

Critical Education

Volume 16 Number 4

December 5, 2025

ISSN 1920-4175

Global Pedagogy and the Question of Palestine A Dialogue

Linda Herrera

University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign

Michael A. Peters

Beijing Normal University

Professor Emeritus University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign

Herrera, L., & Peters, M. A. (2025). Global pedagogy and the question of Palestine: A dialogue. *Critical Education*, 16(4), 168-183. <https://doi.org/10.14288/ce.v16i4.187433>

Abstract

Global pedagogy refers to a broad, ethically grounded approach to education that extends beyond national boundaries and emphasizes the collective responsibility to teach and learn about interconnected global crises and historical injustices. The question of Palestine and the ongoing genocide in Gaza serve as the "canary in the coalmine". Its suppression is not an isolated phenomenon but a diagnostic for a wider authoritarian turn that seeks to foreclose the very possibility of critical, transnational solidarity. In this dialogue, Michel Peters, a philosopher of education, and Linda Herrera, a critical anthropologist of education in the Middle East, engage in a dialogue about how educators can keep critical thought and solidarity alive by partaking in practices that are resilient, resourceful, and relentlessly focused on building counter-publics. These requires embracing a "fugitive" pedagogy, curating and archiving counter-memories, and building transnational literacies of solidarity.



Readers are free to copy, display, and distribute this article, as long as the work is attributed to the author(s) and **Critical Education**. More details of this Creative Commons license are available from <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>. **Critical Education** is published by the Institute for Critical Educational Studies and housed at the University of British Columbia.

LH: In your column, “Gaza, war crimes and the ethics of global responsibility: A permanent moral stain on the West?” (Peters, 2025), you argue that the ongoing Israeli genocide of Palestinians in Gaza has become “both a site of unbearable tragedy and a test of the moral foundations of global pedagogy”. Part of why I reached out to you is because you are one of the few critical education philosophers I have come across who is addressing this abomination unfolding before of our eyes through a lens of global pedagogy in a direct and morally clear way. To begin, can you explain what you mean by “global pedagogy”? Is it related to the concept of “critical pedagogy”?

MP: Thanks for taking the time to comment on the column, and nice to be in touch once again. I enjoyed our last conversations even though they were nearly fourteen years ago (Herrera & Peters 2011, Peters & Herrera, 2011). You ask what I meant by “global pedagogy”. I use the term to refer to a broad, ethically grounded approach to education that extends beyond national boundaries, emphasizing the collective responsibility to teach and learn about interconnected global crises, historical injustices, and human rights violations. It positions education as a tool for fostering moral awareness, solidarity, and resistance in the face of systemic violence and complicity. Gaza, in this framework, is not just a geopolitical conflict but a pedagogical “site” where the world learns—or fails to learn—lessons about ethics, witnessing, and accountability.

Specifically, the quote you cite appears in the section on “Pedagogy and the ethics of witnessing” where I state,

In this light, Gaza becomes both a site of unbearable tragedy and a test of the moral foundations of global pedagogy. Future generations will not lack for evidence – they will study the footage, the data, the destruction. What they will question is our silence. The task for educators, then, is not only to bear witness, but to transform witnessing into ethical response: to ensure that pedagogy becomes a mode of solidarity, not complicity. (Peters, 2025)

Here, global pedagogy is tested by whether educators and societies use real-time evidence of atrocities (e.g., documented destruction in Gaza, including the erasure of universities and cultural sites) to challenge denial, complicity, and epistemological violence. I draw on Jacques Derrida’s ideas of “autoimmunity” (where systems self-destruct through their own defenses) and the “unconditional university” (an open, critical space for mutual recognition), suggesting global pedagogy must counteract “epistemicide”—the deliberate destruction of knowledge systems, as seen in what is happening with a broader pattern of scholasticide in Gaza (the systematic targeting of educational infrastructure, educators, and records).

I was lucky enough to meet Derrida in 2000 in the Derrida Downunder conference. I have always found his approach to ethics attractive in terms of sensibility, heavily influenced by another Jewish thinker Emmanuel Levinas, whose “ethics as first philosophy” where the traditional pursuit of knowledge is considered secondary to a basic ethical duty to the other. A thinker who held that to encounter the Other is

to have the idea of infinity. I am attracted to both thinkers and to “ethics as first philosophy”.

When I contemplate global pedagogy, I see it in Derridean terms with a strong emphasis on witnessing and documentation. In practical terms, we should use digital evidence and narratives to educate about asymmetries in power, such as Western states’ arms support for Israel amid ICJ (International Court of Justice) rulings on a “plausible” genocide. It’s an ethical response that involves shifting from passive observation to active solidarity, critiquing corporate and academic involvement (e.g., universities investing in defense contractors).

Theorizing Derrida further, I would mention “Cosmopolitan Dialogue” which calls for education that promotes mutual recognition, historical accountability, and resistance to colonial “monocultures of knowledge”. This kind of framing highlights Gaza as a moral litmus test: If global pedagogy fails here, it perpetuates silence and complicity, undermining the ethical foundations of international education. Global pedagogy in this context is closely related to—and can be seen as an extension of—critical pedagogy, a tradition pioneered by Paulo Freire and developed by scholars like Henry Giroux, Peter McLaren, and others. Critical pedagogy views education as a practice of liberation, where teachers and learners critically analyze power structures, oppression, and ideology to foster social justice and transformative action. It emphasizes the “conscientization” (raising awareness of systemic inequalities) and challenges dominant narratives that reproduce inequality.

My use of global pedagogy builds on this by scaling it to transnational issues, integrating elements of critical global citizenship education (CGCE) including the shared focus on power and resistance. Like critical pedagogy, global pedagogy critiques how education can either reinforce oppression (e.g., Western universities’ ties to military-industrial complexes enabling Gaza’s destruction) or resist it through counter-narratives and solidarity. I certainly echo Freire’s ideas by framing pedagogy as a “counter-pedagogy of witnessing”, where learners confront “false equivalencies” in media coverage of the conflict. I worked with Gert Biesta (Peters & Biesta, 2008) and Peter Trifonas (Trifonas & Peters, 2005) on books that follow related themes.

Critical pedagogy often focuses on local or national contexts (e.g., classroom dynamics challenging racism or classism), but global pedagogy applies it to worldwide phenomena like settler-colonialism in Gaza, climate crises, or corporate globalization. For instance, in related scholarship, revolutionary critical pedagogy intersects with critical global citizenship to address how education can build awareness of interconnected oppressions, such as imperialism and epistemic violence.

Both stress ethics over mere legality; critical pedagogy critiques how schools socialize students into accepting injustice, while global pedagogy tests this on a planetary scale, urging educators to incorporate Palestinian voices and challenge “sociologies of absence” (Boaventura de Sousa Santos’ term for erased knowledges). This aligns with Giroux’s work on scholasticide in Gaza (2025),

where he argues for critical pedagogy as a tool against authoritarian erasure of history and culture. Critical pedagogy is more classroom-oriented, while global pedagogy emphasizes broader “public pedagogy” (Giroux’s term for learning through media, culture, and global events), making Gaza a “global classroom” for moral lessons. My use of the term “global pedagogy” in the column is a critically informed approach that globalizes the emancipatory aims of critical pedagogy, using Gaza’s tragedy to demand education that confronts complicity and builds ethical solidarity. This relation is evident in ongoing scholarly dialogues, where both are tools for resisting neoliberal, colonial, and authoritarian forces.

LH: I fully endorse your concept of global pedagogy and share the urgency of building bonds of ethical solidarity across borders. You posit that future generations will question the silence on Gaza, and indeed, many are questioning it now. While there is clearly far too much silence, we can also hear thundering roars across the world, from educators, students, and a wide range of people of conscience to stop the genocide. People are raising their voices through marches, campaigns, independent and citizen media reporting (certainly not in the corporate media), lawsuits, reports, advocacy, and anti-genocide sit-ins and encampments at schools and universities, among other means.



Figure 1. Columbia University Encampments, Day 5, 2024. Photo by [عباد ديرانية](#)

This file is made available under the [Creative Commons CC0 1.0 Universal Public Domain Dedication](#).

Source: [https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Columbia_reinstated_Gaza_Solidarity_Encampment_day_5_\(cropped\).jpg](https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Columbia_reinstated_Gaza_Solidarity_Encampment_day_5_(cropped).jpg)

From as early as October 2023 but really picking up steam in April 2024 with the Columbia University encampments, we witnessed a veritable transnational movement around Palestine solidarity. Encampments spread to over 120 campuses across at least 45 states in the United States, and to at least over thirty countries (United Nations 2024). If we are looking for models of global pedagogy, we should study these events which espoused the principles you lay out. People formed community over a common cause and across lines of difference of age, religion, professional status, social class, race, and nationality. Muslim, Jewish, Christian,

Hindu, non-denominational, and other students broke bread, debated issues, stood firmly together against genocide, crimes against humanity, the war machine, and made demands for not only a ceasefire, but disclosures, divestment, accountability. They called for leaders, whether elected officials or university administrators to, at a minimum, abide by their own standards and by the law. An observer of the college encampments in the US commented, “Students across campuses are building relationships of mutual respect and solidarity. They’ve remained peaceful, with little conflict until police or counterprotesters appear” (Their, 2024).

These student encampments recall the spirit of Tahrir Square in Egypt during the 25 January 2011 uprising that led to the fall of the thirty-year regime of Hosni Mubarak. At that time, people from all walks of life met in the Square which was transformed into a space of social solidarity, creativity, debate and deliberation around a common cause. Many Egyptians lived in tents on the Square well into the following year in a spirit of unity and mutual support. This Tahrir model where people created their own alternative “public square” spread to the Occupy movements, Indignados movement in Spain, Gezi Park Protests in Turkey, among many others (Bayat, 2017; Herrera, 2014). Whether in 2011 or today in 2025, many participants of these movements are grappling with how to transition from solidarity encampments to building ethical and accountable systems of governance and power.



Figure 2. Tahrir Square, Cairo, Egypt, February 9, 2011. Photo by Jonathan Rashad.

This file is licensed under the [Creative Commons Attribution 2.0 Generic](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0/) license.

Source https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Tahrir_Square_-_February_9,_2011.png

For the most part, university leadership have gone the route of taking punitive measures to crack down on Palestine solidarity by restricting speech, cancelling talks, firing staff and faculty, expelling individuals and groups like Jewish Voice for Peace and Students of Justice for Palestine (SJP). They have acquiesced to

special interest pressures, sometimes preemptively. The result has been campuses being turned into “epicenters of repression”. (Akram-Boshar, 2024). By May of 2024, some 3,645 largely peaceful protestors were arrested in the US alone, and this in a country where free speech and civil disobedience are supposedly sacrosanct and constitutionally protected (Ulfelder, 2024). Many participants in these movements have been slandered for “antisemitism”, despite an abundance of evidence to the contrary, and the fact that many participants were themselves Jewish. In the summer of 2025, university administrators were busy institutionalizing repression across universities through rewriting “draconian” student conduct policies (Akram-Boshar, 2024). By fall 2025, the encampments essentially ceased to exist, though pro-Palestine solidarity continued in other forms.

Concurrently, pro-Israel lobbyists and lawyers were working overtime to weaponize civil rights laws and Title VI anti-discrimination protections. A recent report issued by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and the Middle East Studies Association (MESA), “Discriminating against Dissent: The Weaponization of Civil Rights Law” (2025) documents how, counterintuitively, “the most important legal tool of repression against campus speech has been civil rights law—specifically, Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which prohibits institutions that receive federal financial assistance from engaging in discrimination on the basis of “race, color, or national origin” (AAUP & MESA, 2025, p. 1).

The report lays out in meticulous detail the legal strategies over the last two decades in which “pro-Israel actors inside and outside the government have pushed for a reinterpretation of the Title VI to include a broad notion of antisemitism that can be easily used to recast many criticisms of Israel as unlawful discrimination.” The recent case of UC Berkeley handing over the names of 160 faculty, students, and staff citing civil rights violations for “potential connection” to antisemitism is but one of countless other examples (Zahneis 2025). Recall that our own University of Illinois (where Michael is emeritus professor) became infamous for “unhiring” the American-Palestinian professor Steven Salaita in 2014 due to “pressure from donors who did not like some of his personal tweets criticizing the Israeli government’s assault on Gaza in 2014”. In fact, his crime seemed to be that his Tweets, which were emotional and angry as they were happening in real time as he witnessed the Israeli bombardment of a defenseless Gazan population (a prelude to the current genocide), were condemned for being “uncivil” (Center for Constitutional Rights, 2015).

Working from what seems to be a common playbook, similar patterns of repressing speech and public protest can be found in Germany, the UK, the Netherlands and France where pro-Palestinian solidarity has been codified as “terrorism” and a “threat to the public order”. As documented by The European Legal Support Center (ELSC) “European governments instrumentalise counterterrorism measures to criminalise Palestine solidarity groups” and are attempting to “securitize” forms of solidarity (2025, p. 3).

You wisely suggest that a global pedagogy would urge educators to incorporate Palestinian voices and challenge “sociologies of absence”. I would say that many,

not a majority, of educators have been trying to do this for decades, though they often suffer harsh consequences. Students, faculty, and staff in the US and Europe have faced felony charges, suspensions, expulsions, have had their degrees retroactively revoked, lost research funding, have faced reputational damage and other forms of harm precisely because they refuse the posture of silence (Hellmann 2025).

My question to you is, in this highly punitive, heavily surveilled environment, how do we “transform witnessing into ethical response: to ensure that pedagogy becomes a mode of solidarity, not complicity?” How do you think we should navigate this punitive political and legal environment?

MP: I highlight a crucial intersection between domestic authoritarian trends in the US and parallel dynamics in Israel, framing resistance not just as opposition but as a deeper comprehension of neofascism’s mechanisms—particularly how it suppresses critical thought, education, and dissent to enforce state obedience. Effective resistance requires this dual awareness, avoiding isolated struggles and instead building solidarity across contexts. By drawing on historical and contemporary analyses to substantiate the parallels, while noting debates around the “fascism” label to ensure balance we can perhaps understand the US context, then Israel, and end with thoughts on solidarity networks.

Neofascism in the US: MAGA’s Renewal of Authoritarian Principles

I try to point out that neofascism in the US manifests through efforts to erode critical legal studies, critical pedagogy, and broader forms of criticism, often under the guise of loyalty to the state or “patriotism.” This aligns with scholarly views that link the MAGA (Make America Great Again) movement to neofascist ideologies, where “neofascism” refers to a modern adaptation of classical fascism’s emphasis on ultranationalism, anti-intellectualism, and suppression of opposition, but integrated with neoliberal economics and populist rhetoric. For instance, critics from the left argue that MAGA embodies a “national populism” that echoes fascist tactics by targeting universities and education systems: bans on teaching critical race theory in several states, attacks on “woke” curricula, and efforts to defund or control higher education institutions are seen as attempts to silence dissent and foster authoritarian obedience. This is framed as a renewal of old-fashioned fascism’s principles, such as book burnings or propaganda control, now updated for the 21st century through social media and legal manoeuvres like Project 2025, which proposes restructuring federal agencies to prioritize loyalty over expertise.

However, perspectives from the right and center often reject the fascism label outright, arguing that MAGA is more akin to conservative populism or anti-elitism rather than true fascism, which historically involved total state control, party militias, and explicit racial hierarchies. Some conservatives counter that accusations of fascism are hyperbolic and weaponized by the left to stifle debate, pointing out that MAGA supporters view their movement as defending democracy against “deep state” authoritarianism. Yet, even these critiques acknowledge overlaps, such as the movement’s tolerance for far-right fringes or its emphasis on strongman leadership, which historians like Robert Paxton (a fascism expert)

describe as “proto-fascist” tendencies without full equivalence to 1930s regimes. The key risk, as you note, is how this dynamic blocks resistance: by labelling critics as “uncivil” or “terrorist supporters,” or “antisemitic”; it normalizes obedience and marginalizes movements like Black Lives Matter or campus protests against inequality.

Neoliberalism’s role here is also worth emphasizing, as it has created economic precarity that fuels neofascist appeal—think declining wages and inequality paving the way for scapegoating immigrants or minorities, much like in interwar Europe. Resisters must understand this not as isolated “edginess” but as a systemic design to dismantle critical tools in education and law that could challenge the status quo.

Neofascism in Israel: Settler Politics and Far-Right Theologies

Turning to the “twin context”, neofascism in Israel emerges through settler politics and far-right influences in Benjamin Netanyahu’s cabinet, often intertwined with religious-nationalist theologies. Analysts point to figures like Itamar Ben-Gvir (National Security Minister) and Bezalel Smotrich (Finance Minister), whose parties advocate for expanding settlements in the West Bank, annexing territories, and prioritizing Jewish supremacy—echoing fascist ethnonationalism. These elements draw from far-right Zionist thought, such as Kahanism (inspired by Rabbi Meir Kahane), which promotes expulsion of Arabs and views settlements as divine mandates, blending theology with authoritarian state policies. Netanyahu’s coalitions have amplified this, with policies like judicial reforms seen as eroding democratic checks to enable unchecked settler expansion and suppression of Palestinian rights.

Critics from progressive and centrist viewpoints argue this represents a shift toward neo-fascism, threatening both Palestinians (through land dispossession, ethnic cleansing, and violence) and Israeli democracy (via attacks on judiciary and media). On the other side, supporters frame it as necessary security measures or religious fulfilment, rejecting fascist labels as anti-Israel bias. Still, the parallels to US neofascism are striking: both involve attacking institutions (courts, education) that foster criticism, while promoting obedience to a nationalist vision. Understanding this duality, as you suggest, reveals how global far-right networks—Netanyahu aligning with figures like Viktor Orbán or even MAGA elements—reinforce each other.

Building Solidarity: Linking Struggles on the Ground

My emphasis on solidarity is on linking with existing networks—resistance isn’t invented anew but built on historical foundations. For Palestine, struggles for state sovereignty date to 1947, when the UN Partition Plan sparked the Nakba and ongoing displacement. Key networks include the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), founded in 1964, which evolved from armed resistance to diplomatic efforts like the Oslo Accords (albeit highly flawed), advocate for self-determination and independence. Grassroots groups like the Boycott, Divestment, Sanctions (BDS) movement, Palestinian civil society organizations, and networks in Gaza/West Bank continue this, focusing on sovereignty amid occupation. Recent recognitions of Palestinian statehood by countries like Norway and Spain underscore these long-

term efforts. In the US, coalitions include organizations like the Southern Poverty Law Center (tracking hate groups), ACLU (defending free speech and education), and grassroots movements like Indivisible or anti-racist collectives that resist through protests, legal challenges, and education. These often intersect with Palestinian solidarity via groups like Jewish Voice for Peace or campus activists linking US authoritarianism to Israeli policies.

This sense of solidarity thrives by recognizing these as interconnected: US support for Israeli far-right elements (e.g., via aid) bolsters domestic neofascism, so linking networks—through joint campaigns, international alliances, or shared strategies like non-violent resistance—amplifies impact. This avoids the trap of state co-optation, focusing on ground-level struggles to preserve spaces for criticism and sovereignty. My approach is to emphasise resistance demands not just reaction but strategic understanding of neofascism’s forms, fostering transnational links to outmanoeuvre authoritarian closure. This isn’t about expertise on Palestine but about seeing the bigger picture—where suppressing critical thought anywhere weakens it everywhere.

Your own work is highly relevant to my concerns about neofascism and resistance. You examine how education systems can simultaneously reinforce authoritarianism and foster critical citizenship and resistance (Herrera 2023). Your book *Revolution in the Age of Social Media: The Egyptian Popular Insurrection and the Internet* (2014) explores how Egyptian youth used digital platforms to challenge authoritarian regimes during the 2011 Arab uprisings, and *Wired Citizenship: Youth Learning and Activism in the Middle East* (2014) shows how young people are forming a “generational consciousness” under conditions of political repression and economic exclusion. This lens is critical for understanding resistance to authoritarianism, as it highlights how marginalized groups can leverage education and technology to contest power.

These dynamics parallel my concerns about attacks on critical legal studies and pedagogy in the US. For instance, efforts to erase critical perspectives in US education (e.g., bans on critical race theory or “divisive concepts”) mirror authoritarian tactics in MENA, where curricula are often designed to enforce obedience rather than inquiry. Your focus on youth activism also connects to my point about linking with existing networks of struggle. But I am concerned that my comparing US MAGA dynamics to Israeli settler politics risks oversimplifying distinct historical contexts.

Do you think your previous work on how MENA youth navigate authoritarianism through digital and civic engagement provide a blueprint for countering attacks on critical thought in the US and supporting Palestinian struggles against settler-colonial policies?

LH: When I studied the “wired” and revolutionary youth in the lead up to and during the Arab uprisings (from 2009-2012), the political class and elites were not yet taking social media seriously. That is no longer the case, far from it. Now we have a situation where governments across the MENA region are using the most sophisticated surveillance software to track what their citizens are saying and doing

online. A person can be prosecuted on the basis of something as flimsy as circulating a joke about a leader or violating norms of “public morality” by posting a video of them dancing in public. Nevertheless, social media like Tik Tok, Signal, Telegram, Instagram, YouTube, are still dynamic spaces for sharing news, citizen journalism, expressing solidarity, and forming a collective moral consciousness, whether about Palestine, global injustice, alternative movements, you name it.

In response to your question, I would not go so far as to say we can point to “a blueprint for countering attacks on critical thought in the US and supporting Palestinian struggles”. In the US, it has been not only alarming but obscene to witness how the major networks and newspapers have been working overtime to “manufacture consent” for genocide (to use Noam Chomsky’s term) while defaming people and groups who raise objections to it. Combine this with the terrifying fact that reporting from the ground in Gaza has decreased exponentially in the past two years because the IDF (Israel Defense Forces) deliberately targets and kills journalists and media workers. Some 247 journalists have been killed in Gaza, more than in any other conflict (United Nations 2025). This is a form of “silencing” carried out in the most sinister form.

Social media is another frontier of the propaganda war. Netanyahu has himself unapologetically declared it one of the most important “weapons” to capture the American public. When talking to a group of social media influencers he said, “We have to fight with weapons that apply to the battlefields in which we’re engaged in and the most important ones are on social media” (The New Arab 2025). In fact, a pro-Israel consortium has taken over Tik Tok, the social media app of choice for Gen Zs with 150 million users in the US, precisely to stop information and outrage about the genocide in Gaza which is “bad publicity” for Israel. In fact, Larry Ellison, the owner of Oracle, the company that is managing TikTok’s U.S. data and algorithm, is the single largest donor to the Friends of the IDF with “gifts” of upwards of \$26 million (Seidman 2025). The Ellison family also owns Paramount Skydance which recently purchased the CBS news network and installed Barry Weiss, someone who has been working for the interests of the Israeli government since her days as a student at Columbia University. More recently, she perpetuated “The Gaza Famine Myth” (Osgood 2025). Imagine that the largest US donor of a foreign military involved in an active genocide is buying up major US media assets in broad daylight to cover it up.

So, when you ask if the MAGA dynamics in the US can be compared to Israeli settler politics, I would unequivocally say no. If anything, large swaths of the MAGA base, and particularly the under 30s, are questioning and pushing back against the “forever wars” in the Middle East, the genocide in Gaza, the war in Ukraine, bombing of Iran and Yemen, attacks in Venezuela, and the list goes on. They are asking why American taxpayer dollars are being used to slaughter children and cause havoc abroad, and not being used to improve the situation of American lives “at home”?

And pointing to MAGA as the problem misses the point about the ongoing decay of the political class on all sides of the aisle. We need to fully acknowledge that the genocide was able to escalate under the Biden administration, with the support and

complicity of liberal Democratic leaders who, with their Republican colleagues, voted time and again to arm it, in contravention of US laws, specifically the Leahy Law that prevents U.S. foreign assistance from going to foreign units that have committed gross human rights violations. This political class has by and large been captured by special interests and big money with very few exceptions. In their seminal book, *The Israel Lobby and US Foreign Policy* (2007) Mersheimer and Walt lay out in great detail how the pro-Israel lobby has been especially effective in influencing US foreign policy. How else can one explain why, two years into the most documented and visible genocide, when no one can claim they do not know what has been happening, 250 state lawmakers from the US, both Republicans and Democrats, traveled to Israel in August 2025 in a trip fully paid for by the Israeli government? What does it mean when the notorious war criminal Benjamin Netanyahu gets invited to the US Congress (July 24, 2024), by both Republican and Democratic leaders, and receives 59 standing ovations? Something is terribly amiss.

I would like to circle back to your point about how “suppressing critical thought anywhere weakens it everywhere”. In our current context, with law being weaponized to suppress political speech, with social media being bought with the aim of manufacturing consent for genocide, with schools and universities in the US and many countries in Europe trying to enforce silence around Palestine, which is about something much larger than Palestine, it stands as the canary in the coalmine, I have one final question: Can you elaborate on ways, in our current climate, we as educators and participants in history, can keep critical thought and solidarity robust, global, and alive?

MP:

You conclude by asking how, in this climate of weaponized law, controlled media, and institutional silencing, we can keep critical thought robust, global, and alive. This is the essential question, and it brings us back to the very heart of what a global pedagogy must become: a practice of intellectual and ethical survival. It is a very necessary question because it is the infrastructure of critical thought and critical thinkers.

I think you are right to frame Palestine as the “canary in the coalmine.” Its suppression is not an isolated phenomenon but a diagnostic for a wider authoritarian turn that seeks to foreclose the very possibility of critical, transnational solidarity. In the face of this, I would suggest that our task as educators is to cultivate what we might call “insurgent pedagogies of connection”—practices that are at once resilient, resourceful, and relentlessly focused on building counter-publics. But “insurgent pedagogies of connection” involve a multi-layered approach for survival, and I have tried to provide some ideas of the forms it might take. These processes and principles are not exhaustive, and they are not meant to be definitive. I offer them as mere critical instruments that might come to aid in thinking critically in times of twin-system competition in an emerging multipolar world. And rather than discuss them I have become list-oriented to mention these “instruments” in some kind of systematic order, so I have numbered them and provided subclauses. It’s very officialese and less imaginative but tries to be comprehensive.

1. *Curating and Archiving Counter-Memories:* The deliberate destruction of journalistic and educational life in Gaza is, as you note, the ultimate form of silencing. Our first pedagogical duty, then, is to become archivists of what power seeks to erase. This means systematically preserving and integrating into our teaching the very digital evidence—the citizen journalism, the satellite imagery, the testimonies from the ground—that corporate media marginalizes and that states attempt to bury. We must use our classrooms, both physical and digital, as repositories for these “dangerous memories.” This is a direct application of the “ethics of witnessing” I mentioned earlier; it transforms the act of learning into an act of historical preservation against epistemicide. We teach not only the content of the crisis but the methods of its documentation and the politics of its erasure.
2. *Embracing a “Fugitive” Pedagogy:* When speech is criminalized as “terrorist support” or “antisemitism,” and when mainstream platforms are captured by special interests, we must operate with the strategic cunning of the fugitive. This does not mean retreating but rather diversifying our tactics. It involves:
 - Leveraging “Tactical” Digital Tools: We must learn from the very youth you study, using encrypted platforms for organization (Signal, Telegram), creating educational content for decentralized spaces, and understanding the algorithms of platforms like TikTok well enough to subvert their control, even as we acknowledge their compromised nature.
 - Creating “Under-the-Radar” Networks: Formal institutional support may be withdrawn, so we build informal ones—reading groups, guest lectures under ambiguous titles, community teach-ins, partnerships with unions and faith groups. These spaces function as intellectual sanctuaries and sites for “conscientization” away from the punitive gaze of administrators and donors.
 - Reclaiming Ambiguity: Sometimes, the most powerful critique is not the loudest proclamation but the carefully framed question, the comparative historical analysis, the text that does not explicitly name Palestine but provides the analytical tools to understand settler-colonialism everywhere.
3. *Building Transnational Literacies of Solidarity:* Finally, to counter the parochialism enforced by nationalism, our pedagogy must be explicitly designed to foster transnational literacy. This means:
 - Teaching the Architecture of Complicity: We must move beyond merely stating that the US supports Israel and instead teach the precise mechanisms: the AIPAC lobbying infrastructure, the campaign finance, the corporate entanglements like the Ellison-TikTok nexus you revealed, the legal weaponization of Title VI. Students must learn to map the networks of power that enable violence abroad and repression at home.
 - Linking Struggles Analytically, Not Just Emotionally: We should draw clear, scholarly connections between the suppression of Black Lives Matter, the attacks on Critical Race Theory, the defunding of public education, and

the scholasticide in Gaza. They are not the same, but they are interconnected symptoms of a system that views critical thought, racial justice, and Palestinian liberation as existential threats. By understanding these links, resistance in one domain strengthens and informs resistance in another.

- Centering Global Epistemologies: This is where challenging the “sociology of absence” becomes a concrete practice. Our syllabi must be global, prioritizing scholars and voices from the Global South, Indigenous communities, and occupied territories. It is an active rejection of the intellectual monoculture that undergirds political silence.

In essence, keeping critical thought alive requires a shift from a pedagogy that is simply *about* the world to one that actively *intervenes* in it. It is a pedagogy that is less about the transmission of settled knowledge and more about the collective cultivation of intellectual defiance and insistence on the rights of criticism and reply against all attempts to close thought down, to normalize it, to erase it, to deform it. In an environment controlled by GenAI where images, “voice”, and “news” can be reproduced instantly, this becomes a herculean effort to remain curious and skeptical of all media and official discourse, whatever its source. I am recommending an approach that accepts that we may be operating in increasingly hostile environments but insists that the classroom—however and wherever we define it—remains a crucial site for forging the ethical solidarity and analytical clarity that our silent institutions have abandoned. The canary is dying; our pedagogy must be the alarm.

References

- AAUP (American Association for University Professors) & MESA (Middle East Studies Association). (2025). *Discriminating against dissent: The weaponization of civil rights law to repress campus speech on Palestine*. American Association of University Professors; Middle East Studies Association.
https://www.aaup.org/sites/default/files/2025-11/Discriminating-Against-Dissent_0.pdf
- Akram-Boshar, S. (2024, October 6). Campuses are pulling out all the stops to crush Palestine solidarity this fall. *Truthout*. <https://truthout.org/articles/campuses-are-pulling-out-all-the-stops-to-crush-palestine-solidarity-this-fall/>
- Bayat, A. (2017). *Revolution without revolutionaries: Making sense of the Arab Spring*. Stanford University Press.
- Biesta, G., & Egéa-Kuehne, D. (Eds.). (2001). *Derrida & education*. Routledge.
- Center for Constitutional Rights. (2015). *Salaita v. Kennedy, et al*.
<https://ccrjustice.org/home/what-we-do/our-cases/salaita-v-kennedy-et-al>
- European Legal Support Center. (2025, August). *Europe’s proscription of Palestine solidarity*. Monitor and Research Department. <https://elsc.support/wp-content/uploads/2025/08/Europes-Proscription-of-Palestine-Solidarity.pdf>
- Giroux, H. (2025). Scholasticide: Waging war on education from Gaza to the West. *Journal of Holy Land and Palestine Studies*, 24(1), 1–16. <https://gazaeducationsector.palestine->

[studies.org/sites/default/files/pdf/public_records/giroux-2025-scholasticide-waging-war-on-education-from-gaza-to-the-west.pdf](https://www.studies.org/sites/default/files/pdf/public_records/giroux-2025-scholasticide-waging-war-on-education-from-gaza-to-the-west.pdf)

- Hellmann, M. (2025, April 26). They staged protests for Palestine. The consequences have been life-changing: Legal aid group says most students contacting them are Palestinian, Arab Muslim and other students of color. *The Guardian*. <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2025/apr/26/university-student-protesters-discipline>
- Herrera, L. (2014). *Revolution in the age of social media: The Egyptian popular insurrection and the internet*. Verso.
- Herrera, L. (2022). *Educating Egypt: Civic values and ideological struggles*. American University in Cairo Press.
- Herrera, L. (Ed.), with Sakr, R. (2014). *Wired citizenship: Youth learning and activism in the Middle East* (Critical Youth Studies series). Routledge.
- Herrera, L., & Peters, M. A. (2011). The educational and political significance of the new social media: A dialogue with Linda Herrera and Michael A. Peters. *E-Learning and Digital Media*, 8(4), 364–374.
- Mearsheimer, J., & Walt, S. (2008). *The Israel lobby and U.S. foreign policy*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Nanguneri, S. (2023, November 20). In California schools, Palestinian history is off-limits. *The Nation*. <https://www.thenation.com/article/society/california-ethnic-studies-palestine/>
- The New Arab. (2025, September 27). Netanyahu says social media Israel’s new “weapon” after TikTok acquisition. <https://www.newarab.com/news/netanyahu-says-social-media-israels-new-weapon>
- Osgood, B. (2025, October 6). Conservative writer Bari Weiss named editor-in-chief of CBS News: Appointment of media figure known for pro-Israel, anti-“woke” stances comes as US media firms feel Trump pressure. *Al Jazeera*. <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2025/10/6/conservative-writer-bari-weiss-named-editor-in-chief-of-cbs-news>
- Peters, M. A. (2000). *Derrida Downunder*. New Zealand Books. <https://nzbooks.org.nz/2000/comment/derrida-downunder-michael-peters/>
- Peters, M. A. (2001). Humanism, Derrida and the new humanities. In G. Biesta & D. Egéa-Kuehne (Eds.), *Derrida & education* (pp. 209-231). Routledge.
- Peters, M. A. (2005). War, crimes against humanity, and the new humanities: Derrida and the promise of Europe. In P. Trifonas & M. A. Peters, (Eds.) *Deconstructing Derrida: Tasks for the new humanities* (pp. 82-103). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781403980649_6
- Peters, M. A., & Biesta, G. (2009). *Derrida, deconstruction, and the politics of pedagogy*. Peter Lang.
- Peters, M. A., & Herrera, L. (2011). The future of Muslim youth: Interview with Linda Herrera. *Policy Futures in Education*, 9(2), 248–257.
- Peters, M. A. (2025, July). Gaza, war crimes and the ethics of global responsibility. *PESA Agora*.

- Scholars Against the War in Palestine. (2024). <https://spectrejournal.com/scholars-against-the-war-on-palestine-2/>
- Seidman, D. (2025, October 11). From AI to TikTok to TV, this pro-Israel billionaire is expanding power in US. *Truthout*. <https://truthout.org/articles/from-ai-to-tiktok-to-tv-this-pro-israel-billionaire-is-expanding-power-in-us/>
- Thier, H. (2023, May 4). The Student Encampments Aren't a Danger to Jews. But the crackdown is. *The Nation*, <https://www.thenation.com/article/activism/campus-encampment-police-crackdown-antisemitism-brutality/#>
- Trifonas, P., & Peters, M. A. (Eds.). (2004). *Derrida, deconstruction and education: Ethics of pedagogy and research*. Blackwell.
- Trifonas, P., & Peters, M. A. (Eds.). (2005). *Deconstructing Derrida: Tasks for the new humanities*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ulfelder, J. (2024, May 30). Crowd Counting Consortium: An empirical overview of recent pro-Palestine protests at U.S. schools. *Ash Center for Democratic Governance and Innovation, Harvard Kennedy School*. <https://ash.harvard.edu/articles/crowd-counting-blog-an-empirical-overview-of-recent-pro-palestine-protests-at-u-s-schools/>
- United Nations. (2024, October 4). Rights expert urges universities to respect pro-Palestinian protests. UN News Global perspective Human stories. <https://news.un.org/en/story/2024/10/1155376>
- United Nations. (2025, August 26). Killing of journalists in Gaza hospital attack “should shock the world”: UN rights office. *UN News*. <https://news.un.org/en/story/2025/08/1165719>
- Zahneis, M. (2025, September 12). UC Berkeley hands over 160 names to the federal government for “potential connection” to antisemitism. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. <https://www.chronicle.com/article/uc-berkeley-hands-over-160-names-to-the-federal-government-for-potential-connection-to-antisemitism>

Authors

Linda Herrera is Professor in the Department of Education Policy, Organization and Leadership at University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign. She has researched, written about, and taught courses on education and power in the MENA region, qualitative research methods (with a focus on critical ethnography and oral history), international development policy, youth and generations, childhood in global context, the social effects of technological change, and critical democracy and citizenship education. Her books include, *Education 2.0: Chronicles of Technological and Cultural Change in Egypt* (OUP, 2025), *Educating Egypt: Civic Values and Ideological Struggles* (American University in Cairo Press, 2022), *Global Middle East: Into the Twenty-first Century* (University of California Press, 2021), *Revolution in the Age of Social Media: The Egyptian Popular Insurrection and the Internet* (Verso, 2014), *Wired Citizenship: Youth Learning and Activism in the Middle East* (Routledge, 2014), *Being young and Muslim: New Cultural Politics in the Global South and North* (Oxford University Press, 2010), and *Cultures of Arab Schooling: Critical Ethnographies from Egypt* (State University of New York Press, 2006).

Michael A. Peters is Distinguished Professor of Education at Beijing Normal University Faculty of Education PRC, and Emeritus Professor in Educational Policy, Organization, and Leadership at

the University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign. He is the executive editor of the journal, *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, and founding editor of five international journals, *Policy Futures in Education*, *E-Learning and Digital Media* (SAGE), and *Knowledge Cultures* (Addleton), *The Video Journal of Education and Pedagogy* (Springer), *Open Review of Education Research* (T&F). His interests are in philosophy, education and social policy and he has written over eighty books, including most recently: *Wittgenstein and Education: Pedagogical Investigations*, (2017) with Jeff Stickney, *The Global Financial Crisis and the Restructuring of Education* (2015), *Paulo Freire: The Global Legacy* (2015) both with Tina Besley, *Education Philosophy and Politics: Selected Works* (2011); *Education, Cognitive Capitalism and Digital Labour* (2011), with Ergin Bulut; and *Neoliberalism and After? Education, Social Policy and the Crisis of Capitalism* (2011). He has acted as an advisor to governments and UNESCO on these and related matters in the USA, Scotland, NZ, South Africa and the EU. He was made an Honorary Fellow of the Royal Society of NZ in 2010, a Fellow in 2018, and awarded honorary doctorates by State University of New York (SUNY) in 2012 and University of Aalborg in 2015.