We live in difficult times, in times of monstrous chimeras and evil dreams and criminal follies.

(Joseph Conrad, *Under Western Eyes*)

This chapter responds to Giroux’s (2006) call to all public intellectuals to take action and to develop democratic emancipatory projects that challenge neoliberalism’s power, dominance and oppression, and to defend democracy, democratic public life and the public sphere in these uncertain times. In response, academics, scholars, and activists are asked to be seen and to see themselves as public intellectuals who provide an indispensable service to the world, and to resist the narrow confines of academic labour by becoming multi-literate in a global democracy in ways that not only allow access to new information and technologies, but also enable us to become border-crossers.

Not being a political scientist, historian, or sociologist, I am approaching this political project from the lens of a critical educator. So, from this perspective, it is proposed that one way to respond to the aforementioned challenge is to develop a comprehensive conceptual framework for naming, organizing and evaluating/critiquing the broad range of neoliberal pedagogical tools that mediate constructions of consent and coercion among the neoliberal centres of power, nation-states, citizen-subjects and in all forms of social life. While pedagogy is essential to teaching and learning inside the classroom, pedagogy in the broader sense plays a key role in transmitting dominant ideologies, as well as notions of national and cultural identity through the reproduction and maintenance of particular discourses and languages (Bernstein 1999). Many neoliberal ideologies, values, economic polices and practices are shaped, conveyed and adopted through networks or constellations of top-down and bottom-up hegemonic tools by way of the media, politics, education, and policy institutes, etc.

The vigorous claims of market superiority have not only moved nation-states closer to neoliberalization, but have also resurrected nineteenth-century Social Darwinism in terms of valuing competition, efficiency and entrepreneurialism. As a result, this neoliberal turn (Brown 2003) transforms and acquiesces societies, spaces, subjectivities, and modes of organizing towards ‘an increasingly broad range of neoliberal policy experiments, institutional innovations and politico-ideological projects’ (Brenner and Theodore 2002: 28). These neoliberal turns are achieved through various pathways (i.e. think tanks, policy briefs, political agendas, universities, schools, etc.).
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On top this, neoliberalization has been responsible for the widespread dismantling of the welfare state, the weakening of public education systems, decimation of the middle/working classes and perpetuation of the grotesque inequalities of wealth. Neoliberalization also demeans and devalues gender and identity while advancing class/racial injustices by absorbing the democratic practices of civil society within narrow political-economic spaces (Giroux 2004: 106).

This type of market fundamentalism is enabled through a myriad of neoliberal governments, corporations, media and society that inculcate citizen-subjects into believing the Thatcherite motto, that ‘there is no alternative’ (TINA) to our current market-driven society. As a result, the belief is that the only way for the poor and working classes to succeed is to become entrepreneurs and to adopt the neoliberal ideology and rhetoric of individual freedoms and personal responsibility through meritocracy (Rose 1998) sans public safety nets.

Still, the outward attractiveness of neoliberalism’s individual freedom, prosperity, and growth makes it challenging (Smith 2012) for the public to realize that neoliberalization is designed to benefit only a very small class of people and nation-states (Harvey 2005). A worldview such as this makes it easier to justify the thought that some people deserve much more than others because, after all, the neoliberal refrain is that we are all responsible for our own destinies (1).

These pedagogical ‘lessons’ teach citizen-subjects and nation-states alike that their place in this new world order is to either comply and tow-the-line or suffer the consequences of failure and abject poverty, with no one to blame but themselves. Rather than the promise of democratic citizenship, neoliberalization’s uncritical lessons promote profits over people (Chomsky 2011) and values of economic dominance, exploitation, enterprise and entrepreneurship at all costs (McCafferty 2010: 543).

To that end, this chapter introduces a discursive analytic framework aimed at unpacking the bricolage of neoliberalization (Mullen et al. 2013) called the ‘pedagogies of neoliberalism’. This conceptualization helps to complicate the various neoliberal constructions of knowledge production, reproductions and recontextualizations. Within the neoliberal frame, these pedagogies are selected, disseminated, appropriated and repositioned to become new knowledges (Bernstein 1991) that teach the essence of the new world order while positioning the learner: citizen-subjects/nation-states as reifications of economic capital (Patrick 2013). By connecting the dots, it is theorized that this new framework can help to name, expose and critique the hegemony of neoliberalism’s pedagogical tools that both teach and give rise to new social imaginaries in the economy, the public sphere, popular sovereignty and rights (Taylor 2004). Finally, a framework such as the pedagogies of neoliberalism can help to expose how the pedagogies of neoliberalism are insidiously manifested in all walks of life, including education, media, economy, labour market, etc., and explain how these implications hinder our rights to democracy and social justice.

Neoliberalism

Neoliberalism has been accepted as the dominant ideology shaping our world today (Robertson and Dale 2009), making it the most successful and ruthless ideology in world history (Anderson 2000). The guiding principles of neoliberalization are based on Hayek (1973) and Friedman’s market-based ideas, which then became the driving force of the economic ‘reforms’ of the Reagan administration (Harvey 2005). While the wealthy 1 per cent and financial markets have touted and embraced neoliberalism, its wave of destruction has encompassed institutional reform and discursive adjustments, entailing much destruction, not only of prior institutional frameworks and powers, but also of divisions of labor, social
relations, welfare provisions, technological mixes, ways of life, attachments to the land, habits of the heart, and ways of thought.

Harvey 2006: 1

According to Brown (2015) neoliberalism has ‘inaugurated democracy’s conceptual unmooring and substantive disembowelment’ (9). Today individuals and multinational corporations who promote a neoliberal agenda wield such financial power that they ‘wreak havoc on much of the world’s population by not only ruthlessly destroying resources, nature, and the working classes but also by creating human cast-offs by pushing social groups and whole nations into collective neglect’ (Harnecker 2007: 1). The embedded financial orthodoxy was built by ‘a monolithic rationalist cult, hell-bent on liberalization and the sweeping aside of all impediments to the thoroughgoing penetration of market forces into all spheres of social activity, regardless of the costs’ (Cerny 2000: 226). As a result, neoliberal ideology, and its resultant policies and practices, have been made all more dependent on the market for existence and livelihoods, thus more subject to market disciplines; and disrupted the Left politically by marginalizing non-market-based democratic alternatives from the space of politics (Harnecker 2007).

However, neoliberalism concerns more than globalization, financialization, privatization, deregulation, international competition, de-industrialization, economic crises, and new communication technologies (Bellamy et al. 2011); rather neoliberalism is also about the exertion and distribution of political, economic and cognitive power and discourse. Neoliberalism has moved beyond a set of hegemonic discourses and practices to achieve the status of a doxa, or an accepted worldview (Bourdieu 1999; Patrick 2013). This ‘doxa’ is what Chopra (2003) refers to as, ‘an unquestionable orthodoxy that operates as if it were the objective truth’ (419). In this manner, neoliberalism realizes its ultimate goal – the monetary and psychological enslavement and subjugation of nation-states and citizen-subjects alike. Warning prophetically about the tyranny of a market-driven society, Karl Polanyi (1944) envisioned the ominous state of neoliberalism, writing that ‘To allow the market mechanism to be sole director of the fate of human beings and their natural environment… would result in the demolition of society’ (73). Polanyi’s words predicted the ideological tsunami of neoliberalism as a potent signifier for the free-market thinking that has dominated politics for the past three decades (Peck 2013).

In fact, after the US financial crisis of 2008, many thought that neoliberalism was hearing its ‘death knell’. Yet, in spite of this, the so-called doomed neoliberalism has mutated and persisted in response to the crisis of 2008 and earlier crises. This continuous adapting and self-reconstructing is directly relevant to comprehending neoliberalism’s unexpected and continuous evolving strength (Mirowski 2013; Peck 2013). Instead of neoliberalism going completely under and loosing its footing, the financial crises became the one of its modus operandi and the crisis itself becomes one of neoliberalism’s preferred courses of action for creating a fuzzy disequilibrium that allows neoliberalism to flourish (Brenner 2006; Klein 2007; Peck 2013; Saltman 2007). The neoliberal pedagogic tool here is ‘chaos through crises’ which ‘offers more latitude for [the] introduction of bold experimental “reforms” that only precipitate further crises down the road’ (Mirowski 2013: 53). As a result, the roll-out of crises after crises puts the public and nation-states in a trance-like state of acquiescence by using ‘disorientation following massive collective shocks – wars, terrorist attacks, or natural disasters’ (Klein 2007: 160) to achieve control by rolling out austerity policies and other economic shock therapies (Peck 2013).

The very term ‘neoliberalism’ has become contentious. Venugopal (2015) argues that neoliberalism has become a deeply problematic and incoherent term that has multiple and contradictory
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meanings, and thus has diminished analytical value (1). Stuart Hall (2011) adds that neoliberalism is not one thing or one concept but that it continuously evolves and diversifies. Jamie Peck (2013) contends that neoliberalism is more of a ‘rascal concept’ that has multiple and varied mongrel formations that can only exist in a mixed forms. For Plehwe et al. (2006), neoliberal philosophy is a ‘plural’ set of ideas rather than as a singular ‘pensée unique’ (Ramonet 1995). In other words, there is no such thing as a singular neoliberal concept/system; rather neoliberalism has to exist in a parasitical relationship with other systems (Peck 2013). It is better understood as an ethos or a pattern of restructuring that continuously rolls out and rolls back as it adapts and transforms (ibid.).

Barnett (2010) asserts that, if neoliberalization is assumed to work through the naturalization of market rationalities and the normalization of individualistic egoism:

[T]hen the critical task becomes one of exposing the various dimensions of neoliberalization as social constructs… motivated [a] shift away from public and collective values towards private and individualistic values… that reinforce the image of there being a clear-cut divide between two sets of values – those of private, individualistic self-interest on the one hand, and those of public, collective interests on the other. (271)

Springer (2014) argues for a better understanding that insists on hybridity and variegation rather than a one-dimensional essentialized polemic view of neoliberalism (158). However, for all its multiplicity, neoliberalism has become ingrained in our everyday lives, yet many still do not understand what neoliberalism is all about, or understand how their own lives, their stations in life and thought processes have been manipulated and shaped by it. Therefore, the question becomes, how can the public come to know or for that matter reject something which, for them, ‘putatively lacks spatio-temporal solidity, or at minimum, must they them-selves consciously understand their beliefs as part of a coherent intellectual tradition?’ (Mirowski 2013: 34).

While we know that it is impossible to reject something that is not understood because ideology is embedded, whether Marxist or neoliberal, and acts to naturalize, historicize, and eternalize (Lye 1997), the question is: how might we as public intellectuals and critical pedagogues work within, against, and beyond the unbridled neoliberal market-driven pedagogical strategies? One approach is to develop a language of critique to uncover and explicate the inequitable, unethical, and ultimately inhumane pedagogies of neoliberalism as tools of power in late capitalism.

Pedagogy

General notions of pedagogy include the teaching/learning events in the classroom; however, there is a broader notion of pedagogy that identifies any intentional and/or systematic enterprise, usually outside traditional or formal schooling, in which content is adapted to unique needs and situations to maximize learning (Kleis 1973: 6). According to Basil Bernstein (1991), pedagogic discourses or ‘devices of transmission’ are relayed through symbolic modalities of practice that construct different forms of consciousness and identity for different categories of learners. A pedagogic device is a discourse of interaction that not only constructs ‘particular knowledge and skills to be acquired, but also particular social identities and orientations to meaning for learners… in this way, the outside knowledge becomes inside knowledge’ (ibid.: 94). For Bernstein, pedagogic discourse is produced through three hierarchical constructs: the field
of production, re-contextualization and reproduction. For example, he notes that certain institutions, such as universities, research institutes, etc., produce newly specialized and complex forms of knowledge which constitute the fields of production that are then interpreted and turned into pedagogical knowledge in order to be accessible and appropriate for different contexts.

So while production involves new knowledges, other pedagogic tools involve selecting from existing forms of knowledge, and converting them for use in very different societal and institutional settings (Bourne 2008). In this sense, Robertson et al. (2004) and her colleagues link pedagogy to wider cultural practices and social structures that can be viewed as cultural relays (Bernstein 1996). These relays according to Robertson et al. (2004) are said to be governed by particular regulative structures and practices that take place in and through elements like space, place, time and discourse which work together to regulate all social life (166). They further add that, the relay and relayed are not neutral; that is ‘…neither set of rules is ideologically free’ (Bernstein, 1996: 41). Rather, particular ‘rules’ act selectively (to restrict or enhance) the meaning potentials and thus what is available to be realized and pedagogized’ (4).

For Bernstein (1996) and Gramsci (1971), dominant ideologies such as notions of national and cultural identity are transmitted through the hegemonic production, reproduction and maintenance of discourse and knowledge. The state or the apparatuses of power construct ‘boundaries between: different subject areas; between different types of pedagogic institutions; and between different categories of learner, offering each access to selected forms of knowledge’ (Bourne 2008: 1). As a result, these ideologies and notions of identity not only impact policies and practices, but also offer ‘different forms of specialized consciousness’, thus helping ‘to construct different identities for different categories of learners’ (ibid.), in this case citizen-subjects/nation-states, etc.

Therefore, pedagogy, in this broader sense, plays a key role in hegemonically (Gramsci 1971) transmitting dominant ideologies of society through the reproduction and maintenance of particular discourses and language, as well as knowledge production through which notions of national and cultural identity are transmitted. So, beyond its utility as a metaphor for the current political-economic zeitgeist, what do we know about neoliberalism’s pedagogic devices/tools and how are they constructed and transmitted?

**Pedagogies of neoliberalism**

As already argued, the broad notion of pedagogy must extend far beyond matters of schooling and include those spaces, practices, knowledges, discourses and maps of meaning and affect produced through a range of cultural and pedagogical technologies (Giroux 2011). That said, the conceptualization of the pedagogies of neoliberalism, as tools for description and critique, is concerned with the ways in which specific knowledge structures are produced, reproduced and disseminated through hegemonic networks that underlie and promote neoliberal discourses and practices. The networked machineries of neoliberalism, such as think tanks, policy briefs, political agendas, universities, research institutes and schools, etc., are dedicated to the making of political, intellectual and moral leadership in and through these knowledge technologies (Jessop and Oosterlynck 2008).

Susan Strange (1988) cites four sources of structural power within the current international political economy, including military, production, finance and knowledge structures, that are disseminated through various networked advocacy groups. Yet, according to Strange, power derived from the knowledge structure is the most overlooked, underrated, less well understood when compared with other sources of structural power. Strange writes:
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This is partly because it [knowledge structure] comprehends what is believed (and the moral conclusions and principles derived from those beliefs); what is known and perceived as understood; and the channels by which beliefs, ideas and knowledge are communicated – including some people and excluding others.

(Ibid.: 115)

These networks are so pervasive, that, ‘no force has emerged that can match the neoliberal networks in terms of organizational capacities, knowledge, production and dissemination on a wide range of policy issues’ (Plehwe et al. 2006: 41). The seduction of the various neoliberal organizing devices, here conceptualized under the umbrella of the pedagogies of neoliberalism, is both political and hegemonic, not simply because of the dialectical relationships of the neoliberal project vs citizen-subject/nation-state, a sort of quasi power/masses relationship, but also because it is both reciprocal and mutually interacting in a pedagogic way. This is because each pedagogy of neoliberalism emerges from and gives rise to the other, and each is informed by the interest and culture of the other. These dialectical relationships are shared, mutually defined and are precisely pedagogic, hegemonic, and political (Fontana 1993: 26; Freire 1978). For example, pedagogies of neoliberalism’s free-market ideologies activate an intuitive but seductive rhetoric of ‘freedom’, ‘choice’ and ‘entrepreneurship’, while at the same time, they underestimate the degree to which contemporary governance-talk is all about ‘delivery’, ‘participation’ and ‘empowerment’ and ‘entrepreneurialism’ (Smith 2010).

Yet, we know little about neoliberalism as pedagogy or pedagogies. In response to the seemingly rational notion of how neoliberal propositions emerged as the only recourse (Harvey 2005; Graeber 2002), Table 26.1 depicts some of the topics/subjects propagated by the current-day Mont Pelerin Society’s think tanks’ subject list, adapted with permission from Plehwe et al. (2006: 43). It further delineates the various pedagogies of neoliberalism and how these neoliberal technologies/trends are manifest.

Table 26.1, of course, is not a comprehensive list, but reveals some of the subjects propagated by one of neoliberalism’s most effective knowledge production mechanisms: think tanks (Djelic 2014). These subjects are then linked to the various pedagogies of neoliberalism which act as hegemonic levers: knowledge production and reproduction, discourses and teachings found in scholarly writings, research, media, think tanks, policies, institutes, universities, schools, politics, etc. Within this critical analysis, the pedagogies of neoliberalism illustrate the conditions in which these hegemonic pedagogies operate, and how citizen-subjects and nation-states learn their places, their roles and their responsibilities as economic pawns in the neoliberal financial global chess match. The impact of some pedagogies of neoliberalism creates spaces in which deeply indebted countries, nation-states, their natural resources and workers, find themselves without a voice or recourse with which to challenge and battle their oppressors against their subjugation and enslavement. These neoliberal pedagogies also create new regimes from the federal level, to the state and county level, resulting in a paternalist regime of poverty governance for disciplining the poor, women and people of colour (Soss et al. 2011).

Understanding the tactics used to perpetuate the various pedagogies of neoliberalism will enable us to better understand neoliberalism’s pervasive ideology as well as the ways in which it has indoctrinated much of the world (Saunders 2013). Naming the various pedagogies of neoliberalism can help to expose the insipid logic of the neoliberal regimes and expose how these predatory practices teach us to accept our oppression and also accept the decoupling of collective interests from individuals/workers who are left without any option or protective rights of citizenship and are ultimately left without a safety net.
Table 26.1 Neoliberal pedagogies and corresponding trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects propagated by MPS</th>
<th>NL pedagogical trends: how they are manifest/ authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>free-market think tanks*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Economic policy/support/growth**
- Globalization
- Deregulation/privatization
- Dismantling welfare state
- Labour/wages/employment
- European Union/monetary system
- Consumer protection/risk
- Development/politics of transition

**Law and society**
- Legal protection/institutional protection of private economic activity
- Rule of law/order of market economy
- Criminal law/crime

**Government/social/economy**
- Efficiency/limitation of government
- Taxes/state budget
- Social security/welfare/philanthropy
- Family/moral values
- Gender/feminism/racism
- Pensions/health politics
- Transport/infrastructure/telecommunication
- Energy politics/ecology/protection
- Regions/federalism

**Education and media**
- Education/market economy
- Science/technology
- Media/public discourse/culture
- Philosophy/ideological fundamentals
- Theoretical fundament/theory history
- Monitoring (of left-wing activities)

**Foreign policy/military**
- Networking/cooperation of think tanks

*Source: Mont Pelerin Society’s think tanks’ subject list, adapted with permission from Plehwe et al.2006: 43.
Therefore, the pedagogies of neoliberalism, first and foremost, need to be understood within the current and continued ascendance of neoliberalism. In this view, neoliberalism enacts a series of pedagogies across institutions and social settings. Some of these pedagogies of accountability, austerity, decentralization, audit, privatization, etc., as well as the extension of economic rationality to cultural, social, and political spheres, have helped to redefine the individual from a citizen-subject to an autonomous economic actor (Baez 2007; Lemke 2001; Turner 2008; Saunders 2013). These pedagogies of neoliberalism take place in particular ways in particular sites – for instance, public education, higher education, corporate America, media, and the industrial-prison complex. Others take place in the public where the pedagogies of neoliberalism serve to rupture public interests and replace them solely with private interests, guided by the market. These neoliberal pedagogies have increasingly shaped individuals’ common sense guided by the ‘invisible hand’ of commodification, commercialization, and marketization. This extension of market logic and the prioritization of economic outcomes have come to redefine the purpose and role of social, cultural, and political institutions (Apple 2001; Giroux 2006; Harvey 2005; Slaughter and Rhoades 2004, Saunders 2013).

If citizen-subjects and nation-states do not understand the impact of the various pedagogies of neoliberalism, how can such a pervasive and dominant ideology exist? The answer to this apparent paradox is found in the characteristics and tactics of neoliberal pedagogies and their hegemonic ideologies. These include alternatives and rival forms of thought that legitimize neoliberal structures and outcomes while they obfuscate the negative impacts of neoliberalism (Eagleton 1991; Saunders 2013). Neoliberalization and its pedagogies have so saturated our consciousness that they define our common sense beliefs and become indivisible from our basic ideas and fundamental assumptions (Apple 2004).

One of the problems with this onslaught of neoliberalism is the way in which we are continually pushed to read and accept the neoliberal turn without critical examination of its context in the world, without the context of who or what is communicating that word or message or how this ideology achieves hegemony or how this hegemony is maintained, and what happens when the claims of an ideology are contradicted by reality (Bello 2009). So theorizing and attending to the complexities and dangers of the various pedagogies of neoliberalism as assemblages or constellations (Peck 2013) rather than as a singular entity helps us to better understand the various neoliberal practices that create associations among corporate centres of power, the citizens and nation-states. It is argued that this type of hegemonic dissemination of knowledge becomes one of the trends/mechanisms of the pedagogies of neoliberalism. Conceptualizing the pedagogies of neoliberalism as purposeful and directed knowledges can help us understand how the particular neoliberal views of power are influenced, redefined and reinforced. And yet, the only way we can accurately explain and uncover the predatory nature of neoliberalism in terms of how it defines and shapes culture is if we also illustrate its mechanisms, methods and, most importantly, its pedagogies. Neoliberalization does not follow coherent directions, therefore it is important to consider the different kinds of methodological and research approaches necessary for examining the fluid and nonlinear movements of neoliberalization and neoliberalism as connected assemblages.

As such, conceptualizing the pedagogies of neoliberalism can help expose how neoliberalism’s disparate strategies are adopted and co-opted in different contexts (Ong 2005), and how neoliberal practices and policies have enabled powerful financial corporations to run roughshod over nation-states and citizen-subjects alike. Naming, conceptualizing and viewing the different trends of neoliberalization through a pedagogical metaphor allows for the creation of new lenses to evaluate and critique the devastating consequences of unregulated financial flow and market-driven ideologies and values.
Conclusion

In short, conceptualizing and naming the pedagogies of neoliberalism is useful in two ways: first, it provides a framework for uncovering the hidden curriculum, social silences, and the cognitive mapping of neoliberal policies and practices as they ensnare nation-states and citizen-subjects alike in collective indoctrination and coercion. Second, understanding the various pedagogies of neoliberalism can teach citizen-subjects to critically think about the different values and beliefs held and perpetuated by think tanks and other neoliberal technologies and organizations that have become purveyors of the neoliberal turn. Third, identifying the pedagogies of neoliberalism can help nation-states and citizen-subjects to recognize that their cognitive maps have been manipulated in relation to their space and place in society. As a result, this framework can be understood as part of the counter-hegemonic praxis of social and political change aimed at challenging and dismantling the neoliberal stranglehold. This can result in action aimed at the greater good by contesting the vagaries of power inherent within these neoliberal pedagogies. In this process, deeply indebted countries, nation-states, and citizen-subjects-workers may realize and take both individual and collective action to refute oppression and to challenge their oppressors against subjugation and enslavement and gain strength from their collective efforts.

Finally, the project of the pedagogies of neoliberalism needs to be further explicated. One of the things public intellectuals can do immediately is to work to uncover and expose the hidden mechanisms that function to keep neoliberalism’s practices, policies and influences so entrenched in the public’s psyche through prescribed methods of hegemony. Drawing on a wide range of literature across the cultural studies and critical social sciences, and with particular emphasis on the political economy, the explication of the pedagogies of neoliberalism can help us to identify and evaluate the consequences of neoliberal polices and practices, the proliferation and expansion of hegemonic political and economic inculcation that diminishes democracy and freedom.

Finally, this chapter seeks to disrupt neoliberalism’s hegemonic practices and policies by naming and theorizing some of its most effective weapons: its pedagogies that increase poverty as they eliminate individual and nation-state sovereignty, while at the same time, increase political and economic subordination and dissolve democracy. In addition, the chapter also explored the way that the various pedagogies of neoliberalism serve to signify and reproduce the divide between rich and the poor. So, by offering a language to name, uncover and critique the inequitable, unethical and ultimately inhumane economic power structures, the pedagogies of neoliberalism stand as descriptive pedagogical tools that argue against the current neoliberal turn in which the interest of capital comes at the expense of human life, democracy, dignity and responsibility towards the future. It is through the articulation of these pedagogies that we can give nation-states and citizen-subjects the tools necessary to live, in the Freireian (1993) sense, with hope and the possibility of a more just and democratic society.
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