)thematization of past times in order to relate more adequately to the changes inherent to actual reality (*Wirklichkeit*), also refers to Koselleck’s thought. According to Koselleck, we necessarily relate to past and future times, in order to reorganize ourselves in a certain effective reality, “in other words: all stories were made of lived experiences and the expectations of the people who undertake or undergo them” (KOSELLECK, 2006, p. 306).

“The conditions of possibility of real history are, at the same time, the conditions of possibility of its knowledge. Hope and remembrance, or more generally, expectation and experience [...] constitute, at the same time, history and its knowledge, and they certainly do so by showing and producing the internal relationship between past and future, today and tomorrow” (KOSELLECK, 2006, p. 308).

“This brings me to my thesis: experience and expectation are two suitable categories for dealing with historical time, as they intertwine past and future. They are also suitable for trying to discover historical time, because, enriched in their content, they direct concrete actions in the social and political movement. [...] Concrete history matures in the midst of certain experiences and certain expectations. [...] As categories, they (the concepts of experience and expectation) provide the formal determinations that allow our historical knowledge to decipher this execution. They (experience and expectation) refer to the temporality of man, and with this, in a meta-historical way, to the temporality of history” (KOSELLECK, 2006, p. 308-309).

We also emphasize that this temporal view of Koselleck, based on the relationship between experience (past times) and expectation (future times), is directly related to the issue of temporality in Heidegger, especially with regard to Heidegger’s view that *Dasein* (each of us) is originally indeterminate, mobilizing between the world that is yours (“there”) and the “can-be” that we are also. It is precisely this mobility between “there” and “can-be” that underlies the temporalization or differentiation of *Dasein* and history (time). In this regard, see the fifth chapter, §§ 72-77, of *Being and Time*.

or less consciously to past and future times, especially in rather critical contexts⁴. Finally if, on the one hand, we may have a crisis in the discipline of History and in History teaching, we can also work, on the other hand, with an assumption that seems to be very convincing (and even encouraging): that despite our spatiotemporal coordinates, when and where we are, we need and will need past and future times to mobilize ourselves, or also there will always be, somehow, interest in spaces where past and future times are addressed more consciously/reflexively, by the discipline of History, by History teaching...

However, this perception is not and cannot be just reassuring, because while we need past and future times, history and History teaching to reposition ourselves, to participate more effectively in the differentiation movement of history (time), we can't simply deny that we are going through a major crisis in our activity, that part of our society and our students have shown a considerable lack of interest in our research studies and classes.

In this case, despite some comfort regarding the dimension and importance of our professional activity, our research studies, and History teaching, it is important to keep thinking carefully, to build a careful and thorough diagnosis of this lack of interest that we have observed and experienced, in relation to the which we have often reacted with impatience and even pessimism. And, here, I would like to propose a certain reading of contemporary temporality in order to think through and grasp at least some of this lack of interest in history and in History teaching today.

What we have more generally, at least in face of the issue of temporality, is that there is something inherent to contemporary temporality that has also made possible this lack of interest in history, in History teaching, in thematization and more careful discussion of the past. I would say that there is a certain apathy and even antipathy towards the past times at least with regard to a way of relating to the past that is at the base of our activity (our discipline): the epistemological-critical-pragmatic way. What we have, therefore, is something

⁴ "Historical consciousness mixes 'being' and 'should' in a meaningful narrative that refers to past events in order to make the present intelligible, and give a future perspective to the current activity. Thus, the historical conscience makes an essential contribution to the ethical-moral consciousness" (RÜSEN, 2011, p. 57).

complex: on the one hand, a certain lack of interest and even antipathy towards the more careful (scientific) thematization of history and, on the other hand, a growing interest in knowing certain contexts and characters in other spaces of historical cultural like cinema, theater, music, electronic games, and this taking another approach to past times: the aesthetic. Or, based on a certain wish to simply know more and update, thus, a more general need to go through more experiences⁵.

Our perception is that if, on the one hand, we necessarily relate, either more immediately or more consciously or theoretically, with past and future times, on the other hand, the very relation to the past and future is marked and somehow determined by the horizons or historical contexts in which we find ourselves. If we always relate to past and future times, this relationship is also made of a certain degree of specificity depending on our horizon, our society.

Unlike modernity, for instance, today we experience a relation to time, past and future times (of course, in a more general way, among others possible and depending on more specific groups and contexts⁶), marked by what we can call a double-reduction: the reduction of trust in rather available past times and also in the future, which has been experienced as a horizon that may tend to deepen certain contemporary dramas⁷. Therefore, what we have is a temporality made

⁵ We always relate to past and future times in both ways: the epistemological-critical-pragmatic and the aesthetic. What happens is that there are temporalities and contexts where we can have a generalization and even hypostasis concerning a more epistemological-critical-pragmatic or more aesthetic approach. It is precisely this issue that underlies Gumbrecht's thematization of what he calls "culture of meaning" and "culture of presence:" "Presence and meaning, however, always appear together and are always in tension. It is impossible to make them compatible or to bring them together in a 'well balanced' phenomenal structure" (GUMBRECHT, 2010, p. 134). See also: ABREU, Marcelo Santos de; CUNHA, Nara Rúbia de Carvalho. Cultura de história, história pública e ensino de história: a investigação e formação de professores de história. *História Hoje*, [s.l.], v. 8, p. 111-134, 2019.

⁶ See: GUIMARÃES, Géssica; RAUTER, Luisa. Ativismo, movimentos sociais e politização do tempo: possibilidades dos femininos no Brasil contemporâneo. In: GUIMARÃES, Géssica; PINHA, Daniel; RANGEL, Marcelo de Mello (org.). *Diante da crise: teoria, história da historiografia e ensino de história hoje*. Vitória: Milfontes, 2021.

⁷ "For many decades, no one has really taken characters in history seriously as role models. I will give a literary example: many of you will have read the wonderful novel of the great French realist Stendhal, from 1831, referring to the 1830 bourgeois revolution in France. There is a young protagonist, Julien Sorel. The whole ambition of this character's life is to be equal to Napoleon, he wants to be a copy of Napoleon. I think that for us, in practice, it no longer exists. We can admire Pope Joseph Ratzinger, perhaps we can admire President Lula – to have two completely different protagonists –, we can also admire Tiradentes. But the way to express this may be as a Lula's fan or admirer, not wishing to copy a character and take him as a historical paradigm for acting in our own time" (GUMBRECHT, 2011, p. 28).

of a certain estrangement (especially with regard to the epistemological-critical-pragmatic mode of relationship) in relation to the past(s), seen, at least more generally, as outdated, obsolete and, hence, inadequate in terms of providing feasible answers to more contemporary questions and possibilities. A perception that is largely due to the type of relationship we establish with technology, which has made the past seem so different, backward, and obsolete⁸.

The past(s), its(their) customs, characters, fashion, artifacts, ideas, and institutions (is)are looking increasingly old-fashioned and even outdated. I like to think here based on a metaphor coined by Koselleck, the *Sattelzeit*, ‘saddle time,’ which points to a kind of accelerated acceleration of time, to the temporal perception that each present time tends to differentiate itself and seems to be even more different from its immediate past than this was and seemed to be in relation to what preceded it.

Regarding the future, we also have a generalized, broad social perception that it is likely that we will experience a kind of deepening of certain dramas that are already available: ecological, sanitary, political-diplomatic, economic... what

“[...] we are no longer in a historicist chronotope. Our future does not remain open to possibilities. Today’s future is increasingly threatening, a risk we take with insurance. One example of this was the huge success of Al Gore’s text, which said that we had at most five years before we release the most aggressive displays of the ecological threat. That if we fail to lower, drastically reduce certain pollution levels, in five years there would be no solution. This is not a discourse pointing to a future open to possibilities. Today’s economic discourse is now a discourse concerned with survival. [...] it is no longer we who are heading towards the future, it is the latter that ambiguously comes to meet us” (GUMBRECHT, 2011, p. 39).

“[...] I believe it is interesting that in the past the historicist model of identifying a regularity in historical change existed on the basis of predictions. Identifying regularities in historical change used to project scenarios into the future and then have an urge for action [...] today I think that no serious politician does this: analyze history, make a projection and then act as advised. For instance, there are all those ecological predictions, it is known that former US Vice President Al Gore was awarded the Nobel Prize for a prediction about the ecological future of the planet. But today, at the time the forecasts are published, counter-forecasts are also published” (GUMBRECHT, 2011, p. 28-29).

“A German philosopher I like very much, Niklas Luhmann, who has invented a certain philosophy of systems, has a good formula. He tells us that, in the past, predictions were made only by analyzing the past. Today, we buy insurance instead to protect ourselves from an unwanted future. We have no idea what the future will be like, we don’t make predictions, but we buy insurance in case the future is undesirable, negative for us, in order to be protected” (GUMBRECHT, 2011, p. 29).

⁸ “All these perceptions were aggravated by the sensation of acceleration, whether actually existing or sensed. Everyone seemed to be at risk of becoming obsolete, of being left out” (ARAUJO; PEREIRA, 2019, p. 172).

would come close to a certain pessimistic and dystopian orientation (atmosphere, *Stimmung*)⁹.

Thus, what we have is a double-reduction with regard to trust in past and future times, a lack of interest (apathy), and even, in certain contexts, a certain antipathy towards past and future times which are, as we saw above, so important to our position and relation to time, to the reorganization and differentiation of history (time)¹⁰.

Then, we arrive at a reasonably sufficient description of what temporality in general and contemporary temporality might be, and thus at the very understanding of the relationship between contemporary temporality and a certain current lack of interest, apathy and even antipathy towards history and History teaching.

To be clearer, most children, teenagers, and adults show an apathy and antipathy towards the past and future. Many of us are, on the other hand, too close to ourselves, in an endless pursuit of pleasure¹¹.

⁹ “*Dis* is a very common Latin prefix that refers to the idea of duality, division into two parts, separation, movement in various directions, estrangement, cessation, negation, lack, intensity. It encapsulates the idea of difficulty and duplicity. But there is also a Greek prefix *dys* that indicates duality, difficulty, and bad state. *Topos*, in turn, is a radical that means place, so I define dystopia, more freely, as a displace, a place and its negation, a split place or even a place in displacement. In other words, we have a place that is displaced, inappropriate, out of place. At a philosophical level, dystopia represents the resistance to humanism in the face of always hostile realities, from which, apparently, it is not possible to escape” (BENTIVOGLIO, 2019, p. 21).

¹⁰ Regarding the importance of a more intense and confident relationship in past and future times less available for the restructuring and differentiation of the present, see: BENJAMIN, Walter. Sobre o conceito de história. In: LÖWY, Michael (org.). *Walter Benjamin: aviso de incêndio. Uma leitura das teses “Sobre o conceito de história”*. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2005; BEVERNAGE, Berber. *History, memory, and state-sponsored violence: time and justice*. New York: Routledge, 2012; DERRIDA, Jacques. *Espectros de Marx. O estado da dívida, o trabalho do luto e a nova Internacional*. Rio de Janeiro: Relume-Dumará, 1994; DOMANSKA, Ewa. The material presence of the past. *History and Theory*, [s.l.], v. 45, p. 337-348, 2006; GUMBRECHT, Hans Ulrich. *Produção de presença: o que o sentido não consegue transmitir*. Rio de Janeiro: Contraponto: Ed. PUC-Rio, 2010; HEIDEGGER, Martin. *Ser e tempo*. Petrópolis: Vozes; Bragança Paulista: Editora Universitária São Francisco, 2008 (especialmente o quinto capítulo, §§ 72-77); KLEINBERG, Ethan. Presence in absentia. In: GHOSH, Ranjan; KLEINBERG, Ethan (eds.). *Presence: philosophy, history, and cultural theory for the twenty-first century*. Ithaca; London: Cornell University Press, 2013; RANGEL, Marcelo de Mello. *Da ternura com o passado: história e pensamento histórico na filosofia contemporânea*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Via Verita, 2019a e RANGEL, Marcelo de Mello. *A história e o impossível: Walter Benjamin e Derrida*. Rio de Janeiro: Ape’Ku, 2020.

¹¹ It is this view that underlies Gumbrecht’s reflection on what he calls *broad present*, especially through notions such as *simultaneity*, *stagnation*, *fascination*, and *technology*. “This availability of means for easy and immediate satisfaction has become a rule and extends even into the past. More than ever, we can evoke moments from the past through archives and products of the nostalgia industry, which turned our present into an expanded presence of simultaneities and

What I am proposing is something we may call circular: the more we so significantly distrust that past and future times can help us relate epistemologically-critically-pragmatically to issues and possibilities posed by our world, the more we move away from dimensions that can effectively support a rather reasonable and creative relation to our context or horizon: our own past and future times. The more we move away from an epistemological-critical-pragmatic relationship, more careful and confident in past and future times, the more we lose the ideal companions to the time experience and impoverish ourselves, detaching ourselves from the affections, experiences, dramas, advices, and dreams that can give support and stimulate an epistemological-critical-creative relation to history (with time, especially with regard to participation in its change, differentiation movement).

Thus, impoverished, we have dedicated ourselves to the strategy of excessively relating to ourselves, in order to significantly and frantically increase our pleasure. And, finally, the more we get involved with this hypostasized way of relating to ourselves, the farther we move away from the possibility of an epistemological-critical-pragmatic, attentive, careful, confident relation to past and future times¹². The rhythm proper to this mode of epistemological-critical-pragmatic relationship, a slower, more continuous and meticulous pace, becomes (seems to be) painful, and the affections inherent to this mode of relationship (epistemological-critical-pragmatic) and to the its rhythm have been

slowed down our impression of the rhythm of historical time. [...] extreme individualism has thus become a mass phenomenon of our time. Its price lies in the fact that easy availability of reality is linked to the long-internalized expectation of making ourselves permanently available” (GUMBRECHT, 2012, p. 84).

This perception that today we organize much more based on the need to increase our pleasure is also at the base of Heidegger’s criticism of the technique: “[...] a region is developing in the exploration of supplying coal and ores. The subsoil is uncovered, like a coal reservoir, the ground, like ore deposits. The field the peasant had once tilled was different, when tilling still meant caring properly for. Peasant work does not provoke and challenge the agricultural soil. [...] nowadays, another position has also absorbed field tillage, namely, the position that *arranges* nature. And it arranges nature in the sense of an exploration. Agriculture became a motorized food industry. Air is available to supply nitrogen, soil to supply ore, such as uranium, uranium to supply atomic energy; it can then be disintegrated for war destruction or for peaceful purposes. [...] it is about the way of discovering the technique that challenges him (man) to explore nature, taking it as a research object until the object disappears into the non-object of *availability*. [...] modern technique is not reduced to a mere making of man. [...] the power that leads him to arrange the real is at stake, as availability” (HEIDEGGER, 2006, p. 19-23).

¹² See: RANGEL, Marcelo de Mello. Temporalidade e felicidade hoje: uma relação possível entre o pensamento histórico, a democracia e a experiência da felicidade. *Artefilosofia*, [s.l.], v.25, p. 52-67, 2018.

put into question, driven off, as Benjamin noticed; affections such as patience, tenacity, constancy, modesty, attentiveness, certain (critical) skepticism or distrust, wrath/fury ('righteous wrath'), and love¹³.

Thus, we are going to better understand this contemporary experience of lack of interest, apathy, and even antipathy towards the past and future times, especially with regard to the mode of relationship that implements our activity, the discipline History and History teaching, the epistemological-critical-pragmatic mode. Our students insist on asking us: "what is the point of knowing something so different, that doesn't relate to us?"

Post-truth, history and History Teaching

We still have tackled as teachers in general and, in our case, as History teachers, an additional problem regarding the loss of a certain protagonism. We have been following a lack of interest and even verbal and physical aggression

¹³ About this rhythm inherent to a certain epistemological-critical-pragmatic relation to past and future times, see: BENJAMIN, Walter. *Experiência e pobreza*. In: WALTER BENJAMIN: obras escolhidas: magia e técnica, arte e política: ensaios sobre literatura e história da cultura. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1994; BENJAMIN, Walter. *O narrador*. Considerações sobre a obra de Nikolai Leskov. In: *Walter Benjamin*: obras escolhidas: magia e técnica, arte e política. Ensaio sobre literatura e história da cultura. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1994a; BENJAMIN, Walter. *Sobre o conceito de história*. In: LÖWY, Michael (org.). *Walter Benjamin*: aviso de incêndio. Uma leitura das teses "Sobre o conceito de história". São Paulo: Boitempo, 2005; and RANGEL, Marcelo de Mello. *Temporalidade e felicidade hoje: uma relação possível entre o pensamento histórico, a democracia e a experiência da felicidade*. *Artefilosofia*, [s.l.], v.25, p. 52-67, 2018. Concerning a certain affective economy inherent to this epistemological-critical-pragmatic relation to past and future times, which I am also calling affective-epistemic virtue, see: RANGEL, Marcelo de Mello. *História e Stimmung a partir de Walter Benjamin: sobre algumas possibilidades ético-políticas da historiografia*. *Cadernos Walter Benjamin*, [s.l.], v.17, p. 165-178, 2016; RANGEL, Marcelo de Mello. *Entrevista Marcelo de Mello Rangel*. *Ensaio Filosófico*, [s.l.], v. XVI, p. 119-139, 2017; RANGEL, Marcelo de Mello. *Rehistoricização da história, melancolia e ódio*. In: BENTIVOGLIO, Julio; CARVALHO, Augusto de (org.). *Walter Benjamin*: testemunho e melancolia. Serra: Milfontes, 2019b; RANGEL, Marcelo de Mello. *Giro ético-político, verdade e felicidade*. In: CARVALHO, Augusto de; RANGEL, Marcelo de Mello (org.). *História & filosofia: problemas ético-políticos*. Vitória: Milfontes, 2020a; RANGEL, Marcelo de Mello. *Resistência, ódio e amor!* In: AMITRANO, Geórgia; HADDOCK-LOBO, Rafael; RANGEL, Marcelo de Mello (org.). *Rosas e pensamentos outros*. Rio de Janeiro: Ape'Ku, 2020b.

According to Benjamin: "they (the fine and spiritual things, the affections) are alive in this struggle as trust, as courage, as humor, as cunning, as tenacity..." (BENJAMIN, 2005, p. 58 – Thesis IV). And according to Paulo Freire: "how can we not fight, due to lack of courage, will, rebellion, if we don't have *a tomorrow*, if we don't have *hope*" (FREIRE, 2000, p. 47).

And as for 'righteous wrath': "I do not add my voice to those who, speaking of peace, ask the oppressed, the ragged of the world, for their resignation. My voice has a different semantics, it has another tune. I speak of resistance, indignation, the 'righteous wrath' of those betrayed and deceived. Their right and duty to rebel against the ethical transgressions of which they have increasingly become victims" (FREIRE, 1997, p. 113).

within the school, for instance, due to certain interpretations, views and positions. And here we move from a certain lack of interest to a more clearly reactive attitude. And what does make this reactivity possible?

First of all, this is not about a complaint or contestation, a protest or nostalgia in relation to times when science and the professor's position, his words and behavior, took on greater prominence or had a certain reverence. On the contrary, and as we see later, we believe in and have been devoted to what may be considered as deepening the tension between the most varied perspectives with regard to science and teaching, to the very classroom dynamics. It is just a matter of explaining, in this first moment, a certain loss of protagonism of science, of the teacher, which has not been accompanied, in this case, by a more democratizing reorganization of the scientific space and the classroom, but rather by a denial of science, of education as a whole.

This loss of protagonism of science, of the teacher's position itself, is directly linked or may be better understood through the thematization of post-truth as a behavior.

Post-truth may be thought of as an epistemological behavior based on which there is no responsibility for what is said, nor an effort to detach oneself, and therefore some differentiation between the less thematized wishes of those who think and their statements, or there is no exercise of objectivity. And here we emphasize that we are working with a notion of objectivity that is at the same time simple and broad, capable of embracing other views and that it even works as a condition of possibility for any and all objectivity, namely: what is objective if necessarily unfolds from a reasonable sliding-mode differentiation between what is said and a certain more immediate (non-thematized) position of the uttering person.

What is said based on this behavior, i.e. the post-truth, is completely confused with whoever utters it, especially with regard to affections and wishes that are less consciously elaborated and (re)organized. Likewise, there is no delay that separates the act of enunciation and its repercussion. This repercussion is immediate, which means to say that we do not have time for doubt, for (self)questioning, (self)criticism, reorganization, and complexification of

statements. Thus, post-truth may be seen as an epistemological behavior determined by the binomial selfishness/hedonism, by the wish that there is no denial or discontinuity between a given subject and reality (*Wirklichkeit*). An epistemological behavior that ends up having even more serious and devastating effects in societies with a slavery history like ours, marked by a kind of hypostasis or paroxysm of a logic and ethics that might be more general, i.e. the master-slave.

Therefore, what we see is an authoritarian scheme based on which we put into question any space and a more careful, dialogic, tense, and plural (democratizing) exercise with regard to the constitution and reconstitution of objective utterances (in the sense that we propose above: a certain sliding-mode differentiation between what is said and the more immediate position of the uttering person). It is exactly in this context that we have the significant question about the university, science, education, historiography, History teaching, in short, the humanities as a whole and a relatively leading role of the teacher, the scientist. In this case, unlike a reorganization of science, education, and class in a democratizing sense, what we have is a behavior that advances towards the denial of science, education, class, considering that, according to this behavior, i.e. the post-truth, each one of us appears as the only – authoritarian – place from which statements, views, and interpretations become possible.

So, we return to what has already been mentioned, to a more careful observation and understanding that if science and education in general have been facing some lack of trust and interest, we have an even more considerable difficulty with regard to the suppression of this lack of interest and antipathy towards history and History teaching.

In this case, there is a dangerous closeness between:

1. A certain lack of interest in history and in History teaching that may be partially understood through the analysis of contemporary temporality. That is, a lack of interest caused by a certain rather general perception that the past is very far away from us, therefore it would have little or nothing to say to us, and the future, in turn, would be a space where we would be most likely to experience a deepening of contemporary dramas.

2. A lack of interest and even antipathy towards science, education, and the figure of the teacher in general (and also towards history and History teaching), caused by the expansion of this epistemological behavior, i.e. post-truth.

History, History teaching and poetic truth

Based on this diagnosis, I have made a double question, one to the post-truth and the other to a certain tendency to propose the correspondentist paradigm (truth as adequacy), at least as immediately and despite the criticism that has been carefully put forward over the 20th and 21st centuries, as the epistemological proposal that might safeguard the possibility of objectivity and re-enchantment of the interest in science, education, history, and History teaching. What I would like to propose is that the correspondentist paradigm represents or makes possible a specific type of objectivity, one among others, and not the only one, and that it would not be a sufficient argument for a certain re-enchantment of history and History teaching today.

Next, I propose a certain criticism of the correspondentist paradigm and its view of objectivity, and then another mode of objectivity also feasible based on the epistemological-ethical-political behavior that I call poetic truth, or even more synthetically, what we may think of it as a careful and recurrent composition and recomposition of possible statements and interpretations within a given diversified assembly, coming from others. The position here is that this epistemological-ethical-political behavior may suffice for some re-enchantment of history and History teaching, a re-enchantment at once rigorous and ethico-politically oriented, which might be able to summon and gather some of the children, youth, and adults in the name of other possible social aspects and compositions.

Thus, our objective, from now on, is to explain the three reasons that I consider most relevant with regard to a possible criticism of this contemporary defense, at least so immediate, of the correspondentist epistemological behavior.

First, we need to remember that the space where this epistemological behavior became generalized was precisely that of a certain hyperspecialization, consisting of a limited set of scientists and professors, in this case more scientists than professors and many more men than women, and generally belonging to privileged classes or groups¹⁴. It is, therefore, an epistemological behavior that expanded especially from the 19th century on and based on the scientific activity of privileged men – European or Europeanized – who would have education and access to the conditions needed for the constitution of a certain theoretical-methodological-empirical attention based on which it may be possible to organize statements adequate to reality, i.e. seen, from this space, as (true) objectives.

Therefore, what we have is the very risk that, based on a quicker and less critical defense of the correspondentist paradigm, we resume or make it possible to resume a certain epistemological behavior that can or tends to be accompanied by danger (and/or pretense) of a certain elitism or exclusivism regarding the patterns of perspectives and ways of being, of themes and objects that could be more properly valid¹⁵. Or we even run the risk of a certain recolonization of spaces like the school and the university that have been

¹⁴ And with regard to history more specifically: “during the 19th century, when historians defined their discipline, they began to lose sight of a major principle, namely, that history is rooted in social needs to guide life within the time frame. Historical understanding is fundamentally guided by basic human interests: as such, it is aimed at an audience and plays a major role in the political culture of the historians’ society. As 19th century historians strove to make history a science, this audience was either forgotten or redefined to include only a small group of trained expert professionals. [...] the ‘scientificization’ of history entailed a conscious narrowing of perspective, a constraint for the goals and purposes of history” (RÜSEN, 2011, p. 25). See also: WHITE, Hayden. *The practical past*. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 2014.

¹⁵ See: DUSSEL, Enrique. *Filosofia da libertação: crítica à ideologia da exclusão*. São Paulo: Paulus Editora, 1995; HADDOCK-LOBO, Rafael. *Os fantasmas da colônia: notas de desconstrução e filosofia popular brasileira*. Rio de Janeiro: Ape’Ku, 2020; MIGNOLO, Walter. *Histórias locais/projetos globais: colonialidade, saberes subalternos e pensamento liminar*. Belo Horizonte: Editora da UFMG, 2019; MORAES, Marcelo. *Democracias espectrais: por uma desconstrução da colonialidade*. Rio de Janeiro: Nau, 2020; QUIJANO, Aníbal. Colonialidad del poder y clasificación social. *Journal of World-Systems*, [s.l.], v.11, n.2, p.342-86, 2000; SANTOS, Boaventura de Sousa. *O fim do império cognitivo: a afirmação das epistemologias do Sul*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2019; SANTOS, Boaventura de Sousa; NUNES, João Arriscado; MENESES, Maria Paula. Opening up the Canon of knowledge and recognition of difference. In: SANTOS, Boaventura de Sousa (ed.). *Another knowledge is possible: beyond Northern epistemologies*. London: Verso, 2007; SIMAS, Luiz Antonio; RUFINO, Luiz. *Flecha no tempo*. Rio de Janeiro: Mórula, 2019 e SPIVAK, Gayatri Chakravorty. *Pode o subalterno falar?* Belo Horizonte: Editora da UFMG, 2014.

democratized, undoubtedly, not without great effort and more slowly than most of us would like¹⁶.

The second reason for my criticism of the more immediate and even inflexible (exclusive) defense of the correspondentist paradigm is that the argument of objectivity (in this case via a more classical *adaequatio*) may not be enough, at least not with regard to our context, to a certain re-enchantment and suppression of some of the lack of interest in history and in History teaching today. A large part of society has been related to past times because of a rather aesthetic interest, in order to expand experiences and what we can call pleasure. Therefore, a large part of our society is not exactly interested in relating to past times based on the guarantee of objectivity (in this case correspondentist), but rather based on a certain aestheticism and hedonism. Thus, it has not been enough to argue only in terms of objectivity (correspondence, adequacy), for instance, with a group of children, teenagers, and adults who are more interested in exploring other contexts and indefinitely increasing their pleasure.

We don't have enough time and that is not what we want here either, but our work aims, based on this diagnosis, based on a certain tradition that has thought of the importance of aesthetic mobilization, especially in contexts like ours, that this becomes possible, starting from aesthetic strategies, expanded experience, and the appearance of a certain disharmony in the intellectual apparatus (understanding, imagination, and thinking in Kantian terms), based on which we can have a certain reformulation and conceptual reorganization, then

¹⁶ On possible relationships between history, History teaching and (re)democratization in/of Brazil, see: GUIMARÃES, Géssica; SOUSA, Francisco Gouvea de. Desmonte ou reconstrução da universidade: entre o capital e a democratização. *Revista Hydra*, [s.l.], v.4, p. 103-131, 2019; OLIVEIRA, Rodrigo Perez; PINHA, Daniel; RANGEL, Marcelo de Mello. Teoria, historiografia e ensino de história em tempos de crise democrática. *Transversos*, [s.l.], n. 18, p. 6-16, abr. 2020; RANGEL, Marcelo de Mello. *A história e o impossível: Walter Benjamin e Derrida*. Rio de Janeiro: Ape'Ku, 2020; PINHA, Daniel. Formação e corrosão democrática no Brasil do tempo presente: desafios à história da historiografia e ao ensino de história. In: GUIMARÃES, Géssica; PINHA, Daniel; RANGEL, Marcelo de Mello (org.). *Diante da crise: teoria, história da historiografia e ensino de história hoje*. Vitória: Milfontes, 2021; RODRIGUES, Tamara de Oliveira; RANGEL, Marcelo de Mello. Temporalidade e crise: sobre a (im)possibilidade do futuro e da política no Brasil e no mundo contemporâneo. *Maracanan*, [s.l.], n. 18, p. 66-82, jan./jun. 2018 e SOUSA, Francisco Gouvea de. Ensino e cidadania, redemocratização e descolonização. In: GUIMARÃES, Géssica; PINHA, Daniel; RANGEL, Marcelo de Mello (org.). *Diante da crise: teoria, história da historiografia e ensino de história hoje*. Vitória: Milfontes, 2021.

the objectification and overcoming of certain prejudices and positions less thematized so far¹⁷.

The third reason why I criticize this more immediate defense of the correspondentist paradigm – and its understanding of objectivity – is that science is generally committed to a rather settled world, mobilizing from what this world makes possible, from its orientations, perceptions, more encompassing interests, so that the correspondence or not of a given statement to something in front of us is frankly related and is, therefore, measured by what is already visible. That is, for us to check the truth nature of a given sentence based on the corresponding paradigm, we already need to have a certain perception or prior knowledge of a given object, theme, which regulates in a certain way what can and will be said about it¹⁸.

¹⁷ See: DELEUZE, Gilles. *Empirismo e subjetividade: ensaio sobre a natureza humana segundo Hume*. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2001; DELEUZE, Gilles. *Lógica do sentido*. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 1998; LYOTARD, Jean-François. *Peregrinações: lei, forma, acontecimento*. São Paulo: Estação Liberdade, 2000; RANCIÈRE, Jacques. *A partilha do sensível: estética e política*. São Paulo: Exo experimental: Editora 34, 2009; RANCIÈRE, Jacques. *O desentendimento: política e filosofia*. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2018 e GUMBRECHT, Hans Ulrich. *Produção de presença*. O que o sentido não consegue transmitir. Rio de Janeiro: Contraponto: Ed. PUC-Rio, 2010.

¹⁸ Towards a critique of phenomenology to the correspondentist paradigm (adequacy):

“An utterance is true when what it aims at and says is in conformity with the thing it is uttering about. In this case, too, we say: it is okay. What, however, is now in agreement is not the thing, but rather the *proposition*.

The true, whether a true thing or a true proposition, is what agrees, what corroborates. To be true and certain here means ‘to be in agreement;’ and this in two ways: on the one hand, the awareness between a thing and what is previously presumed from it, and, on the other hand, the agreement between what is aimed at by the utterance and the thing.

This dual nature of agreement brings to light the traditional definition of the essence of truth: *veritas est adaequatio rei et intellectus*. This can mean: the truth is a thing’s adequacy to knowledge. But it can also be understood like this: the truth is the adequacy of knowledge to the thing. Ordinarily, the aforementioned definition is simply given by the formula: *veritas est adaequatio intellectus ad rem*. However, truth understood in this way, propositional truth, is only possible when founded on a thing’s truth, the *adaequatio rei ad intellectum*. These two conceptions of the *veritas’s* essence mean conforming to... and thus they think of truth as *conformity*” (HEIDEGGER, 2008, p. 191-192).

“*Veritas as adaequatio rei (creandae) ad intellectum (divinum) guarantees veritas as adaequatio intellectus (humani) ad rem (creatam)*. *Veritas* means everywhere and essentially the *convenientia* and agreement of entities between themselves, which, in turn, are based on the agreement between creatures and creator, ‘harmony’ determined by the order of creation” (HEIDEGGER, 2008, p. 193).

“Thus it may seem that this conception of the essence of truth is independent of the interpretation concerning the essence of being in all beings: the latter necessarily includes, however, a corresponding interpretation of the essence of man as a subject who is the bearer and conveyor of the *intellectus*. Thus, the formula of the essence of truth (*veritas est adaequatio intellectus et rei*) acquires, for each one and immediately, an apparent validity” (HEIDEGGER, 2008, p. 193).

“This apparition of the thing, while covering (measuring) an opposing scope, takes place within

This way of behavior of science is not mistaken, on the contrary, it is more properly usual (or ontological), as we are already within a specific world that guides us and makes possible theoretical and practical behaviors in general, thus placing, presenting what needs to be investigated, based on a certain minimal visibility (or prior, pre-predicative in a Husserlian sense). So, this rather general feature of science is not exactly a problem to be overcome at any price, but rather a feature that marks science and education in any context. However, science and education can also commit to something more than improving certain views that we hold somehow towards what is already visible. I accept and endorse the idea that science and education, history and History teaching, can also pay attention to what is no longer properly visible, what is obscure and/or emerging, that is, also worrying about and participating in the movement through which others emerge and take part, on the edge, in the actual reorganization or reconstitution of actual reality (*Wirklichkeit*) in which we mobilize¹⁹.

an open space, whose opening is never created primarily by the presentation, but is always invested and assumed by it as a relation field. The connection of the representational statement to the thing is the realization of that *relationship* that takes place, originally and each time, as the triggering of a behavior. All behavior, however, is characterized by the fact that, established within the opening, it remains always and each time close to what is manifest *as such*. Only what, in the strict sense of the word, is manifest has been experienced early by Western thought as ‘that which is present’ and has been called ‘being’ for a long time” (HEIDEGGER, 2008, p. 196). “To the extent that the utterance obeys this order, it conforms to the being. To say that one submits to such an order is compliant, correct (true). What is said thus is what is compliant, correct (true).

The utterance receives its conformity to behavior opening. For it is only through it that something manifest can become, generally, the driving measure of an adequate presentation [...] That is to say: the behavior itself must receive in advance the prior gift of that driving measure of every presentation” (HEIDEGGER, 2008, p. 197).

“The essence of truth revealed itself as freedom. This freedom is letting oneself ek-sistant that discovers the being. All open behavior moves in leaving the entity and is related to this or that particular being. Freedom has previously placed behavior in harmony with the being as a whole, insofar as it means abandonment to the unveiling of the being as a whole and as such” (HEIDEGGER, 2008, p. 204).

¹⁹ See: BEVERNAGE, Berber. *History, memory, and state-sponsored violence: time and justice*. New York: Routledge, 2012; DERRIDA, Jacques. *O olho da universidade*. São Paulo: Estação Liberdade, 1999; DERRIDA, Jacques. *A universidade sem condições*. São Paulo: Estação Liberdade, 2003; DERRIDA, Jacques. *Vadios*. Coimbra: Palimage, 2009; DOMANSKA, Ewa; SIMON, Zoltán Boldizsár; TAMM, Marek. *Anthropocenic historical knowledge: promises and pitfalls* (no prelo); KLEINBERG, Ethan. *Haunting history: for a deconstructive approach to the past*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2017; RIBEIRO, Renato Janine. *A universidade e a vida atual: Fellini não via filmes*. São Paulo: Editora da Universidade de São Paulo, 2014; RODRIGUES, Tamara de Oliveira. Outros modos de pensar e sonhar: a experiência onírica em Reinhart Koselleck, Ailton Krenak e Davi Kopenawa. *Revista de Teoria da História*, [s.l.], v. 23, p. 156-177, 2020; RODRIGUES, Tamara de Oliveira. Theory of history and history of historiography: openings for unconventional histories. *História da Historiografia*, [s.l.], v. 12, n. 29, p. 96-123, 2019.

In this way, we arrive at the issue of poetic truth, an epistemological behavior quite different from post-truth and also from the correspondentist paradigm. What is at stake in the poetic truth is precisely the effort concerning this relation to what is no longer properly visible, dealing with the thematization of what is obscure, peripheralized, vulnerable, and/or emerging²⁰. But how would it be possible, in this case, for a science or an education that is also devoted to what is not exactly visible?

We do not have enough time to more carefully thematize this moment or possibility of science and education, of history and History teaching: that of relating to what is not exactly visible. But we can still make this reflection and proposal a little more concrete.

The condition of possibility or a certain primary method for this epistemological behavior, i.e. poetic truth, is precisely the oscillation between the most distinct spaces (which we can also call hyperempiria), and, thus, direct contact, more overt and recurrent, with different perspectives, ways of being, and knowledge. So it is precisely through this hyperempiria, in this (overt and recurrent) way of relating to difference, that a certain estrangement from oneself (from what is already more common) would be possible, making room for others and making possible the constitution of a certain rather accurate sensitivity regarding the perception of what is more obscure, vulnerable, and/or emerging. Our view here is that it is precisely this more overt and attentive position in the midst of diversity that makes possible or keeps/intensifies a certain (democratizing) tension and the very constitution of a set of affections adequate to the perception of what differs and to the *insistence* in this behavior, i.e. embracing what is no longer properly visible, affections such as love, modesty, patience (attention, listening) and a certain fury (indignation), which constitute what I would like to call affective-epistemic virtues.

In this way, poetic truth is made of the availability (and effort) of being recurrently among others listening and being heard, carefully and responsibly organizing and reorganizing possible interpretations. Interpretations that are

²⁰ For the issue of vulnerability, see: BUTLER, Judith. *Vida precária: os poderes do luto e da violência*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2019. (Especially p. 157-182.)

objective, but not exactly because they are more or less close to reality, but because they consist of what we may call an assembly marked by diversity, by various perspectives and knowledge, based on a more complex relation to actual reality (*Wirklichkeit*). It is precisely through this tension that we have the possibility and even the need for significant theoretical, methodological, empirical, and critical (intersubjective) attention, as we need to take care of what is key when it comes to being in a space like this one marked by difference (at least from a certain democratizing position): from a patient listening and attention to what each and every one explains and, also, to what we think, so that the community constitution of certain shareable views is possible, which, in this case, they are organized based on the slip between what is said and a certain more immediate position of the uttering person, being, therefore, objective.

What I would like to underline, before we finish, is exactly the epistemological-ethical-political nature of this scientific behavior, i.e. poetic truth, since: a) it is marked by a certain objectivity (slip between what is said and the uttering person's immediate position); b) because it makes possible the constitution and retention of a certain affectivity inherent to a theoretical, methodological, empirical, and critical (intersubjective) expressive attention; and this c) based on or following/intensifying what I call democratization or even starting from the actual participation of others in the making of utterances, shareable views, and relationships capable of reorganizing actual reality (*Wirklichkeit*).

Referências

ABREU, Marcelo Santos de; CUNHA, Nara Rúbia de Carvalho. Cultura de história, história pública e ensino de história: a investigação e formação de professores de história. *História Hoje*, [s.l.], v. 8, p. 111-134, 2019.

ABREU, Marcelo Santos de; RANGEL, Marcelo de Mello. Memória, cultura histórica e ensino de história. *História e Cultura*, v. 4, p. 7-24, 2015.

ALBUQUERQUE JÚNIOR, Durval Muniz. Fazer defeitos nas memórias: para que servem a escrita e o ensino da história? In.: GONÇALVES, Márcia de Almeida; ROCHA, Helenice; REZNIK, Luís; Ana Maria Monteiro (org.). *Qual o valor da História hoje?* Rio de Janeiro: Editora da FGV, p. 21-39, 2012. p. 21-39.

ARAÚJO, Helena Maria Marques. Produzindo narrativas e memórias decoloniais no ensino de história. In.: GUIMARÃES, Géssica; PINHA, Daniel; RANGEL, Marcelo de Mello (org.). *Diante da crise: teoria, história da historiografia e ensino de história hoje*. Vitória: Milfontes, 2021.

ARAUJO, Valdei Lopes de; PEREIRA, Mateus. *Atualismo 1.0. como a ideia de atualização mudou o século XXI*. Vitória: Milfontes; Mariana: Editora da SBTHH, 2019.

ARAUJO, Valdei Lopes de; RANGEL, Marcelo de Mello. Apresentação; teoria e história da historiografia: do giro linguístico ao giro ético-político. *História da Historiografia*, Ouro Preto, v.8, n. 17, p. 318-332, abr. 2015.

BENJAMIN, Walter. Experiência e pobreza. In.: *Walter Benjamin*. Obras escolhidas. Magia e técnica, arte e política. Ensaio sobre literatura e história da cultura. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1994a.

BENJAMIN, Walter. O narrador. Considerações sobre a obra de Nikolai Leskov. In.: *Walter Benjamin: obras escolhidas: magia e técnica, arte e política. Ensaio sobre literatura e história da cultura*. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1994b.

BENJAMIN, Walter. Sobre o conceito de história. In.: LÖWY, Michael (org.). *Walter Benjamin: aviso de incêndio: uma leitura das teses "Sobre o conceito de história"*. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2005.

BENTIVOGLIO, Julio. *História & distopia*. Vitória: Milfontes, 2019.

BEVERNAGE, Berber. *History, Memory, and State-Sponsored Violence: Time and Justice*. New York: Routledge, 2012.

BUTLER, Judith. *Vida precária: os poderes do luto e da violência*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2019.

History teaching: temporality, post-truth and poetic truth
Marcelo de Mello Rangel

CARVALHO, Augusto de; RANGEL, Marcelo de Mello. História e filosofia e outros mundos possíveis. In.: CARVALHO, Augusto de; RANGEL, Marcelo de Mello (org.). *História & Filosofia: problemas ético-políticos*. Vitória: Milfontes, 2020.

CEZAR, Temístocles. O que fabrica o historiador quando faz história, hoje? Ensaio sobre a crença na história (Brasil séculos XIX-XXI). *Revista de Antropologia*, São Paulo, v. 61, p. 78-95, 2018.

DELEUZE, Gilles. *Empirismo e subjetividade*. Ensaio sobre a natureza humana segundo Hume. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2001.

DELEUZE, Gilles. *Lógica do sentido*. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 1998.

DERRIDA, Jacques. *A universidade sem condições*. São Paulo: Estação Liberdade, 2003.

DERRIDA, Jacques. *Espectros de Marx*. O estado da dívida, o trabalho do luto e a nova Internacional. Rio de Janeiro: Relume-Dumará, 1994.

DERRIDA, Jacques. *O olho da universidade*. São Paulo: Estação Liberdade, 1999.

DERRIDA, Jacques. *Vadios*. Coimbra: Palimage, 2009.

DOMANSKA, Ewa; SIMON, Zoltán Boldizsár; TAMM, Marek. *Anthropocenic historical knowledge: promises and pitfalls* (no prelo).

DOMANSKA, Ewa. The Material Presence of the Past. *History and Theory*, v. 45, p. 337-348, 2006.

DUSSEL, Enrique. *Filosofia da libertação: crítica à ideologia da exclusão*. São Paulo: Paulus Editora, 1995.

FREIRE, Paulo. *Pedagogia da autonomia*. Rio de Janeiro: Paz & Terra, 1997.

FREIRE, Paulo. *Pedagogia da indignação: cartas pedagógicas e outros escritos*. São Paulo: Editora UNESP, 2000.

GUIMARÃES, Géssica; PINHA, Daniel; RANGEL, Marcelo de Mello (Org.). *Diante da crise*. Teoria, história da historiografia e ensino de história hoje. Vitória: Milfontes, 2021.

GUIMARÃES, Géssica; RAUTER, Luisa. Ativismo, movimentos sociais e politização do tempo: possibilidades dos femininos no Brasil contemporâneo. In.: GUIMARÃES, Géssica; PINHA, Daniel; RANGEL, Marcelo de Mello (org.). *Diante da crise: teoria, história da historiografia e ensino de história hoje*. Vitória: Milfontes, 2021.

GUIMARÃES, Gécica; SOUSA, Francisco Gouvea de. Desmonte ou reconstrução da universidade: entre o capital e a democratização. *Revista Hydra*, [s.l.], v.4, p. 103-131, 2019.

GUMBRECHT, Hans Ulrich. Depois de “depois de aprender com a história”, o que fazer com o passado agora? In.: ARAUJO, Valdeí Lopes de; MOLLLO, Helena Miranda; NICOLAZZI, Fernando (org.). *Aprender com a história? O passado e o futuro de uma questão*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora FGV, 2011.

GUMBRECHT, Hans Ulrich. *Graciosidade e estagnação: ensaios escolhidos*. Rio de Janeiro: Contraponto: Ed. PUC-Rio, 2012.

GUMBRECHT, Hans Ulrich. *Nosso amplo presente: o tempo e a cultura contemporânea*. São Paulo: Editora Unesp, 2015.

GUMBRECHT, Hans Ulrich. *Produção de presença: o que o sentido não consegue transmitir*. Rio de Janeiro: Contraponto: Ed. PUC-Rio, 2010.

HADDOCK-LOBO, Rafael. *Os fantasmas da colônia*. Notas de desconstrução e filosofia popular brasileira. Rio de Janeiro: Ape’Ku, 2020.

HEIDEGGER, Martin. A essência da verdade (1930). In.: *Marcas do Caminho*. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 2008a.

HEIDEGGER, Martin. A questão da técnica. In.: *Ensaio e Conferências*. Petrópolis: Vozes; Bragança Paulista: Editora Universitária São Francisco, 2006.

HEIDEGGER, Martin. *Ser e tempo*. Petrópolis: Vozes; Bragança Paulista: Editora Universitária São Francisco, 2008b.

HOOKS, bell. *Ensinando pensamento crítico: sabedoria prática*. São Paulo: Elefante, 2020.

HOOKS, bell. *Ensinando a transgredir: a educação como prática da liberdade*. São Paulo: Editora WMF Martins Fontes, 2017.

HOOKS, bell. *Tudo sobre o amor: novas perspectivas*. São Paulo: Elefante, 2020.

KLEINBERG, Ethan. Haunting history: deconstruction and the spirit of revision. *History and Theory*. 46, p. 113-143, 2007.

KLEINBERG, Ethan. *Haunting history: for a deconstructive approach to the past*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2017.

KLEINBERG, Ethan. Presence in absentia. In.: GHOSH, Ranjan; KLEINBERG, Ethan (eds.). *Presence. Philosophy, History, and Cultural Theory for the Twenty-First Century*. Ithaca; London: Cornell University Press, 2013.

KOSELLECK, Reinhart. *Futuro passado*: contribuição à semântica dos tempos históricos. Rio de Janeiro: Contraponto: Ed. Puc-Rio, 2006.

LYOTARD, Jean-François. *Peregrinações*: lei, forma, acontecimento. São Paulo: Estação Liberdade, 2000.

MATTOS, Ilmar Rohloff de. “Mas não somente assim!” leitores, autores, aulas como texto e ensino-aprendizagem em História. *Tempo*, v. 11, n. 21, 2007.

MENDES, Breno. Ensino de história, historiografia e currículo de história. *Transversos*, v. 18, p. 108-128, 2020.

MIGNOLO, Walter. *Histórias locais/projetos globais*: colonialidade, saberes subalternos e pensamento liminar. Belo Horizonte: Editora da UFMG, 2019.

MORAES, Marcelo. *Democracias espectrais*: por uma desconstrução da colonialidade. Rio de Janeiro: Nau, 2020.

MURUCI, Fábio; RANGEL, Marcelo de Mello. Algumas palavras sobre giro ético-político e história intelectual. *Revista Ágora*, Vitória, v.21, p. 7-14, 2015.

NICOLAZZI, Fernando. Muito além das virtudes epistêmicas: o historiador público em um mundo não linear. *Maracanan*, n. 18, p. 18-34, 2018.

OLIVEIRA, Rodrigo Perez; PINHA, Daniel; RANGEL, Marcelo de Mello. Teoria, historiografia e ensino de história em tempos de crise democrática. *Transversos*, [s.l.], n. 18, p. 6-16, abr. 2020.

PINHA, Daniel. Formação e corrosão democrática no Brasil do tempo presente: desafios à história da historiografia e ao ensino de história. In.: GUIMARÃES, Géssica; PINHA, Daniel; RANGEL, Marcelo de Mello (org.). *Diante da crise*: teoria, história da historiografia e ensino de história hoje. Vitória: Milfontes, 2021.

PINHA, Daniel. O lugar do tempo presente na aula de história: limites e possibilidades. *Tempo & Argumento*. Florianópolis, v. 9, n. 20, p. 99-129, 2017.

QUIJANO, Aníbal. Colonialidad del poder y clasificación social. *Journal of World-Systems*, v.11, n.2, 2000, p.342-86.

RANCIÈRE, Jacques. *A partilha do sensível*. Estética e política. São Paulo: Exo experimental org.; Editora 34, 2009.

RANCIÈRE, Jacques. *O desentendimento*. Política e filosofia. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2018.

RANGEL, Marcelo de Mello. A história e o impossível. Walter Benjamin e Derrida. Rio de Janeiro: Ape` Ku, 2020a.

RANGEL, Marcelo de Mello. A urgência do giro ético-político: o giro ético-político na teoria da história e na história da historiografia. *Ponta de Lança*, v. 13, p. 27-46, 2019a.

RANGEL, Marcelo de Mello. *Da ternura com o passado*. História e pensamento histórico na filosofia contemporânea. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Via Verita, 2019b.

RANGEL, Marcelo de Mello. Entrevista Marcelo de Mello Rangel. *Ensaaios Filosóficos*, v. XVI, p. 119-139, 2017.

RANGEL, Marcelo de Mello. Giro ético-político, verdade e felicidade. In.: CARVALHO, Augusto de; RANGEL, Marcelo de Mello (org.). *História & Filosofia*. Problemas ético-políticos. Vitória: Milfontes, 2020b.

RANGEL, Marcelo de Mello. História e *Stimmung* a partir de Walter Benjamin: Sobre algumas possibilidades ético-políticas da historiografia. *Cadernos Walter Benjamin*, v.17, p. 165-178, 2016.

RANGEL, Marcelo de Mello. Rehistoricização da história, melancolia e ódio. In.: BENTIVOGLIO, Julio; CARVALHO, Augusto de (org.). *Walter Benjamin*. Testemunho e melancolia. Serra, Espírito Santo: Milfontes, 2019c.

RANGEL, Marcelo de Mello. Resistência, ódio e amor! In.: AMITRANO, Georgia; HADDOCK-LOBO, Rafael; RANGEL, Marcelo de Mello (org.). *Rosas e pensamentos outros*. Rio de Janeiro: Ape'Ku, 2020c.

RANGEL, Marcelo de Mello. Temporalidade e felicidade hoje: uma relação possível entre o pensamento histórico, a democracia e a experiência da felicidade. *Artefilosofia*, v.25, p. 52-67, 2018.

RANGEL, Marcelo de Mello; RODRIGUES, Thamara de Oliveira. Temporalidade e crise: sobre a (im)possibilidade do futuro e da política no Brasil e no mundo contemporâneo. *Maracanan*, n. 18, pp. 66-82, 2018.

RIBEIRO, Renato Janine. *A universidade e a vida atual: Fellini não via filmes*. São Paulo: Editora da Universidade de São Paulo, 2014.

RODRIGUES, Thamara de Oliveira. Outros modos de pensar e sonhar: a experiência onírica em Reinhart Koselleck, Ailton Krenak e Davi Kopenawa. *Revista de Teoria da História*, v. 23, p. 156-177, 2020.

RODRIGUES, Thamara de Oliveira. Theory of history and history of historiography: Openings for unconventional histories. *História da Historiografia*, v. 12, n. 29, p. 96-123, 2019.

RÜSEN, JÖRN. *Jörn Rüsen e o ensino de história*. SCHMIDT, Maria Auxiliadora; BARCA, Isabel; MARTINS, Estevão de Rezende (org.). Curitiba: Ed. UFPR, 2011.

History teaching: temporality, post-truth and poetic truth
Marcelo de Mello Rangel

RÜSEN, JÖRN. *Razão histórica*. Teoria da história: os fundamentos da ciência histórica. Brasília: Editora Universidade de Brasília, 2001.

SANTAELLA, Lucia. *A pós-verdade é verdadeira ou falsa?* Barueri, SP: Estação das Letras e Cores, 2019.

SANTOS, Boaventura de Sousa. *O fim do império cognitivo: a afirmação das epistemologias do Sul*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2019.

SANTOS, Boaventura de Sousa; NUNES, João Arriscado; MENESES, Maria Paula. Opening up the Canon of knowledge and recognition of difference. In.: SANTOS, Boaventura de Sousa (ed.). *Another knowledge is possible: beyond Northern epistemologies*. London: Verso, 2007.

SIMAS, Luiz Antonio; RUFINO, Luiz. *Flecha no tempo*. Rio de Janeiro: Mórula, 2019.

SOUSA, Francisco Gouvea de. Ensino e cidadania, redemocratização e descolonização. In.: GUIMARÃES, Gêssica; PINHA, Daniel; RANGEL, Marcelo de Mello (org.). *Diante da crise: teoria, história da historiografia e ensino de história hoje*. Vitória: Milfontes, 2021.

SPIVAK, Gayatri Chakravorty. *Pode o subalterno falar?* Belo Horizonte: Editora da UFMG, 2014.

WHITE, Hayden. *The practical past*. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 2014.

Santa Catarina State University
Graduate Program in History
Special Issue - 2021
Journal Tempo e Argumento
tempoeargumento.faed@udesc.br