This book introduces us to the scene of the queer/cuir discussions about education in Spanish – Portuguese language contexts. We may say it arrives at a particular time since many countries of the global south and north are suffering the attack of conservative initiatives. This “conservative turn” consists in the deepening of eighties and nineties neoliberalist policies, and also campaigns that resist the presence of what they call “gender ideology” in educative and cultural spaces.

In the “Introduction” the editors present the questions and desires that gave form to the compilation. As they express, the main goal is to give more visibility to the theoretical production in our region, and to contribute to global debates on queer approaches to education.

In essence, the book address one fundamental question: “can ‘queer’ maintain some (or any) of its political thrust?” With texts that share empirical investigations, theoretical and artistic approaches, chapters strongly support one of val flores’ affirmations: “rather than a new form of knowledge, a queer/cuir
pedagogy implies the ability to ask questions about the paths to access knowledge and to build meaning”. That is why the spirit of the volume, as they say, “is not about, but in or with queer theory”. Consequently, what we will find is this book is the result of a strong commitment to “linguistic justice and redistribution of privileges”. This intellectual attitude implies being aware of our past and present marked by different forms of coloniality, our place in the academic circuits, and the need to “collaborate with others who are pushed even further away”.

The article Perspectivizing and Imagining Queer Pedagogies Through Collaborative Interventionist Research in a Brazilian School by Branca Falabella Fabrício and Luiz Paulo Moita Lopes (chapter #3) starts with an accurate diagnosis about the scenario in Brazil. Authors point out that –as in many other countries– government and parents have been confronting teachers “in order to protect children from the influence of what has been dubbed ‘gender ideology’” (p.29). In this context, they revisit two school research projects, showing that this sort of initiative can disassemble “the reactionary impetus we are now facing” (p.31).

One element that arises as original and powerful in this article is the utilization of the concept of “scale”, as proposed by Carr and Lempert (2016). This is a concept referring to macro social meaning-making phenomena. Evoking Moby Dick, authors explain what appears to us as a relational conception of semiosis and experience. People “scale” their worlds in relation to previous experiences and various fluxes of semiosis. In this chapter, we find this “sensitive scale approach to discourse” (p. 31) research that allows us to identify and describe, for instance, scale-makers (as the State); and the relative position that specific statements and practices occupy nowadays.
From there, the authors suggest that *Queering pedagogy* involves a different conception of language and communication. They propose to include Butler’s concept of performativity to “image” new languages. As they say, “a performative view of language and identity has a decentering potential and may help us rescale meaning-making”.

In chapter #4, Lopez Pereyra also discusses the possibilities of queer pedagogies, but in this case, the author establishes a dialogue with the work of Paulo Freire to think about teacher training. The author calls to embrace “the two approaches, educators might use these pedagogical perspectives to empower and emancipate oppressed minority groups living within hetero-normalized and stigmatized beliefs and practices.” (p.52). They also revitalize the notion of “consciousness” by proposing that educators can help students to “achieve consciousness” generating historicized and politicized reflections and positions based on the situations they experience. Thus, teachers are placed as capable and responsible for the democratization of school spaces.

Then, Lopez Pereyra brings up an interesting and actual discussion regarding the use of the term “queer” in Global South contexts. He mentions the work of De Souza Santos “*Pedagogías críticas del Sur*” to ask if the use of the term “queer” contains languages and symbols that “may bring with it new social and cultural oppressions” (p.58). To answer this, he brings back the connection with Freire’s work by saying that queer concepts, as Freire’s ideas, proposes the recognition of the historicity that permeates political, cultural, and social dimensions in our society. “Queering the south” means for them the possibility of realizing that otherness “is found in all places”.

In chapter #5 authors recognize that the Queer perspectives have had a significant influence on the theory and practice of contemporary pedagogy.
From there, they propose to explore two intersections: the better-known social pedagogy-queer theory, and the one they propose to think about: Queer pedagogy-crip theory. They discuss the contributions of queer pedagogy bringing up the work of val flores. In their words, val articles are fundamental to show how a teacher who specializes in sexual diversity issues thinks about and experiences queer pedagogy from an embodied perspective. For them, this “new Sensitivity” defies the divisions generated by modernity, fundamentally Western definitions of self and bodyness.

In close connection with this argument, they introduce the second intersection: the transversality of the body. They argue queer theory provides crip theory with epistemological support for detecting the modes in which able-bodiedness is engendered, but crip theory calls to consider body beyond sexual and gender boundaries.

Finally, one could say that the authors make the scenario fecund for two classical pedagogical questions: First, what is today the surface of the teaching-learning process? Is it the soul, is it the body? Do we discuss this in educational environments? And second, thinking about pedagogy as a promise that links past, present and future; how we have defined ourselves up to now, and how we will present the world to the newcomers?

Gutierrez starts the article by sharing a persistent scene in her teaching practice: students asking her “how lesbians fuck?” From this question she builds an interesting argument that takes two directions. On the one hand, she discusses the difficulty of talking about sexuality and erotism in “a school environment convulsed by sexual panic” (p.82). Even with the “Comprehensive Sex
Education (CSE)\textsuperscript{1} program running, Argentina’s situation is not different from other countries where these initiatives are deeply resisted. On the other hand, she addresses the discussion about the very existence of a “lesbian” image within a queering perspective. Inside this argumentation, she distances herself from a representational perspective by postulating “the possibility of shifting the codes that have for so long shaped our gaze” (p. 87).

Articulating public policy analysis and philosophical approaches, this article presents a powerful argument and a set of deep questions surrounding an actual debate: how would be to represent ourselves from a non-essentialist position?

Chapter #7 addresses gender, sexuality and education discursive fabric generated from the Program Brazil without Homophobia (2004). From a Foucauldian perspective on governmentality, it considers to what extent this policy “allowed the negotiation of new forms of fixation of difference, as well as of tutelage of popular participation”. Focusing on the complexity of the relationship between the Brazilian State and social movements, authors show the value of discussing these policies considering the school as playing a central role that has at least to surfaces: one the one hand, in the construction and deconstruction of identities. As they stand, these approaches implicate differences not only concerning gender, but also sexualities, races, ethnicities, etc. And, on the other hand, today it constitutes a privileged front of dispute with conservative sectors.

The article written by Francisco Weriquis Silva-Sales deals with school experience of young gender and sexuality dissidents. It presents their

\footnote{In Argentina it is a national initiative called “Educación Sexual Integral” (ESI), it was created in 2006 by Law 26150.}
ethnographic research that was focused on the perceptions of young secondary students about their sexuality and gender performances.

Starting with an interesting discussion about the meanings of feminine manners in gay boys, they discuss relevant topics such as self-identification, prejudice, intersections between race and sexuality among others. Discussing traditional approaches of school as a mere disciplinary place, this study shows what happens when an educational space provides a secure environment for youth to express their gender and sexuality, and -as they say- “representativeness in the adults working with them”.

On the other hand, chapter #9 proposes to think about university communities whiting a philosophical approach, as human groups grounded by fear. Bringing back Hobbesian concepts, it discusses how the academic space they study can be thought as “built on this sacrificial paradigm”. The empirical data is built from their experience as students and then lecturers in a “Westernized Law School”. The main goal is to show how a queer approach to law and its teaching strategies can represent a counter-hegemony.

Chapter #10, by Torres, Pérez and Moragas, starts pointing out a generalized diagnosis in Latin America: The re-politicization of sexuality, promoted by feminist and sexual dissidence movements brought back to the public opinion topics that were traditionally defined as private, such as sexuality and gender. However, at the same time, these processes inspired the strong reaction of several conservative actors. In this context emerged the notion of “gender ideology” as a discursive construction that serves to polarize the actual scenario.

The article analyses these discursive strategies approaching from critical discourse analysis. It considers two main groups of conservative reactions: the
“anti-gender” groups (their manifestations in mass media and academic spaces); and the positioning of catholic educational discourse against Comprehensive Sex Education in Argentina, within the last decade.

The discussions that this article articulates are fundamental since it proposes to draw the attention to the ways “traditional” actors (such as the Catholic Church) converge nowadays with new actors not necessarily aligned with traditional religious o conservative ideologies. In this sense, it represents a relevant contribution to the study of the discourses that configure the public sphere today.

In the same path that the previous, chapter #11, analyses the experiences of LGBT+ Costa Rican high school students, and discourses of secondary school teachers about sexual diversity. It establishes interesting relationships between this data and the imaginary of Costa Rican society.

Although it is true that in Costa Rica the imaginary of tolerance is just that an image that does not correspond with social reality—given that there have been numerous systematic violent manifestations against different social groups—it is also true that, at the level of discourse, being tolerant represents a symbolic threshold that historically has not been easily exceeded.

However, they see that over the last years, beyond the individual posture of each teacher or student, there is a structural logic that tends to expel from the educational scenario those corporalities and subjectivities that don’t fit in the cissexist and heterosexist perimeter. They propose that the factor that subtends this positioning is the so-called “hidden curriculum”.
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Focusing on university environment, chapter #12 proposes to evaluate the creation of oppositional knowledge (Hill Collins, 2013) and the exercise of the right to appear (Butler, 2015) by marginalized groups within the academic space. The study explores the experience of the Gender Studies Research Group in the School of Law, Political and Social Sciences of the Free University of Colombia.

It is under these circumstances that the research group claims its right to discuss institutional definitions by promoting the emergence of academic logic based on “the values of equality, difference, respect, democratic dialogue and inclusion”, and representing a formative space for “academic activism”. It is within this activity that the research group’s queering pedagogies stand for is the questioning and displacement of the legitimate Subject of Law.

At the end of the book, we find two fundamental and strategic productions: a glossary, and an article written by val flores. The epilogue presents the glossary. One might wonder why a glossary is even necessary. In other words, how can a glossary provide queerness coordinates? Fortunately, authors -who become from language teaching- implosion what we understand as linguistic code. As they say, this text (?) “engages with pictorial forms of resistance at the material and symbolic levels”.

Finally, we can bring back val flores affirmation (“Rather than a new form of knowledge, a queer/cuir pedagogy implies the ability to ask questions about the paths to access knowledge and to build meaning”). To ask about pedagogy, and what to means to talk about it. As we stand before, one of fundamental questions is about the time: how to introduce the newcomers to the present, but also to the past and the future. As flores suggest, “queer temporalities” introduce us to “a present time riddled with anachronisms and a range of ways
of doing, of bodies, knowledge, affections, and national legislations, which talk to and collapse against each other”.

If queer/cuir theory and practice can maintain some of its political thrust in education, is exactly there: displaying in educative spaces the limits of “the unthinkable, the intolerable, the unhearable or the (un)known”.

**Hugo Morales Maroto**  
*Complutense University of Madrid, Madrid, Spain*  

*Queer Epistemologies in Education* by Pérez and Trujillo is the first book in English that aims to visualise the different perspectives of contributors from various Spanish and Portuguese-speaking countries on the main issues, trends and debates in education through the approach of queer epistemology.

Despite the fact that its reading is inevitably queer transversal, I have decided to divide the analysis into three large thematic blocks.

**Analysis of theory through practice and vice-versa**

The first block, the first four chapters, provide this analysis in which they present transformative pedagogies as an alternative space, in order to be able to project a queer world that confronts different extremely conservative socio-political contexts.

The starting point is the difficulty of translating theory into practice through queer pedagogies that motivate and encourage students. In order to do this, a good start is to value the power of words, and to consider the performativity of language and identity in the classroom as fundamental bases for creating scales.
These are posited as analytical tools that give general meanings to everyday experiences such as gender, sexuality and race, in order to visualise reality and who we can be.

For example, the study of Fabrício and Moita-Lopes' ethnographies brings to light queer literacy practices carried out by teachers with students, through text-based or interactive activities such as a blog discussion forum. It is through this analysis that it is understood that the scales are a way of introducing students to question such concepts, as well as social justice and social rights.

They are educational practices that stimulate students and lead them towards critical reflection, although the role of the teacher plays an important role in achieving this teaching and learning context. This idea is adopted by López, who projects it as a social agent in order to break down borders and create spaces of justice, freedom and (de)construction. To this end, he proposes the interrelation of Freire's pedagogy and queer pedagogy as a step towards transformation.

Freire (2010) argues that liberatory discourses should permeate teacher education to help teachers become aware of: who one is as a teacher, ways of knowing how to project the classroom, and recognise the intersectionality of their own diversity, including ethnicity, sexuality, geography and culture. In this way, visualising the boundary of being and knowing as a form of empowerment on teacher’s part opens a path of agency and reflective action that will be enacted in the classroom, generating a community of hope.

Teaching becomes a space of resistance and transgression that empowers students from radical tenderness so that they can get to know themselves, have a more critical outlook, and autonomy to decolonise and break with hegemonic,
dichotomous and heteronormative constructions, which will help them to contemplate themselves in the diversity of realities.

Thinking about the latter in the field of social education, Pié and Planella intersect them with the crip theory and its relationship with queer pedagogy. They argue that the school should not be hostile to reflection where mechanisms of normalisation and control are promoted, but rather, as queer pedagogy contributes, it should be an open space to other ways of thinking and inhabiting the world. And it is at this point where this pedagogy recognises that until now it had not considered the body as a central element in relation to the understanding of individual and collective existence as a whole for social transformation. This idea is the transversality with the crip theory that criticises the normative body, what is considered normal and defends that bodies are socially and culturally constructed in categories. Thus, as Guerra (2020) expresses, "disability will then be a social construct, and therefore, a system of oppression" (p.11), the result of the biopower of the State, which must be deconstructed through education.

The authors highlight McRuer who, despite being a non-disabled person, relies heavily on understanding how the imperative of bodily integrity is performative and how the category of disability is produced. In order to do so, he sees it as relevant to understand how the imperative of compulsory heterosexuality is produced and how it produces queerness. These imperatives are then intertwined to construct an ideal, but it is this reiteration, which always has a certain instability, that allows for a disruption in these imperatives and will be exploited by queer and crip activisms and theories (Morales, 2021). In this chapter, it would have been interesting to analyse the five points in common that these imperatives have, in order to transfer them to the educational context
and obtain a critical view that leads to new spaces for reflection. According to McRuer (2006), these are:

1. Dichotomous categories.
2. The normative category requires boundaries for its definition, i.e. disability defines ability.
3. Departure from the disciplinary systems of normativity is understood as queerness, deviation from the construction of the norm and pathologisation.
4. The imperatives of normality need externality to reinforce the centre, to the extent that these elements assume this categorisation, the system is reinforced.
5. To take advantage of the instability of the imperatives and not to assume categorisations in order to subvert the obligatory normativity and generate other ways of being.

In order to destabilise the imperatives Gutierrez, still only from a lesbian activist approach, foregrounds the power of images to raise awareness of desire, sexuality, knowledge of affect and the multiplicity of bodies from the positioning of queer politics. Their use makes it possible to offer representations and imaginaries of new possible ways of being, beyond the normative framework that makes invisible the realities that remain outside the cis-hetero and homonormative system that is reproduced in education and sometimes even continues to be hidden or silenced.

**A critical approach from queer political positions as a form of everyday resistance through the educational sphere**

The second part of this book consists of the following three chapters. Pocahy and do Amaral begin by focusing on governmental educational actions in
Brazil. From this analysis they rescue the main idea of how from the micro part of society (such as the streets, networks, environments or school), the productions of subjectivity and the biopower, which discriminates against certain practices and social identities that perpetuate an ideal of normality and truth, are disputed.

They become aware that from the micro they have the power to deconstruct and transform the policies that erase difference to create them in difference. This is reflected in the study of the Brazil Without Homophobia Programme, which promoted training seminars in education, research on homophobia, reformulation of public policies and dissemination of information on sexuality in education through the creation of educational material from the LGBT movements.

Other examples, of this are Weriquis’ findings from his ethnography in school in Brazil with participant observation of conversations in everyday life and workshops inside and outside the school environment, with young people who are gender and sexuality dissidents. This analysis provides insight into how education can be a space of freedom to generate strategies of resistance. A context that makes it possible to denounce the oppressions to which they are subjected when they find themselves outside the social margins set by heteronormativity and the imposed binary logics, when they understand that reality is different from that system. At the same time, this educational environment offers them the possibility of subverting their own norms, questioning themselves politically, reconceptualising categories, producing possibilities of recognition, and constructing spaces for empowerment and self-affirmation of identity through oral and corporate language.
Another form of resistance from the educational sphere, specifically from the Faculty of Law, is presented by García and Winter, who consider the University as a promoter of community, power and the fear that shapes hierarchical social relations.

Queer pedagogies encounter this systematic violence that runs through the university as well as social systems, and is what constitutes us in subjectivity. In this sense, Law Faculties would be the ones that would have to be trained to placate these violences. But to speak of queer law is a complete contradiction, because antinormativity clashes with the order that the law watches over.

However, what queer theory brings to this field is a way of denaturalising the norm. In this chapter, the authors' actions as teachers in law classrooms are presented as they succeed in: Defeating the fear of the evaluation system through agreements, queer perspectives and collectivity with the students; Destroying the idea of authority from the beginning; Promoting performative teaching. All this with the intention of questioning and (de)constructing oneself through a process of de-colonization and queerisation of the university.

This implies new ways of living and thinking practices that the academy is not yet open to accept, and, it prohibits them (as other attempts to do), in order to perpetuate the traditional, hierarchical and sovereign teaching system in the classroom.

It is this conservative context that results in attacks from the so-called "gender ideology" on the diversity of non-normative realities and queer educational projects. A line that runs through the next three chapters of the following block to confront and/or reflect on this.
Rebellion of queer pedagogy in the face of conservative attacks

To confront these attacks Torres, Pérez and Moragas propose to analyse the political and discursive strategies of the right, religion and hegemonic sex education, which are carried out by conservative and anti-gender groups, in this case in Argentina.

It is easy to deduce that these groups argue their violence in order to maintain the social order of discourse and hegemonic representations and identities. In order to do so, they carry out the following strategies: They use self-presentation with the choice of a word or phrase for the creation of collective identities; They create discourses that generate known conceptual and narrative frameworks that reconstruct specific discourses such as "gender ideology"; They argue through publications, such as books and academic writings without research bases, that promulgate such false discourses in order to continue manipulating the citizenry. All of this with the intention of generating boundaries, especially at the educational level, that shape a society against sexualised and gendered norms.

However, the analysis of the discourse of secondary school teachers and students in Costa Rica by author Fernández-Fernández shows how the school can be a perfect space to renew these confrontations. That is, it can be the place to confront the political struggles that strengthen binarisms and promote the idea of good-bad sexuality in which bodies, desires and subjectivities that are not within the normative margins of cis-heterosexuality are subjected to violence and discrimination that is perpetuated in the school itself.

In order to critically transform school spaces, queer pedagogies are used as a way of analysing the socio-cultural context and addressing school concerns. This is a way of locating the points of instability of the discourse that reifies the
normality of biopower and examines the limits of intelligibility of teachers and students.

Another similar proposal is offered by Pérez-Rodríguez with his analysis of the Gender Studies research group. She is committed to the creation of academic activism as an alternative space for resistance and knowledge generation in order to transform and question the way in which institutional knowledge is created. From there, through actions that are exemplified to confront the norm and hierarchies, they claim their right to exist in order to value their realities; they demand their presence; and they watch over the principles of freedom and equality in the academic sphere. Therefore, this activism challenges the university in a queer way by constructing knowledge abjected by the institution that questions the normative order, while at the same time creating new spaces where the right to be and to do is under the alliances of the group that composes it.

After concluding these blocks, we find two epilogues that are not intended to close this book, but to offer thought-provoking openings.

One is a glossary of queer by the Criscadian collective for a language teacher training programme. Unlike the others, this one can be read in any order one prefers because they are rhizomatic entries. It presents itself as a body to be immersed in, showing itself through symbolic practices and creative relational materials that serve as a mediating process in the collective's struggle. In turn, it aims to mobilise bodies and discourses that challenge hetero- and homonormative practices-spaces, which are reproduced at the curricular, cultural and political levels, operating with the intersections of race, identities, pedagogy, politics, decolonisation, places and language learning.
Finally, Val Flores offers us a reflection on the possible futures of queer pedagogy, which will involve taking on challenges and continually questioning in order to deconstruct normality, with an intense affective and bodily engagement. She proposes defending the absurd and the staggered as practices for contradiction and non-conformity that do not imply articulating themselves in a universal or definitive way. Thus queer pedagogies will be practices of (dis)learning for (dis)knowledge, which rebel against traditional ideologies to offer critical and free ways of thinking.

Clearly, the chapters have a very powerful queer perspective, yet it is a book written in English from the academy. From my point of view, this is a contradiction, as it means creating a hierarchical space that perpetuates the governmental, economic and social system, especially when thinking about to whom we want to transmit this information and whether it is being accessible. In this sense, and also in a self-critical way, why do we not stop producing content with academic and universal language, and start producing writings or other forms of queer information that are accessible and allow us to unify forces and alliances? If the queer revolution is a struggle of non-conformism and rebellion from the margins against the Daddy State and hierarchical structures, the language of the academy may be creating an oppression towards the real people who find themselves in them and do not have the possibility of accessing through these readings. How can queer practices and above all crip practices be fought from the inaccessibility of theory and without taking into account all the realities? An interesting aspect from the academy would be dismantling it in order to create non-hierarchical spaces for social transformation towards utopias.

Despite this, Pérez and Trujillo's own idea with this project is a strategy of rebellion from within to deconstruct the dominant ideology and social
transformation. I see this book as a performative act from a political position that pushes us to go beyond the geographical and linguistic margins, by offering the opportunity to fluctuate in information and research in order to open up new spaces for learning, collaboration and synergies.
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As a critical scholar working in a historically (and currently) conservative and hegemonically infused research space, it is affirming to see books like Queer Epistemologies in Education: Luso-Hispanic Dialogues and Shared Horizons. The text is enormously helpful to supporting its reader understand the realities, complexities, histories, and educational implications of queer work in Luso-Hispanic spaces. Authors discuss an array of topics, methodological approaches, and education levels emerging from regional and geographic contexts that have been historically conservative themselves and as the authors mention, marginalized to a degree within academia. To this end, as discussed by Moira Pérez and Gracia Trujillo-Barbadillo in the introduction, authors take up the important task of centering queering education outside the “hegemonic sites of theoretical production” (2020, p. 4) “whitening” and in ways that have been informed by the “denial of indigeneity” (2020, p.5). From this foundation, the book provides distinct voices and experiences that help the reader understand
how queer epistemologies have been situated within the colonial/Catholic cultural matrix of power (Mignolo, 2011/2017). Authors are sure to reflect on many of the intersectional identities that exist within the spaces they write about. The epistemologies in these regions are changing and change the nature of queer thought, which change how these ideas are taken up as part of educational and research processes.

The approach to the text is clearly needed for transformation educators and academics to promote thinking and create spaces that will allow for more complete understandings of human essence within so called modern societies. Discussing modernity, the authors clarify their application of its meaning encompassing the socio-historical construction that situates the colonial matrix of power, modern capitalism, and, in the Bauman (2000) sense, how society is constructed to the mechanistic elimination of those things that do not fit the mythical white, hetero norms. The authors in the book seem to be united in their understandings of how the colonial matrix of power and modernity function within their region and educational spaces in the past and present, yet they utilize their standpoints to illuminate how these realities differ within their locations the Ibero-American context. They also lean heavily on Butler (1990; 1993; 2015), and those scholars that have taken up her ideas in within Luso-Hispanic spaces. The chapters in this book include an interesting mixture of conceptual/theoretical and data driven empirical pieces. The empirical pieces are well supported by theoretical literature. Whilst not always explicit, the reader can see the clear similarities and uniqueness between the geographical spaces considered.

In the prologue, Jaime Barrientos broadly situates these, how the topics taken up in the text have not historically had the same type of visibility as in other locations, though is sure to note how they are now changing (2020, p. 23-24).
The author also notes how in Ibero-America, as in many other parts of the world, conservative framings are being used as weapon in the culture wars which are functioning as class antagonisms that frames how epistemologies are taken up (e.g. César & Duarte, 2017). The chapter is helpful in establishing an umbrella from which to consider subsequent chapters.

In the next chapter, Branca Falabella Fabrício and Luiz Paulo Moita Lopes importantly provide further framing of ideology within modernity and how it assaults queer and minority identities by situating them as deviant. They discuss Brazil to illustrate how modernity and the political ecology therein de-intellectualize the public and essentialize practices. Their conversation effectively demonstrates how these epistemologies situate pedagogical thinking. Fabrício and Moita Lopes argue this is achieved by revealing the relationship between language, meaning construction, signification, and material reality. The authors then provide pedagogical interventions that might support more complex understandings of these ideas. Here readers unfamiliar with the concepts will benefit from the accusable articulation of complex topics and those familiar will be provided with analyses that may nuance their thinking. Authors importantly contend that “queer pedagogies are paramount in reimagining social life and in rehearsing a future that does not legitimize social fascism” (2020, p. 45) an idea sorely needed in current and future moments.

Manuel López Pereyra puts Freirian pedagogy and philosophy in conversation with the Western conception of queer pedagogy discussing the associated emancipatory potential, particularly as it relates to the teachers in Latin America. Part of this work includes critical consciousness which comes from understanding queer epistemologies and its relationship to the political process which, “must be understood from an epistemic and ontological position of emancipation, where learning spaces are constructed and reconstructed
according to the unique reflection-action dynamics of the subjects in struggle” (2020, p. 54). This to Pereyra involves troubling the term “queer” itself, bringing in the regional knowledge, hegemonic and colonial critiques which permeate the chapters of the book. The analysis culminates in helpful analysis and examples of what a queer pedagogical praxis might entail.

Asun Pié-Balaguer and Jordi Planella-Ribera help us understand how we might develop frameworks that break from normative and hegemonic epistemological standpoints. To achieve this, they examine social pedagogy from a queer, pedagogical, and crip perspective. They importantly argue that engaging in theoretical conceptualizations of the body can help us transcend hegemony that emerge from denying aspects of our humanity commonly observed as part of modernity. The chapter is helpful in considering the idea of normalization even within communities of queer resistance. Consideration of crip intersectionality therefore might be another space to further nuance thinking about epistemology and research.

María Laura Gutiérrez illuminates the queer imaginaries associated with transforming how images are used. She argues for a pedagogy of erotic justice that reorganize “bodies of knowledge and knowledge of bodies” (2020, p. 91). This to “contest the economies of sensuous surfaces not only in the face of mainstream pornography but also some of feminism’s own limitations.” (2020, p. 92). Her research centers the normalization of difference as an object of curiosity and discussion in the mainstream classroom and our capacity as activists in educational spaces.

Fernando Altair Pocahy and Thalles do Amaral de Souza Cruz conduct an extensive analysis of the Brazilian Educational rhizome and more specifically the “governmentality of populations and of self-governing stemming from the
propostion of public policy” (2020, p. 97). They argue for public policies that attend to human rights and equality, to “exercise biopower and disciplinary power in the field of education” (2020, p. 106) and give examples of the oppression of certain policies and replacement possibilities to contend with those currently situating education.

Francisco Weriquis Silva-Sales examines the relationship between school and sexuality, focusing on what types of sexuality can be expressed, and its policing within heteronormativity. Ethnographic data is offered to illustrating how those in the Brazilian school understood the nature of queer related to nature, performance, existence, freedom, race, and how it situates life “outside the margins” (2020, p. 136). This research highlights student power and room for resistance.

Daniel J. García López and Luísa Winter-Pereira consider how the modern university paradigm is built upon the ideas of power and fear. Utilize scholars such as Agambenian and Hobbesian conceptualizations to historicize how epistemological normalization is built into the development and administration of law. Ultimately, in this interesting chapter, they make a compelling call for the destruction of the idea of authority and the ways it has normalized performativity.

Germán S. M. Torres, Sara I. Pérez, and Florencia Moragas analyze the discourse of anti-gender groups and the rhetorical, political and discursive strategies used to cultivate gender ideology. These speak to the contemporary politics in Argentina, which “shape the boundaries of the public sphere” (2020, p. 175). The article speaks to the production and circulation of the “democratization and pluralism of sexual citizenship and inclusive education”
(p. 175). I look forward to revisiting this chapter in considering these concepts and how they apply to civics education.

Daniel Fernández-Fernández studies the sexual discourse among high school teachers and students in Costa Rica to consider the implications for queer pedagogies within the extreme global conservative national and global contexts. The participant voices were quite powerful in considering the complexities of coming out and the many forms of violence often associated with these efforts. He considers the imaginaries, metaphors, and realities situating the complex ecology situating sexual ideology.

Adriana M. Pérez-Rodríguez considers “the creation of oppositional knowledge (Hill Collins, 2013) and the exercise of the right to appear (Butler, 2015)” (2020, p. 203) as an act of agency, defiance, and delegitimization of the existing gender paradigm. Considering a University in Columbia, she studies the history of the institution, materials in coursework, and how these have affected students’ ability to be themselves freely and the supports to aid in these efforts. The participants describe the “academic activism” (2020, p. 211) therein and how queer pedagogies they might work to eliminate exclusionary instances of power to make justice a reality for everyone.

The epilogue is an interestingly written queer glossary which creatively presents framings, efforts at deconstruction, intersectionality, and other ideas in poetic, artistic and entertaining ways.

The reality of queer epistemologies is that they are important to consider broadly, but also how they more specifically can re-frame the material reality of our students and recreate society to better support communities. Historically,
queer oppression has been part of the broader socio-historical colonial project cultivated as a social construct to promote class antagonisms (Marx, 2009) to satisfy the economic needs of the economic and political elite (Weber, 2013). Ideas about queerness are produced and reproduced differently over time. Sexuality was a socially constructed concept developed to discourage emotional relationships among men, further encourage procreation for populating the workforce in the European Middle Ages following the plague, discourage a socialist society, and steal women’s labor (Federici, 2004). These ideas were reinforced within political and religious framings which defined a human’s “natural” and “God given” condition. The ideas were built into institution, discourse, ideology, and social organization. We see the implications unfolding in most societies today. The epistemologies were transferred to the Americas and function as a colonizing force, transforming itself to survive and continue to exploit. Authors in this book take ways of seeing and diagnosing the symptoms of these ideological diseases, which they note manifest in discourse, classrooms, pedagogy, research, among other areas. The text is accessible for those who are willing to learn about queer epistemologies.

While I do not wish to de-center the unique and important space this book occupies by discussing academia within the hegemonic space that dominates the epistemological landscape, I find that the books arguments are quite salient to people interested in deep exploration of these spaces and beyond. That is to say, the book’s primary purpose is to reveal the state of these epistemologies in the American South, but it is valuable to those wishing to understand the nature of the epistemological relationships to curriculum, pedagogy, and research. The text provides important examples which demonstrate the need for epistemological consideration, transformation, and its application in classrooms. Consider that even the most progressive locations in the Americas will likely cause individuals to experience extremely hetero-normative epistemological
upbringings, or what the authors discuss in certain areas as conservative “gender ideology.” These normalized epistemologies establish how identity is to be performed (Butler, 2015), what a body can do (Deleuze, 2004), patterns of behavior, and who those behaviors can be done with. Even the most open upbringings in these spaces, therefore, requires critical guides, experiences, and serious study with progressive literature to unlearn much of what one thinks they understand about the nature of knowledge. This is one reason the text is so important. The absence of queer epistemologies themselves in certain spaces continue to negatively enculturate students and how they understand the social constructions of reality. Therefore, it is a supportive text for researchers, teachers, students, and those working in institutions attempting to reconcile harmful ideological and epistemological legacies.

Despite troubled and oppressive histories of marginalizing and silencing queer individuals and epistemologies, many conservative universities and educational sites are currently working to understand their identity as rigorous research institutions within neoliberalism and the culture wars that are occurring across the world. These universities realize that inclusive perceptions within the local, but more often, national, and global landscape is vital to their success, but some are having difficulty reconciling the historical realities of their institutions. Many realize that their historical stance is limiting its potential scientific understanding of human nature. Even in more liberal institutions dedicated students, professors, and community members are still requiring perpetual action in solidarity to change thinking about queer epistemologies in these spaces.

In some spaces, as the text notes, professors, students, and others are still not free to exist. The violence in these cases range from neglect to physical harm. This thinking and action naturally causes queer epistemologies to be absent
from discourse, thinking, and pedagogy, shaping how students learn, and understand themselves and others. Responses to the violence experienced by those with a queer identity discussed in the context of the book is an act of literacy, agency, solidarity, love, democracy, and transformation (Magill & Rodriguez, 2021). The inclusion of these approaches to knowledge are a revelation to the reality of human nature and possibility (Rodriguez, 2008). Transformation itself begins with the inclusion of queer/other epistemologies, and their application within educational spaces. Hopefully these educational spaces will help extend queer epistemologies to other educational avenues the authors discuss in the text and beyond. As is discussed in the text, the epistemologies within the text have importantly been on at the forefront of social justice and transformational movements and is therefore, one reason hegemony recognizes them as dangerous.

This text offers readers a look into the state of queer research and considerations which add needed context for how they exist locally and broadly in educational spaces and thinking. It has implications for identity, the macro and micro geographic and ecological epistemological standpoints from which epistemologies unfold, how the topic is being received in specific pedagogical approaches and within the Americas broadly. Therefore, this book represents an important symbolic step for understanding how queer epistemologies are being considered in addition to where and how they are being examined. That a book of this nature is in a mainstream publishing house, considering that the material speaks to epistemological perceptions outside the “hegemonic sites of theoretical production” (2020, p. 4) “whitening” and in ways that have been informed by the “denial of indigeneity” (2020, p. 5), is cause for celebration, but not rest.
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