

BNCC and History Teaching: possible horizons¹

BNCC e Ensino de História: horizontes possíveis

Adriana Soares Ralejo*
Rafaela Albergaria Mello*
Mariana de Oliveira Amorim*

ABSTRACT

The Base Nacional Comum Curricular (BNCC) [National Common Core Curriculum] has raised significant debates about the constitution of a school curriculum. In this article, we develop a reflection on how this curricular proposal has mobilized discussions about the possibilities of constituting and developing History teaching. As a regulatory device of education, what kind of power does this document have over what is practiced in schools? In addition to the constraints and moorings that the curriculum generates in teaching, could we also see the potential for teaching History that dialogs with the realities experienced by our students and shared in the school space? Based on these guiding questions, we have developed this article in three parts: first, we present the publication path of BNCC and the clashes surrounding the teaching of History, as well as the concepts of curriculum and History teaching with which we work. In a second step, we present how the disciplinary community (GOODSON, 1997) debated the History meanings present at the BNCC, based on a survey of scientific articles that presented this curriculum as a research theme. And in a third moment, we exhibit some keys for reading the document based on the concepts of “general competencies” and “Historian attitude”. Finally, we can answer the question: what possibilities can the BNCC provide for meaningful teaching in History teaching?

Keywords: BNCC. History Teaching. Curriculum. Historian attitude.

1 Translated by Rita Isadora Pessoa Soares de Lima. E-mail: ritaisadora@gmail.com

* Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro. Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brasil. E-mail: drikaralejo@hotmail.com - <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1725-4675> E-mail: molamorim@gmail.com - <https://orcid.org/000-0001-5336-3428> E-mail: rafaelalbergaria@gmail.com - <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1752-4690>

RESUMO

A Base Nacional Comum Curricular (BNCC) tem suscitado importantes debates sobre a constituição de um currículo escolar. Neste artigo, desenvolvemos uma reflexão sobre como essa proposta curricular tem mobilizado discussões sobre as possibilidades de constituição e de desenvolvimento do ensino de História. Enquanto dispositivo regulador da educação, que tipo de poder esse documento exerce sobre aquilo que é praticado nas escolas? Para além dos constrangimentos e amarras que o currículo gera no ensino, poderíamos também enxergar potencialidades para um ensino de História que dialogue com as realidades vividas por nossos alunos e alunas e compartilhadas no espaço escolar? A partir dessas questões norteadoras, desenvolvemos este artigo em três partes: em um primeiro momento, apresentamos a trajetória de publicação da BNCC e os embates em torno do ensino de História, bem como os conceitos de currículo e de Ensino de História com os quais trabalhamos. Em um segundo momento, apresentamos como a comunidade disciplinar (GOODSON, 1997) tem debatido sobre os sentidos de História presentes na BNCC, a partir de um levantamento de artigos científicos que têm apresentado este currículo como tema de pesquisa. E em um terceiro momento, apresentamos algumas chaves de leitura do documento a partir dos conceitos de “competências gerais” e da “atitude historiadora”. Por fim, teremos condição de responder à questão: que possibilidades a BNCC pode proporcionar para um ensino significativo no ensino de História?

Palavras-chave: BNCC. Ensino de História. Currículo. Atitude historiadora.

BNCC and History Teaching: initial notes

The Base Nacional Comum Curricular – BNCC (BRASIL, 2017b) [National Common Core Curriculum] is a curriculum document developed by the Ministry of Education for all Basic Education. Expressed under Article 210 of the 1988 Federal Constitution (BRASIL, 1988, our translation) and provided for in Article 26 of the Diretrizes e Bases da Educação [Education Guidelines and Bases Act] of 1996 (BRASIL, 1996, our translation), this document started to be developed based on the Plano Nacional da Educação (PNE) [National Education Plan] in 2014 (BRASIL, 2014), having been presented to the public for the first time in September 2015, when it stirred an immense debate about the need or not of a national curriculum for the country.

The first BNCC version for the school subject of History presented in 2015 fostered an intense debate in the disciplinary² (GOODSON, 1997) and epistemic³ (BALL, 2001) community of History over what knowledge and contents should be selected and published in the curriculum. This first version somehow cracked the so-called traditional History field and brought, to the arena of the History disciplinary community, the proposal of a curriculum critical assessment of the hegemonic Eurocentric view. However, with the unfolding of this intense discussion entailed by the first BNCC, Ministério da Educação (MEC) [Ministry of Education] dissolved the team of twelve professionals who developed its first History version, inviting, then, a new commission consisting of members, predominantly, from a single higher education institution. This was presented to the public in May 2016, with a selection of comprehensive contents, giving form to a more content-focused curriculum than the previous one and presenting the development of Brazilian History from a Eurocentric perspective. The third version of the BNCC, for the History school discipline, was presented in April 2017 and approved in December of the same year, with few changes. This version made use of the concept of competency-based learning, which was part of the reform movements of the 1990s and was embedded in the *Parâmetros Curriculares Nacionais* (PCNs) [National Curriculum Parameters] for High School.

The BNCC is an official curriculum document and should support the curricula of the different municipalities and states of Brazil. So, in view of its use in all elementary education up to the year 2020 (BRASIL, 2017a), how to think about diverse possibilities for teaching History in schools? Does the BNCC, as a regulatory apparatus of Education, only regulate, tie and constrain the History that should be taught in schools? Or is it that BNCC also leaves open spaces where the teaching of History can become powerful and touch the realities lived and experienced in schools?

Bill Green (2017) states that knowledge issues in the curriculum are always linked to power issues. The author claims that the Australian national curriculum came into force in 2011 and that there was a great deal of questioning about what knowledge should be validated by a national curriculum. Thus, we agree with Green that curriculum is always political. As a practice of representation and power, the curriculum component of History at BNCC represents the legitimation of certain knowledge.

2 The concept of “disciplinary community” refers to a heterogeneous group composed of internal subgroups that live in antagonism, but despite agonistic possibilities, the disciplinary community coexists with the aim of maintaining stability.

3 The concept of “epistemic community” refers to the competition for certain concepts of knowledge of a disciplinary community and Ball associates the concept with the tensions inherent in the constitution of the community itself.

This relationship between historical school knowledge, curriculum and power is also discussed by Gabriel and Costa (2011), as they argue that the curriculum presupposes processes of constitution of hegemonies, which occur within the scope of the production, distribution and consumption of school historical knowledge in the midst of a system of differences in which there are several disputes for the establishment of the truth and for the establishment of what should be taught in schools. According to Gabriel (2019), the History curriculum tends to reflect the set of contents that constitute the curriculum of this discipline at different levels of Education. In line with the author, in general, these contents are perceived as prescriptions, as naturalizations, and their imbrications with asymmetric power relations are not indicated. Therefore, there is an instrumental view of the History curriculum and teaching that legitimizes the status quo, reinforcing the silencing or erasing of narratives of cultural, social, ethnic and gender minorities historically excluded from History curriculum practices.

It is also important to point out that we understand the teaching of History as a “border place” (MONTEIRO, 2007). In this perspective, teaching History at school refers to the relationships between the concepts of curriculum, historical school knowledge, the production and distribution of this knowledge, and the relationship between the teaching and student knowledge. According to Monteiro (2007) and Monteiro e Penna (2011):

This approach which portrays the research on the Teaching of History as a border place uses a geopolitics analogy: the question of borders, which can be understood in the North American sense of *frontier*, land beyond which an emptiness extends, a no man’s land, but also in the sense of *border* – ‘place where differences can be marked, but which also allows the meeting, exchanges’ (SANTOS, 1994 *apud* MONTEIRO, 2007, p. 76, emphasis added, our translation).

The border is a place where differences are demarcated, but where it is also possible to produce approximations, dialogues, or distance between cultures that come into contact (MONTEIRO; PENNA, 2011, p. 194, our translation).

Both the curriculum and the teaching of History are thought of as cross-border space-times, irreducible to just one field of knowledge, that is, they are produced and function in the relationship between different fields, between knowledge, and between multiple powers. The History curriculum can

considered, then, as a map, as a rhizome, as a cartography of knowledge and powers, as a provisional territorialization, as a striated field that is constituted by lines of knowledge and powers, which are mobile and dynamic, objectifying the content and subjectifying teachers and students. This conception of teaching History indicates that there are possibilities to create gaps and bet on differences, on socio-cultural and ethnic diversity, to promote the discursive inclusion of silenced and denied subjects and identities throughout the schooling process. As it turns out, we are not doomed to a traditional narrative.

Based on the above considerations, we ask: how have studies and research analyzed this relationship between BNCC and History Teaching? This is a question that we followed through the second part of this text. And what theoretical-practical possibilities can be developed and suggested as ways to teach and learn History in schools? These suggestions take shape in the third part of this article.

Clashes over the significance of the History BNCC

In this second part of the text, we seek to understand how researchers in the field of History understand the BNCC. We then conducted a search for the keyword “BNCC” (acronym and full name) on the Journal Portal of the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior (CAPES) [Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel] and selected the articles that referred to the discipline of History⁴.

From reading these articles, we identified some issues that permeate these texts. In this way, we will present a brief summary of these, bringing their main contributions to the field and, later, we will carry out a dialogue with / between them, producing an analysis of which representations of History teaching are being expressed in these works: what meanings they highlight as positive and as negative ones? And how have these researchers positioned themselves regarding the productive use of this normative document?

⁴ The search on the CAPES Journals Portal took place on July 7, 2020 and 16 articles related to the History BNCC were found. From these 16 articles, we selected five that mentioned the term BNCC in their keywords. For this analysis, we added the article by Silva, Santos and Fernandes (2019) for being an article published in an Education magazine, differentiating itself from the others and for its relevance in working on the methodology with History teachers.

The article developed by Igor Salomão Teixeira and Nilton Mullet Pereira (2016) addresses the theme of the Middle Ages in the first and second version of the BNCC document, also analyzing the community of medievalists in Brazil. The authors consider that the first version brought important questions with the rupture of linearity and Eurocentrism in the contents, bringing “necessary lights to approaches that were previously very marginal in the teaching of History” (TEIXEIRA; PEREIRA, 2016, p. 17, our translation), however, some contents related to the periods of Antiquity and the Middle Ages were removed. The authors point out that the Associação Brasileira de Estudos Medievais (ABREM) [Brazilian Association of Medieval Studies] defended the return of the study of medieval Europe but avoiding a conservative position related to the Teaching of History. As Teixeira and Pereira (2016) state:

that the non-privilege given to European History is precisely the highlight of the preliminary version of the BNCC text, as this position reflects a long period of disputes in the field of History teaching that has extended since the 1980s (CABRINI, 1994) and that contemplates a strong criticism of what has been called Eurocentrism (TEIXEIRA; PEREIRA, 2016, p. 21, our translation).

Thereby, the authors consider that the path taken by the group in the first version was an important path for the construction of historical thought but that by removing the content of the Middle Ages, they eliminated the possibility of critical thinking about the past with the strangeness that knowledge generates. The authors consider that the second version returned to the European privilege content with a stereotyped aspect in relation to the Middle Ages, full of prejudices and historiographical outdatedness (TEIXEIRA; PEREIRA, 2016).

Thus, Teixeira and Pereira (2016) affirm some possibilities of entry of the Middle Ages in the History curriculum for the construction of a sense of otherness, such as: the question of Islam in different contemporary events in relation to the Middle East; the gender issue in the far east; and the residuals of the Iberian world such as songs and parties, the *Folia de Reis*⁵ and Christmas. The authors argue that teaching Middle Ages makes possible to think historically in order to study the differences.

⁵ *Folia de Reis* is an Iberian tradition that is not very expressive in the northern hemisphere in general, but can be roughly related to Twelfth Night Festivities, when groups of costumed merry-makers dance through the streets and carollers sing door-to-door.

The article by Dennison de Oliveira (2017), on the other hand, presented content related to the different themes of the 1917 centenarians: the First World War, the Russian Revolution, Brazil's declaration of war on Germany and the General Strike. For the author, there is a continuity in the component of History for Elementary Education at BNCC and the component of History in Parâmetros Curriculares Nacionais para o Ensino Médio (PCNEM) [National Curriculum Guidelines for Secondary Education]: "only if you notice differences in form and not in content" (OLIVEIRA, 2017, p. 100, our translation).

Oliveira (2017) praises the nine competencies for the History discipline of Elementary School present in the document, which had already been put in effect to High School since 2000 but questions the degree of public power commitment to make this proposal effective. What we realize is that, apparently, these competencies were ignored by the public authorities in High School and the author therefore has no hope of their presence in Elementary School.

The article by Marcos Silva (2018) states that the first BNCC version was misinterpreted by the academic community. The author claims the latter did not understand that emphasizing Brazilian History would not imply ignoring world History and that the document was in fact ethical in bringing African matrixes content in accord to the data presented by Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística (IBGE) [Brazilian Statistics Institute] about Brazilian population. The author maintains that the organization of quadripartism means the secular political domination of the European continent. Subsequently, the author analyzes the BNCC official version and points out that there are no marks of plurality in the document, and makes the category of historical knowledge abstract, neglecting memory preservation criteria. Regarding Laws 10.639/2003 (BRASIL, 2003) and 11.645/2008 (BRASIL, 2008), Silva (2018) sustains that "there is cultural alterity, but without almost mentioning domination and exploitation" (SILVA, 2018, p. 1010, our translation). The author declares that despite bringing new protagonisms, the document is nevertheless conservative.

Nilton Mullet Pereira and Mara Rodrigues (2018), in turn, present the differences between the three BNCC History documents. Based on theoretical and thematic questions about identity and temporality, the authors carried out an analysis of how these documents addressed these themes. For the authors, the disputes in the curricular production of BNCC were mainly in the field of its legitimacy and of another historical formation for the Brazilian identity constitution, that is, the emphasis precisely on the continuities supposedly established between the European, African or indigenous past and the current social bond (PEREIRA; RODRIGUES, 2018).

Thus, the authors consider that the first version produced an inversion of the geographical center, with less emphasis on Europe and more on Latin America and the African continent. The authors considered that the second version presents the historical past as continuity and repetition, with no questioning and that the third version does very little to address the identity issues. For the authors, there is a growing deflation of the History classes, the lack of critical potential, without encouraging empathy with minorities. The authors consider that there is an aseptic, universal and depoliticized conception in the version made effective by the government. They conclude about the need for a militant History for new identities and temporalities, being necessary to break with centuries of colonized thoughts.

Francisco José Balduino da Silva, Jean Santos and Márcia Fernandes (2019) raise a discussion about the BNCC and the attempt to standardize the History curriculum for High School. In an analysis based on Stephen Ball's theoretical framework, the authors presented arguments in defense of the BNCC based on the government, institutes and foundations. Subsequently, the authors present data collected by a questionnaire answered by High School History teachers, in which they stated that they did not feel contemplated with the BNCC, just as they considered that the BNCC does not privilege a reflective perspective for students. Hence, the authors consider that the BNCC discourse is far from the teachers' reality.

The article by Douglas Lima (2019), on the other hand, analyzes how the period of the Middle Ages was inserted throughout the BNCC versions and concludes by reflecting on the possibilities of thinking about Medieval History in the teaching of History. On the insertion of the Middle Ages in the BNCC, the author declares:

Seeking a comparison between the versions of the Core, it is observed that the Middle Ages-related content experienced a marked variation. Initially inserted loosely in a few items, Medieval History came to occupy a prominent place in the historical knowledge expected for the 6th year, being marked by a conservative and content-focused approach, while in the third and last version, we move on to broad axes that structure the 6th year of Elementary Education around Classical Antiquity and a Mediterranean Middle Ages under a sociocultural approach (LIMA, 2019, p. 12, our translation).

From the readings of the articles presented above, we realized some questions raised by authors in the field of History Teaching. These authors expressed their critical analyses of the official version of the document and how they brought up the issue of the clash in the History disciplinary community (GOODSON, 2018) in the construction of the Core.

We realized that these texts express different sorts of analysis of the BNCC and that they defended their positions in the History disciplinary community, both disagreeing and adjectivating the official document in different ways. Thus, in view of the various critical utterances on the BNCC, we consider, based on Goodson (2018), that the different authors share the same opinion about the importance and promotion of the school discipline of History.

Goodson (2018) considers

A disciplinary community can also be a heterogeneous group composed of internal subgroups that live in antagonism, but despite the agonistic possibilities, the disciplinary community coexists with the objective of maintaining stability and promoting the teaching of the discipline (GOODSON, 2018, p. 20, our translation).

We understand, over the reading of these texts, that the teaching and learning process of / in History are broad and lead to several discussions, as well as the production of historical knowledge causes increased tension in the disciplinary and epistemological community over which knowledge should be legitimized in the official document. There is a struggle for the legitimation of its disciplinary territory and this is a political struggle. As Goodson (2018) states, school subjects consist of groups of different identity elements, values and interests.

Therefore, we verified that the curricular prescriptions present in the History component for Elementary Education, presented in the approved version of the BNCC as thematic units, knowledge objects and skills, differ little from the curricular contents present in textbooks hitherto, representing a pattern towards its permanence in the curricular policy. However, we can also project changes presented in the document. Not in the sense of presenting revolutionary and unprecedented proposals in the field of History teaching, but by taking positions that value the specificity of the component in question through the definition of specific competencies, in dialogue with general competencies, and the concept of “Historian attitude”, which we will develop in the next part of the text.

General competencies and Historian attitude

We do not aim in this article to establish any kind of value judgment that evaluates BNCC as something good or bad, right or wrong. Our aim, based on the review of the articles surveyed, was to understand how researchers and teachers position themselves in the face of a curricular document with such a great impact on education. From the moment that this document gains a prescriptive character, how and to what extent can we establish a critical and productive approach?

When we point out that BNCC can have productive features, we are saying that a curriculum, which is produced by an epistemic community, also produces meanings. Thus, based on Ball (2001), we understand that a cycle of policies evinces the existence of a complex nature of curricular policies, composed of micropolitical processes and actions by professionals at different levels (MAINARDES, 2006). Between the public and the private, Ball pinpoints that educational policies mobilize and are mobilized in different contexts: influence, production and practice. It is precisely this last context that we would like to highlight and to establish relationships regarding the uses of the BNCC: who determine the meanings to be taught?

We stress, among the various subjects involved in the teaching-learning process, the role of teachers. It is in their hands that the document will also be interpreted and materialized in the shape of lessons / classes. Thus, we recognize that these subjects have a power position in this process, as those who produce meaning stemmed from the contents, and not only as reproducing agents of previous prescriptions.

Having recognized these power relations involved in the educational process, we will analyze, in this last part, potentialities that the BNCC can provide for teaching practices. Our glance turns to the meanings of History teaching expressed in the document and the way in which they relate to the theoretical perspectives of a critical History defended by authors in this research field.

What is the aim when teaching History in Elementary Education? This questioning, despite providing several possible answers, is as necessary both for our students (“why do I need to learn this?”) as for us, teachers, (“why am I teaching this?”). If we strive for an education that is meaningful and steady to our students, the question of why is also followed by “what” and “how”. Here, we are debating our choice processes, which, many times, can be naturalized.

A teacher, when planning his / her practice, normally uses means such as the textbook, school planning and his / her experiences as a teacher and student to prepare matters what will constitute his / her class. But all these resources, imposed or not, are produced in compliance with political and curricular regulations. During teacher training, we usually come across these types of documents and become aware of the complexity of the process involved that mobilizes the 1988 Federal Constitution (BRASIL, 1988), the Lei de Diretrizes e Bases – LDB (Law 9.394 of 1996) [Law of Guidelines and Bases], the Parâmetros Curriculares Nacionais [National Curriculum Parameters], the Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais (DCN) [National Curriculum Guidelines], the Statute of the Child and Adolescent and the state and municipal curricula.

BNCC production, started in 2015 and completed in 2017 (Early Childhood Education and Elementary School) and 2018 (High School), brings to the fore again the importance of the participation of the epistemic community (BALL, 2001). As explained in the first part of this article, the process of producing this document has generated debates in the History field, calling into question the curriculum tradition. Goodson (2012) claims it is not possible to deny this tradition, but we need to look for ways to revitalize, reconstruct and expand it to make the curriculum diversely accessible and pleasant, turning the school environment into a place significant in meaning. It is these new paths for History teaching that we seek to visualize in amidst power and representativeness disputes brought forth by BNCC.

It is not our focus, in this article, to open a discussion about the validity or not of what was established in its final version and debate over what was silenced and forgot. Nor is it a statement for or against the document. In a movement of comings and goings, we understand there are disputes of different levels and instances of power, so what we consider as a curriculum is never something 100% unilateral. There are marks and traces of different discourses there, which dialogue, negotiate and even oppose each other. BNCC is a product of these discourses which, sometimes more explicitly, sometimes more timidly, is a result that evinces victories over struggles for representativeness and diversity, expressed by laws 10.639/2003 (BRASIL, 2003) and 11.645/2008 (BRASIL, 2008) and by the DCN, but also where there are marks of traditional schooling, with a large list of skills to be developed. We want to use this space to encourage another view: what potential and changes can BNCC generate in our teaching practices?

A first aspect of the document that calls our attention is the definition of ten general competencies⁶, under the argument that it is necessary to guarantee the rights of learning and development to all students in the country (BRASIL, 2017b). These competencies are: knowledge; scientific, critical and creative thinking; cultural repertoire; communication; digital culture; work and life project; argumentation; self-knowledge and self-care; empathy and cooperation; responsibility and citizenship.

Even understanding that the objectives behind Brazilian education go beyond this numbering of ten items, we observe a message that is worth highlighting: the school is not a place that deals only with content and knowledge. The other nine competencies point out that within this space, at all education levels and in all curricular components, aspects that promote training and development of autonomy within a context of diversity and difference must not only be practiced on but should also be encouraged⁷. Knowledge continues to be important in the constitution of education, but it is not reduced to it. Once again we reinforce that this stance on education is not an innovation brought by the document, but the result of debates and struggles for a quality, critical and meaningful teaching, as defended by Paulo Freire.

Relating this aspect above mentioned to the History teaching, this message of the ten general competencies helps us to combat the idea of a History traditionally oriented by events, dates and names that represent a single version that had been characterized by its Eurocentric and patriarchal view. In our teaching practices when exploring, for example, the competency number 2 – scientific, critical and creative thinking – we are led to consider different matters, formulate hypotheses, analyze other versions and interpret them critically, which is bolstered by the competency number 7 – argumentation – which, in turn, makes it possible to formulate, negotiate and defend different ideas.

The so-called socio-emotional competencies are also highlighted in the document, mainly referring to items 8 – self-knowledge and self-care –, 9 – empathy and cooperation –, and 10 – responsibility and citizenship –, thus enhancing the ideas of care and self-knowledge, awareness of the other and the collective.

⁶ The concept of competency is not something new. This came to be widely discussed in the educational field when it was related, in Perrenoud's studies (1999), to a notion of training and the acquisition of tools to solve everyday problems. However, at BNCC this concept is defined as "mobilization of knowledge (concepts and procedures), skills (practical, cognitive and socio-emotional), attitudes and values to solve complex demands of everyday life, in the full exercise of citizenship and in the labor world" (BRASIL, 2017b, p. 8, our translation).

⁷ We would point out that this perspective on the goals of education does not emerge with the BNCC, having been discussed earlier in other curricular documents such as the Law of Guidelines and Bases for National Education (LDB).

These factors boost then perspectives on the History teaching that value the exploration of different narratives and cultural diversity, allowing the subject's own singular perception of time and space and driving actions towards the society in which the subject lives.

We understand that these more general notes do not do justice to all social movements that have a long trajectory in the struggles for representativeness by not specifically bringing up issues that should be guidelines for the whole school, such as ethnic-racial and gender issues. And we also warn that these stands on diversity and multiculturalism were already present in previous documents, perhaps even more explicitly. Thus, when proposing to think about BNCC's potentials that could be appropriated and bring reflections to our practices, we also understand that the document does not "close these doors".

In a general survey by words present in the BNCC, we identified, for instance, that "black", "African" and related signifiers are present 65 times, most of them (25), in the History component, but that they are also present in Portuguese, Physical Education, Art, Sciences, Geography and Religion. The "indigenous" signifier and correlates, on the other hand, are cited 77 times, also majorly in the History component. Moreover, the signifier "gender" and correlates are present 269 times, but all refer to the textual field of the Portuguese language. Thus, in a more precise search, we used the signifier "woman", which appeared 4 times, 3 of them in History and "homosexuals" appeared only once. We can conclude briefly, as it is not the intention of this article to carry out a detailed analysis on this issue, that there are some advances and recognitions of these struggles in the BNCC, but there is still much to be done, especially in regard to the gender issue.

Regarding the specific proposal for the History component, the document explores the concept of "Historian attitude", defining it as an action role that teachers and students can play in the teaching and learning process through different sources. "In this dimension, the historical object becomes an exercise, in a memory laboratory focused on the production of a knowledge specific to History." (BRASIL, 2017b, p. 396, our translation).

Considering the historical knowledge as a necessary knowledge that originates in the present time and dialogues with it, the document points to the need to understand the historical process as a narrative construction:

The past / present relationship is not processed automatically, as it requires the knowledge of theoretical references capable of bringing intelligibility to the selected historical objects. An object only becomes a document when appropriated by a narrator who gives it meaning, making it capable of expressing the dynamics of the life of societies. **Therefore, what interests us in historical knowledge is to perceive the way in which individuals constructed, with different languages, their narrations about the world in which they lived and live, their institutions and social organizations.** In this sense, “The historian does not make the document speak: it is the historian who speaks and the explanation of his criteria and procedures is fundamental to define the scope of his discourse. Every and each operation with documents, therefore, is rhetorical by nature” (BRASIL, 2017b, p. 395, our emphasis, our translation).

Hence, in the highlighted excerpt, we can observe the appreciation of reading historical sources that manifest themselves through different languages. At no point, in the introductory text of the History component, specific lines of approach to historiography are highlighted. What is elicited for the teacher and the other subjects who will use this document in their practices is the problematization of historical knowledge. This way, it is the “Historian attitude” that is highlighted as a practice for those who are involved in the teaching of History.

Ana Maria Mauad (2018), in an article that addresses the uses of the past, also explores this concept of the “Historian attitude”, defining it as a:

Notion that challenges us to put ourselves in front of time, in a movement in which the past time is calibrated in relation to the present, both through the continuity of the practices shared between social groups, and through the lens of distance, difference and discontinuity that make us look at the past with “wooden eyes”. An attitude that inserts us into the temporal flow as agents committed to a history, which is done each day by each one, forging a collective tomorrow (MAUAD, 2018, p. 29, our translation).

It is this attentive look at the historical sources that is highlighted by the document. And it is more than a methodological look at the sources, it is a world perspective provided by the History component. As educational practices, the Historian’s attitude must abide by processes of a) identification; b) comparison; c) contextualization; d) interpretation; and e) analysis (BRASIL, 2017b). The process of a) identification consists of the description of the object studied,

providing different forms of perception and interaction related to its time, space and social relations; b) the comparison provides a look at the otherness and a reading of the similarities and differences in different languages; c) the contextualization instigates the student to locate specific moments and places of the studied object to assign meanings consistent with his time and society; d) the interpretation stimulates the building of critical thinking, going beyond the information offered by the object itself, to relate the importance of the historical object and its values; and, finally, e) the analysis appears as the final stage of this process and provides the student's autonomy and protagonism when problematizing and surpassing the knowledge presented.

It is in the exercise of the "Historian attitude" that speech, reading and writing practices are promoted, not only of specific knowledge in the field of historiography, but also of "literacy practices" that shape and signify the world of life (AZEVEDO; MONTEIRO, 2013). Thus, we believe in the potential of the meaning that the Historian attitude bestows. It is not a question of training Historians but endowing different subjects with autonomy to use their word and position in their social life from the possibilities of past uses.

In different instances of social life, it is possible to assume a Historian attitude. What is this attitude about? To inquire into the past as one of the dimensions of the porous ground of the present where traditions, residual behaviors reside, but from where, when problematized, a critical knowledge emerges and impels us to action (MAUAD, 2018, p. 40, our translation).

Exercising the Historian attitude is to battle the one-sided History, because we came to understand that the historian's action is a discursive construction based on the interpretation of a reality. This practice of knowledge as a production also extends to the classroom scenario, which should be based on the "reconstruction" of the processes that lead to the production of school knowledge, allowing the student to learn to "read history", which can be applied in different situations of his / her daily life (SILVA; MORAIS, 2017). Consequently, the knowledge of the History component can be better systematized, grounded and analyzed when filtered from the historian's attitude, contributing with possibilities of construction of diverse world readings.

Closing remarks

Establishing a line of reasoning between what was exposed in the second part of this article, which sought to understand the meanings in dispute for the teaching of History throughout the BNCC constitution, and what we can observe as established in its final version, we identified how the curriculum presents itself as a field of disputes, a constant to-and-fro movement in order to define what to teach.

BNCC is not an innovative or pioneering document. It is a movement of continuities, initiated in the 1988 Constitution, going through the LDB, the PCNs and the DCN, always struggling for the definition of Education and, in this specific case, the teaching of History. As the BNCC document itself indicates, it is the result of curriculum prescriptions prior to it. Law 10.639/2003 (BRASIL, 2003) and 11.645/2008 (BRASIL, 2008), are examples of how previous movements were inserted in the production of the new document.

Are there advances in the BNCC concerning the ultimate objectives of Education? Yes, but we cannot consider it a revolutionary or innovative document. There are many residues as well. Along with the perspective of the other, of difference and alterity, many Eurocentrism marks are still found in the proposal for the History component, according to the articles we analyze here.

We believe that the Historian attitude is an important concept on which the BNCC relies, offering many opportunities for the development of historical school knowledge. The Historian attitude emphasizes the importance of looking at different sources and documents. It is from the sources that History is made and thus we can see possibilities to combat historical negationism, a theme that has emerged with force through speeches of an authoritarian and conservative order.

In this article, we intended to reflect on the meanings produced in the History community as of the BNCC and explore how History teachers can appropriate this curriculum document. We believe that there are still many open questions that professionals in the field will be able to address in order to instigate and amplify the discussions on the relationship between teaching History and the BNCC.

REFERENCES

AZEVEDO, Patrícia Bastos de; MONTEIRO, Ana Maria Ferreira da Costa. A sala de aula e a produção de sentido em práticas de letramento na história ensinada. *Práxis Educativa*, Ponta Grossa, v. 8, n. 2, p. 559-580, jul./dez. 2013.

BALL, Stephen J. Diretrizes políticas globais e relações políticas locais em educação. *Currículo sem Fronteiras*, [s.l.], v. 1, n. 2, p. 99-116, 2001.

BRASIL. [Constituição (1988)]. *Constituição da República Federativa do Brasil*. Brasília, DF: Presidência da República, 2016. Available at: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/constituicao/constituicaocompilado.htm. Accessed on: Sept. 30, 2020.

BRASIL. Presidência da República. *Lei nº 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996*. Estabelece as diretrizes e bases da educação nacional. Brasília, DF: Presidência da República, 20 dez. 1996. Available at: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/L9394.htm. Accessed on: Mar. 23, 2021.

BRASIL. Lei nº 10.639, de 9 de janeiro de 2003. Altera a Lei nº 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996, que estabelece as diretrizes e bases da educação nacional, para incluir no currículo oficial da Rede de Ensino a obrigatoriedade da temática “História e Cultura Afro-Brasileira”, e dá outras providências. *Diário Oficial da União*: seção 1, Brasília, p. 1, 10 jan. 2003. Available at: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/2003/110.639.htm. Accessed on: Sept. 10, 2020.

BRASIL. Lei nº 11.645, de 10 de março de 2008. Altera a Lei nº 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996, modificada pela Lei nº 10.639, de 9 de janeiro de 2003, que estabelece as diretrizes e bases da educação nacional, para incluir no currículo oficial da rede de ensino a obrigatoriedade da temática “História e Cultura Afro-Brasileira e Indígena”. *Diário Oficial da União*: seção 1, Brasília, p. 1, 11 mar. 2008. Available at: <http://www2.camara.leg.br/legin/fed/lei/2008/lei-11645-10-marco-2008-572787-publicacaooriginal-96087-pl.html>. Accessed on: Apr. 10, 2020.

BRASIL. Presidência da República. *Lei nº 13.005, de 25 de junho de 2014*. Aprova o Plano Nacional de Educação – PNE e dá outras providências. Brasília, DF: Presidência da República, 25 jun. 2014. Available at: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2011-2014/2014/lei/113005.htm. Accessed on: Mar. 24, 2021.

BRASIL. Conselho Nacional de Educação (CNE). Conselho Pleno (CP). Resolução nº 2, de 22 de dezembro de 2017. Institui e orienta a implantação da Base Nacional Comum Curricular, a ser respeitada obrigatoriamente ao longo das etapas e respectivas modalidades no âmbito da Educação Básica. *Diário Oficial da União*: seção 1, Brasília, DF, p. 41-44, 22 dez. 2017a.

BRASIL. *Base Nacional Comum Curricular (BNCC)*. Educação é a Base. Brasília, DF: MEC: CONSED: UNDIME, 2017b.

DELEUZE, Gilles; GUATTARI, Félix. *Mil platôs: capitalismo e esquizofrenia* 2. ed. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2011. v. 1.

GABRIEL, Carmen Teresa; COSTA, Warley da. Currículo de História, Políticas da Diferença e Hegemonia: diálogos possíveis. *Educação e Realidade*, Porto Alegre, v. 36, n. 1, p. 127-146, jan./abr. 2011.

GABRIEL, Carmen Teresa. Currículo de História. In: FERREIRA, Marieta de Moraes; OLIVEIRA, Margarida Maria Dias de (org.). *Dicionário de Ensino de História*. Rio de Janeiro: FGV, 2019. v. 1, p. 72-78.

GOODSON, Ivor. *A construção social do currículo*. Lisboa: Educa, 1997.

GOODSON, Ivor. *Currículo: teoria e história*. 12. ed. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 2012.

GOODSON, Ivor. *Currículo: teoria e história*. 15. ed. atual. e ampl. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 2018.

GREEN, Bill. Currículo, Política e a Pós-Modernidade: além da questão do conhecimento na pesquisa em currículo. *Currículo sem fronteiras*, [s.l.], v. 17, n. 3, p. 501-514, set./dez. 2017.

LIMA, Douglas. Uma História Contestada: A História Medieval Na Base Nacional Comum Curricular (2015-2017). *Anos 90*, Porto Alegre, v. 26, e2019101, 2019.

MAINARDES, Jefferson. Abordagem do ciclo de políticas: uma contribuição para a análise de políticas educacionais. *Educação e Sociedade*, Campinas, v. 27, n. 94, p. 47-69, jan./abr. 2006.

MAUAD, Ana Maria. Usos do passado e história pública: a trajetória do Laboratório de História Oral e Imagem da Universidade Federal Fluminense (1982-2017). *História Crítica*, Bogotá, n. 68, p. 27-45, abr./jun. 2018.

MONTEIRO, Ana Maria Ferreira da Costa. Ensino de História: lugar de fronteira. In: ARIAS NETO, José Miguel (org.). *História: guerra e paz*. XXIII Simpósio Nacional de História. Londrina: ANPUH: Finep, 2007. v. 1, p. 71-97.

MONTEIRO, Ana Maria Ferreira da Costa; PENNA, Fernando de Araújo. Ensino de História: saberes em lugar de fronteira. *Educação e Realidade*, Porto Alegre, v. 36, n. 1, p. 191-211, jan./abr. 2011.

OLIVEIRA, Dennison de. Uso de periódicos para o ensino de História na Educação Básica, projeto 1917: mídia, guerra, greve e revolução. *Revista Intersaberes*, [s. l.], v. 12, n. 25, p. 98-105, jan./abr. 2017.

PEREIRA, Nilton Mullet; RODRIGUES, Mara Cristina de Matos. BNCC e o passado prático: temporalidades e produção de identidades no ensino de História. *Arquivos analíticos de políticas educativas*, [s.l.], v. 26, n. 107, p. 1-22, set. 2018.

PERRENOUD, Philippe. *Construir as competências desde a escola*. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 1999.

SILVA, Marcos. “Tudo Que Você Consegue Ser” – Triste BNCC/História (A versão final). *Ensino em Re-Vista*, Uberlândia, MG, v. 25, n. Especial, p. 1004-1015, 2018.

SILVA, Marco Antônio; MORAIS, Suelena Maria de. Atitude historiadora na leitura dos não-lugares. *E-hum*, Belo Horizonte, v. 10, n. 2, jul./dez. de 2017.

SILVA, Francisco José Balduino da; SANTOS, Jean Mac Cole Tavares; FERNANDES, Márcia Frota. BNCC e o currículo de História: interpretações docentes no contexto da prática. *Currículo sem Fronteiras*, [s.l.], v. 19, n. 3, p. 1011-1025, set./dez. 2019.

TEIXEIRA, Igor Salomão; PEREIRA, Nilton Mullet. A Idade Média nos currículos escolares: as controvérsias nos debates sobre a BNCC. *Diálogos*, Maringá, v. 20, n. 3, p. 16-29, set./dez. 2016.

Text received on 10/03/2020.

Text approved on 12/28/2020.