Interculturality as a Construction of a Political (S) Epistemic (S) Project of the Victims of Modern World System

Luis Fernando Villegas Bayas
Universidad Politécnica Salesiana

Abstract

In this article we will address the issue of multiculturalism as a political - ethical-epistemic project from the victims of the modern world system. Therefore, we seek to contribute to incite and invite the various subjects thinking, logic and rationales historically excluded, invisible and subordinate within modern states that generated the hegemonic uniqueness of these structures of racialization.
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1.0. Introduction

Addressing, in this article the issue of multiculturalism as a political and ethical epistemic project, we approach it from a critical perspective. Therefore, we do not start from the problem of diversity or difference itself, but from the structural-racial problem. That is, from the recognition that difference is built within a colonial structure and matrix of racialized and hierarchical power, with whites and "bleached" at the top the indigenous peoples and Afro-descendant peoples at the bottom (Walsh, 2009, 2 (c)).

Interculturality as an ethical-political-epistemic project will work as a process that we build from the social basis of organized sectors, in contrast to the functional interculturality that is exercised from above, from international organizations, the State, etc. Therefore, we approach interculturality as a "tool" for the transformation of structures, institutions and social relations, and the construction of conditions of being, thinking, knowing, learning, feeling and living differently. This article connects directly with the political projects that are born of the organized sectors, as long as it allows us to reconstruct hope and make possible our "dreams" and desires, transcending the level of what has been naturalized as The only way to live.

Interculturality understood and constructed critically does not yet exist, it is something to be built. Therefore, within our reflection, we will understand it as a strategy, action, permanent process of relationship and negotiation between, in conditions of respect, legitimacy, symmetry, equity and equality (Walsh, 2009, 2 (c)). But the core of our approach is focused on understanding multiculturalism as a political, social, ethical and epistemic project -of knowledge and skills, therefore even the title of this article itself.

For this reason, critical interculturalism becomes a contribution to question power, its pattern of racialization and the difference that has been built in function of it. Therefore, your project is not simply to recognize, tolerate or incorporate the different within the matrix and established structures. It is to implode from the difference in the colonial structures of the power like challenge, proposal, process and project; Is to "reconceptualize" and re-found social, epistemic and existential structures that put into play and in an equitable relation diverse cultural logics, practices and modes of thinking, acting and living.

Interculturality, therefore, is a social, political and civilizing proposal that emerges as a result of the accumulated social and historical struggles that are carried out, especially the peoples and nationalities, in response to the process of coloniality of power exercised by a State, By a society, by a discriminating and exclusionary civilization, which historically has sought its homogenization, its subalternization and its domination.

1.1. The Problem of the Definition of Intercultural

We find a bilevel in interculturality, the first referred to the recognition and respect for the cultures of others and the others and the second involves a process in which despite opting to dialogue is not free of conflicts, since its landing questioned some of the concepts of modern politics (Dussel, 2006 (b)) as it is the notion of the nation State. Therefore, not enough recognition of the other as to others, indeed sets a process in which interculturalism modifies the traditional sense of social struggles.

The notion of multiculturalism does not refer only to the relationship between cultures, it is extended to the relationship between the sexes--men, women, gays, etc.--between generations-children, young people, seniors, adults, between social classes - rich, poor, middle class - between religions - Muslims, atheists, Christians, Buddhists-. In this way, we realize income to the specificity by all subdivisions as well as the opening of a complex field. As a result, a person is crossed by different intercultural fields: can be biologically male, gay option, being young, belonging to the Muslim religion and come from a poor family.

Each of the above aspects involves a conflict with their peers while creating new understandings of multiculturalism. It is
one thing to be man in an indigenous culture and another in a mestizo culture, another thing to be gay in the Muslim world and a “godless world” man and otherwise be gay man as rich or poor, and this is experienced differently if you are young, boy or girl, adult or someone older. We see the universality abstraction of concepts disappear with the challenge of responding to the philosophical paradoxe of the one and the multiple (Casto Gomez, 2007, 79).

As Catherine Walsh (Walsh, 2009, (a)) has pointed out, interculturality of origin in the South is separated from multiculturalism and Eurocentric pluralism; Because it does not only want the recognition of other cultures, or aim at tolerance as the maximum political conquest, but necessarily goes into the construction of egalitarian policies. Multiculturalism makes sense in ancestrally racist cultures, interculturalism is generated in the processes of social movements that have condensed thousands of cultures to marginalization for racist reasons.

The political conception of interculturality is subject to several variables: affirmation of diversity, protection and strengthening of peoples and nationalities through languages new forms of political organization (Dussel, 2009), legitimation of their territories, insertion of their systems Legal, acceptance of their own "economic" systems, other models of education, recognition of their health practices. From what has been raised up to now, in the horizon of the article, we can ask: Does interculturalism rationalize or divert the struggles of social movements that seek to make possible another world (s) where all worlds are possible? Is atomism a danger or a wealth of peoples' struggle? Does interculturality imply a renunciation of judgment over the other? What concrete policies collaborate for a liberalizing interculturality? What consequences does it have for the monocultural, colonial and racist state to recognize interculturality?

Given the above, it is extremely complex to define what we mean by intercultural. There are several reasons for the difficulty in attempting to develop an intercultural concept. Therefore, critical interculturalism helps us to build a project that does not simply seek to recognize, tolerate or incorporate the different within the matrix and established structures, but rather to "disorganize" colonial structures of power as a challenge, proposal, process and project. It allows us to reconceptualize and re-found social, epistemic and existential structures, which put into the scene and an equitable relation of diverse cultural logics, practices, and ways of thinking, acting and living (Walsh, 2009, (c)).

The very question of the definition of the intercultural can mean a question whose "universality" should not be taken for granted, since it is a very "Western" question, that is to say, a question that is part of the logic of The scientific culture of the West as a culture based largely on the art of knowing define and know how to classify. Therefore, the same question about the possibility of defining what intercultural violence could lead to other cultures that do not give the conceptual definition that gives centrality scientific culture that has shaped the Western world.¹

Second, the attempt to define² involves delimitation, fragmentation, fragmentation. To define it must be determined and fixed. Which in turn is a framework of theoretical references that we usually take from the scientific disciplines in which we have formed or in which we develop as "professionals" of a particular knowledge? But we ask ourselves, what problems does the fact that the conceptualization process divides and fragments generates in the "definition" of the intercultural? It is precisely the fragmentation, the division and the fragmentation that would raise the question of where to achieve the recomposition of the intercultural unity and the integrity of its dimensions - for it is not clear that the resource of interdisciplinary cooperation is sufficient to overcome the negative effects of Monodisciplinary parcelling of the intercultural, but also the question of the "intercultural cost", that is to say, for the loss in substance and intercultural history that can mean the perception of the intercultural from the prism of the disciplines that reduce it to an "object"³ study.

A third reason, intimately related to the previous one, is the one that has to do with the fact that the definitions tend to tend to objectivize the defined. Mainly when definitions operate with the old modern Western dualism which clearly distinguishes between the knower and simultaneously defined and the object released⁴; they reflect an objectifying cognitive process which calls and puts what will be defined as something that is outside, on the "other side", in front of us, this is the definitive subjects. From this perspective, a definition of the intercultural runs the risk of conceiving the field of interculturality as an "objective" mode that is examined at a distance and in which even the subjects, without whose practices and relationships the intercultural space was not woven, appear as a "goal" of study than as managers and authors of the processes in question. Assuming that the gestation of what intercultural has to do with cultural practices and ways of concrete life⁵ also concrete and living human beings, then the prospect of a definition similar preclude see a central aspect of the intercultural, namely that it is a quality which it is inside and not outside⁶ of the life we lead. Seen this way, it would be an obstacle to access to an explanation of the intercultural in the sense of a lively interactive participation in which the subjects (victims who have become conscious) and their practices are at stake. It is they who must carry out the intercultural process, as a political project of liberation (Walsh, 2009, (a)), but just as subjects involved and not as observed objects. As a fourth reason, I want to express that conceptual definition are not only articulated, from disciplinary reference frames but also tend to be part of a theoretical construction.

¹ My accomplishment to the Achuar in WASK-enza, Morena Santiago Province, has allowed me to demonstrate this reality. Well peers / as they are doing college to get a degree in bilingual education find it hard to develop this conceptualizante practice. And just as I had to make a great effort to enter explanatory and discursive dynamics, since I am conditioned by conceptualizantes educational processes developed in the academy. The same difficulty I found in my work as Chairman of the irrigation system Ambato-Huachi-Pelileo. For this, it is constituted with the presence of Salasaca Pueblo. In my personal dialogues and Assemblies of the organization clearly it shows the difficulty of establishing conceptualizations how the Western world has taught us.

² Do not forget that from the point of view of Aristotelian logic, which are debtors in structuring our way of seeing the world and expose our ideas, DEFINE is putting limits on one thing to determine its essential characteristics, is that which allows the thing what it is and not another thing.

³ One of the major difficulties with which modern science is facing and has been deeply questioned today from the same modern scientific paradigm, but mainly from paradigms other that begin to visualize from the struggles of our peoples and cultures, is the fact that everything is studied from the so-called social sciences tends to be "objectified" and reified.

⁴ characteristic of the modern Philosophy

⁵ What Habermas called Worlds of life.

⁶ In the sense of other people, it does not affect me, but only as an object to be known and described as an intellectual object.
Definitions are more than mere theoretical support because they represent, fundamentally, key pieces in the architectural of a theory, especially when it seeks its consolidation in a systemic elaboration of itself. This creates serious difficulties because with this the understanding of the intercultural would be involved in a project of theoretical and systematic construction that, as we have tried to show in these first pages of the article are of a monocultural nature. This leads us to ask a key question: what would be the meaning of talking about the intercultural in a monocultural way?

Now, given these difficulties in general terms, it is necessary to reflect “on" the "concept" (Walsh, 2009, (a)) of interculturality from a perspective located in Latin America, and specifically in Ecuador; Which are linked to geopolitics of place and space, from the historical and present resistance of indigenous and black peoples and nationalities to their construction of a social, cultural, political, ethical and epistemic project aimed at decolonization and transformation.

From this locus of enunciation, interculturality indicates and means processes of construction of a knowledge of another, of a political practice another, of a social (and state) power another and of another society; A different form of thought related to and against modernity/ coloniality, and a paradigm other that is thought through political praxis (Walsh, 2007, 47).

This leads us to maintain that interculturality, as it is presented and understood here, is a "concept" formulated and charged with meaning mainly by the Ecuadorian indigenous movement, which this movement refers to as an "ideological" principle in 1990. Following the conception of Catherine Walh, we can argue that this conceptual configuration is in itself "another." First because it comes from a social movement rather than from the academy; Then because it reflects a thought that is not based on the Eurocentric colonial legacies or the perspectives of modernity; And, finally, because it does not originate in the geopolitical centers of production of academic knowledge, that is, in the global north.

In this article, we explore the significance of interculturality as an "other" perspective and practice, which finds its reason for existence in the coloniality of power. That is, we want to think about the concept of interculturality in relation to the coloniality of power with the colonial difference. We emphasize the notion of "multiculturalism Epistemic", while as a political practice as a counter-response to the geopolitical hegemony of knowledge⁸.

1.2. Idealist Version of Interculturality

We start from a first conception that occurs in the Ecuador of Interculturality. Interculturalism aims at peaceful coexistence of cultures⁹ through recognition of cultural diversity. Interculturality is the peaceful relationship between two or more cultures. To reach this level, there is need to overcome prejudices between superior and inferior cultures, which are the basis of racist and unjust policies. Interculturality appears within the dynamic, sustained and permanent process of interrelationship. Power relations are not mentioned and the affirmation of equality is not so clear. This type of interculturality is articulated to the consciousness and it is underlined by the necessity of participatory processes, which are distinguished from the personal efforts.

Cultures are built over time in the measure of establishing just, equitable and intercultural relations. As a result, cultures are destroyed in colonial, violent, authoritarian, and taxing relations.

The idealization of culture usually contains a vision of culture closed, complete and pure. However, every culture is basically multicultural, and intercultural, that is, it has been and continues to form from contacts between different communities, cultures, in a violent or voluntary, conscious or unconscious way. Therefore, there is no pure culture, that is, in each one we find traces of other cultures, traits that we do not know where and why they originated and features typical of culture.

The tendency to idealize one’s own cultures or cultures of others and others are very common. Their idealization can occur through political factors, fatigue, and disenchantment with our own culture or ignorance of the culture of others. Culture is not itself satisfactory. In every culture, there are functional defects with respect to society. That is why the intercultural politics or intercultural policies that are tried to implement from the State introduces dysfunctions in the society through the joyful recognition of the cultures. Similarly, within cultures, we find factors that work in the opposite direction or bad senses that generate damages in the functioning of society. For this reason, it is dangerous to fall into a romantic interculturality. For this reason, we believe, as Catherine Walsh (Walsh, 2009, (a)) affirms, that interculturality is not a goal, it is always a process of construction, it is a constantly revised political project.

To idealize a culture in the line of interculturality supposes to the culture good of itself. In fact our cultures and the cultures of others and others contain key myths to understand ourselves, but others with nefarious aspects in the construction of identifications. All cultures, including Western ones, do not only have myths, but they are linked to superstitions, some of them harmful and potentially dangerous to Humanity (Hinkelammert, 2006). Morin will say that in every culture there are fixations, fictions, accumulated and uncensored knowledge, gross errors and deep truths. To think and build multiculturalism is important not classified as superstitions and ancient knowledge, key knowledge, a situation that has been shared by the colonizer, but especially the challenge not support culture without self-criticism⁹.

---

¹ Multiculturalism here is intended as a political-ethical-epistemic project. That is, when we think about multiculturalism do not it as intellectual entertainment but situated as we have been holding since the beginning of our work on a project that seeks to maintain, strengthen and develop life.

⁸ This understanding the Interculturalidad is present mainly in state agencies.

⁹ Cf. “Intercultural dialogue This is not only or primarily a dialogue between the apologists of their own cultures, which try to show others the virtues and values of their own culture. It is above all critical dialogue between creators of their own culture (intellectual "frontier" between their own culture and Modernity). They are not those who merely defend themselves against their enemies, but who first the recreated from critical assumptions found in their own cultural tradition and from the same globalizing modernity. The currency can serve as a critical catalyst [if used skilled hand critic’s culture]. But also,It is not even dialogue among critics of the metropolitan “center” with critics of cultural "periphery". It is above all a dialogue among critics of the “periphery”, a South-South intercultural dialogue, before moving to the South-North (Dussel, 2006) dialogue.
1.3. Interculturality as Respect for Differences

In the process of understanding interculturality, the affirmation of respect for differences is very common. And politics appears as the guarantee respect for them. This phenomenon can be seen in internal and external migration processes. The cultures of the towns to which the migrants are directed - generally not welcoming - are the great threats to their cultures. Xenophobia and racism attitudes are against his life.

Faced with the impossibility of accepting the other as another, the interculturality of differences generates a series of security and psychological policies. Respect for differences emphasizes the physical integrity of the foreigner. In addition, the discursive constructions of the difference will admit that the valuation of the other and the other is the evaluation of itself. From politics will be implemented communication strategies to change the xenophobic stereotypes of the supposedly superior culture.

The racist environment provokes the need for a work of self-evaluation, of generating attitudes of acceptance, self-confidence, and optimism. It is also important to seek new relationships of affiliation with the culture. The psychological work is directed to the acceptance of the personal being which would lead to the acceptance of the cultural being. As you can see it is a more inward work of the exposed cultures. In spite of all this, the results in this field are very limited; Because of racism instead of decreasing its increases.

Interculturality addressed from this perspective seeks to avoid intolerance and create the guarantee of diversity from a culture that is apparently respectful of others/others in a situation of vulnerability, but is not articulated to generate equality policies.

Interculturality will be built to the extent that we learn to respect differences, without realizing that who can put those conditions is the world in which the market is central, therefore, the market is who lays the basis of tolerance to consume (Negri 2002, Part II).

Within this way of understanding and living interculturality, there is another perspective of differences that responds to a more national and indigenous context. Under this characterization, respect for heterogeneity is demanded, a requirement inscribed in struggles for a just and equitable relationship (Walsh, 2009, (a)). But one of the most pressing problems within this view is the relationship between “ethnicity” and class. There is no doubt that the marginal are situated in a certain ethnic form and that their status as an exploited class increases racism. The question is whether interculturality loses radicality by separating the concept of the condition of “poor”? Is interculturality diluted by not attempting to transform the unjust system?

It is clear that if we separate the notion of class and ethnicity must admit that intercultural policies become functional to the unjust, exploitative, racist and monocultural system. As well noted by Catherine Walsh there is no interculturality without struggles to change the unjust system. Interculturality places us in a political horizon that leads us to radically transform the structural conditions that characterize our societies, marked by the validity of coloniality in all the orders of life and which are evidenced in inequality, discrimination, racialization, exclusion, dependence, social, economic, political, cultural, ideological, epistemic domination, and control and domination of subjectivities, sensibilities, sexualities, imaginaries and bodies. That is why we maintain that interculturality is a political project. But justice is not radical unless equity relations are taken into account. Being female, Indian or black is not alien to the relations of capitalist exploitation. Therefore, interculturality is the recognition of differences in conflict, so interculturality has to be political.

1.4. Interculturality as a Political Project

The willingness to assume interculturality as a posture of life and thought must lead us to overturn our habits of thinking acquired in processes of socialization and learning monocultural or, rather, intended to produce and reproduce cultural homogeneity. Learn to think again from the dialogue with the other.

Interculturality is not an end in itself but must serve to build the world where different worlds are possible, it must help the transformation of the historical world of today’s human beings. That is why as we said earlier, interculturalism is a political project under construction (Guerrero, 2010, 247). Interculturality is a reality that does not yet exist; It is a political task, it is a possible utopia, it is a goal to achieve, that for it to exist it must be constructed (Guerrero, 2010, 247).

Interculturality has, at least in Ecuador and among social actors, a political meaning, and transformation of both the social relations between the various actors that constitute the country and of the structures and institutions. This does not remove the profound limitations that are generated in the implementation process. In Ecuador, this political perspective has been reached since the mid-1980s and, above all, since the 1990 uprising, in the socio-political struggle of the indigenous movement. It has been the indigenous movement, not the state, NGOs or academia, which has implemented the term, thinking from reality and colonial status to the whole of society. In this line, we can affirm that interculturalism in Ecuador, and from the indigenous movement is directly oriented to shake off the power of coloniality and imperialism (Walsh, 2007, 49). For CONAIE, Confederation of Indigenous Nationalities of Ecuador, Interculturality has a deeply political reach: "The principle of Interculturality respects the diversity of indigenous peoples and nationalities, both Ecuadorian and other social sectors.

¹⁰ That’s what Catherine Walsh called functional multiculturalism, the same that is rooted in the recognition of diversity and cultural difference with goals towards inclusion thereof within the established social structure. From this perspective that seeks to promote dialogue, coexistence and tolerance, multiculturalism is "functional" to the existing system does not touch the causes of asymmetry and social and cultural inequality, nor questions how it works and why it is compatible with the irrationality of the rationalized.

¹¹ Therefore, our proposal has always been in the line of understanding multiculturalism as a liberating project born from the peoples and cultures invisible by this system.

¹² As we mentioned Catherine Walsh, “think multiculturalism from the peculiarity of this political locus of enunciation contrasts with that which encloses the concept of multiculturalism, whose logic and significance-for he thought from” above "tends to hold hegemonic-dominant interests and maintain the centers of power." (Walsh, 2009, 52 (a))
But, at the same time, it demands their unity in the economic, social, economic and political levels, with a look towards the transformation of present structures "(CONAIE, 1997, 12)
For CONAIE, interculturality is a key political principle in the construction of a "new democracy", anti-colonialist, anti-capitalist, anti-imperialist and anti-segregationist; Which guarantees the maximum and permanent participation of peoples and nationalities in decision-making (CONAIE, 1997, 11).

In addition, in the process of interculturality, "the values, principles, knowledge, wisdom of our peoples should not only be respected and archived but should be offered as a contribution from our peoples to society as a whole in terms of change, As substantial elements of an alternative approach "Walsh, 2009, 53, (a)).

Throughout the struggles implemented by the indigenous movement, interculturality has guided the demands, actions, and proposals, aimed at rethinking and refunding the State. For this reason, Interculturality, rather than a relationship between cultures, refers to profound changes so that all these cultures have a reflection, representation, and articulation in the economic, social, legal, political in the fields of knowledge and in the construction of a Society (pluri) national. Thus, as Luis Macas notes, "the proposal of interculturality for us has a great depth, in the sense that this approach has touched the very essence of the dominant power and the current economic system" (Walsh, 2009, 9, a)). It is the central axis of an alternative historical project.

When we emphasize the political and ideological meaning of interculturalism in the form assumed by CONAIE, we want to position it as part of processes and practices that must necessarily be understood as hegemonic and insurgent (Walsh 2009, 54 (a)). Insurgents because they point out historical initiatives and contestation actions that go beyond opposition, resistance and reactive action, showing the capacity to generate alternative proposals, questioning the instances of the dominant power, including the capitalist and globalized neoliberal model, to register in a Project, which from the beginning of our reflection we have been raising, that allows the reproduction and development of life. Projects that we have been building since our daily struggles in the organizational processes we generate.

For all the above, interculturality can be understood as a process of building a new hegemony, which not only defies the racist Liberal Modern State (Hardt, 2002) but also promotes new ways of perceiving, constructing and positioning the Subjectivities, logics, rationalities and different life systems. Therefore, our interest in incorporating the present reflection in the framework of a critique of the Irrationality of the Rationalized and the construction of an ethics of life as part of an ethical-political-epistemic project. Therefore, multiculturalism goes beyond the mere recognition (Fornet-Betancourt, 2004) or inclusion (Fornet-Betancourt, 2004) ¹³, calls for profound changes in all spheres of society, contributing as Galo Ramón says "the Construction of an alternative civilization proposal, a new type of state and a deepening of democracy "(Walsh, 2009, 54 (a)).

Interculturality represents a new conceptual configuration, an epistemic rupture based on the past and the present, experienced as realities of domination, exploitation, and marginalization, which are simultaneously constitutive of modernity coloniality. A conceptual configuration while building a social policy response to these realities and epistemic that occurred and occur, it does mainly but not exclusively from a place of indigenous enunciation ¹⁴.

As a social project and process, interculturality requires for its construction a decolonization of minds and bodies, beings, knowledge, systems and structures; Decolonization aimed at everyone with the intention of imagining and raising a new historical project of society, an "other" project of a "other" society, that explodes the insularity of the national order and the ideological bases that support it, including those of the Mestizaje as a discourse of power (Walsh, 2009, 54 (a)). When we consider interculturality as a political project we refer to a political project from below and de-coloniality. Therefore, we propose an interculturalism aimed at confronting and destabilizing the imaginary constructions of society and nation conceived by the local elites, academia, and the West, to give way to "other" imaginaries and why not to "other" Esperanza's as we have proposed following The thought of Ernst Bloch (Bloch, 2007).

Interculturality as a political project builds bridges, social articulations of meaning, involves relations, interactions, negotiations, dialogues, construction of other forms of otherness, in which symbolic exchanges of meanings, and senses, of actors with different representations of the existence, in which is not exaggerates aborts the difference or nor seeks simply mixing, crossbreeding or hybridization of depoliticized identities, but establishes a dialectic between the membership and the difference between the sameness and otherness, between identity and otherness, but with political content, which means that its has clear the question of power and its exercise as well as of its challenge.

Multiculturalism is a social process of symbolic construction, in which consciousness, will, creativity, social imaginary, representations, hopes, dreams, utopias, the horizons of existence of various actors is expressed at a given moment in history, seeking the construction of other, different ways of feeling, thinking, doing, of meaning, weaving life, ie, a different ethical, aesthetic and erotic existence, to establish an interaction symbolic with other distinct entities, in the perspective of a horizon of another existence that makes it possible to know, recognize, value, respect and live with difference and freedom to every society, people, culture, can build their own senses of existence present and future.

Interculturalism should be seen as a proposal of power and liberating as an insurgent force that opens the perspective of a different dimension of individual and collective existence of our societies. Therefore, we must insist that the construction of an intercultural society, necessarily involves, for the struggle for the transformation of the structural conditions of modern society, which has nothing to do with
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purely cultural or ethnic issues, and make the maintenance and reproduce those conditions of hegemonic domination of one group over another; because while not transform the situation of poverty, exclusion, discrimination, inequality, racism, dependence and domination of the dominant globalist, neoliberal capitalism homogenizing and our societies, ie while the situation of coloniality of power, knowledge and being very difficult to have intercultural societies (Guerrero, 2010, 251) is not exceeded.

Interculturalism is, therefore, a clear political dimension, and more than that, multiculturalism is a political task, since it is not only cultural issue, but fundamentally there is a political question, understood as any attitude, action or individual and collective agency that seeks to transform life. This implies the need to take into consideration as a question of power, its exercise of its reproduction strategic center, as well as its challenge, its distribution but fundamentally overcoming as a practice of colonial domination.

Multiculturalism seen as political task means, considering that its construction goes through the need to make visible how it operates the colonial-imperial matrix of power, show that the coloniality continues to operate on three key levels: the coloniality of power, control the economy, politics, culture, nature and life; coloniality of knowledge operating in the epistemic level, philosophical, scientific for subalternization of languages and knowledge; and coloniality of being the domain of sexuality, of subjectivities, sensitivities, imaginary and bodies.

Therefore, multiculturalism, following reflection Walsh, goes hand in hand with the fight against all forms of colonialism, because there can be intercultural, but all forms of coloniality of power, knowledge and being exceeded.

Interculturalism implies that before the colonial difference, classified, layered, nested and subalternizado diversity and difference, for the legitimization of the dominant order; actors under coloniality make their diversity and difference, insurgents to combat all forms of coloniality of power, knowledge and being political instruments.

Multiculturalism means building as a political task of decolonialization processes, de-subalternization, ruptures with the asymmetries of power, why you can not overlook that there can be intercultural, but all forms of coloniality of power, knowledge and being exceeded.

Equity of power for the full exercise of the rights and obligations of all societies and cultures. Therefore, it is necessary to start building a cosmic otherness that allows us to talk with love and respect, with everything where beats the life that we see, that not only humans, but also the nature, are those of others, on which depends our existence. This means, as we have been saying in the second chapter of our work, the construction of different forms, others feel, think, say, imagine, do, Act, mean, ultimately, ethical, aesthetic and erotic construction of existence, which open spaces to the des-clamping of subjectivities and sexuality; open spaces to the sensitivity in order to face the coloniality of affectivity and start as Patricio Guerrero says to corazonar life (Guerrero, 2010, 256).

1.5. Interculturality as a (S) Building New Ethos

Usually, when it addresses the problem of intercultural it deepens not enough or not raised the political dimension which in this horizon in construction assumes the subjectivity; as the strategic axis from where we must enhance the fight against the coloniality of being. What is building a horizon civilization and humanity another, cross-cultural perspectives? But that will only be possible when we start a process of revolution of the ethos of a different kind of relationship with ourselves and others, allowing us the possibility of living with love, respect, and tolerance, the unbearable difference other (Guerrero, 2010, 266). The only revolution will be possible as well notes Patricio Guerrero, with the insurgent force of tenderness, as the proposal of different values, has little chance to transform ourselves as human beings worthy, if it is not accompanied by changes, not only legal, institutional, structural, but primarily those that occur deep in the ethos, our horizon of values, in the depths of our subjectivities in awareness, knowledge, sensitivities, imaginaries, in bodies, representations and in the perception of reality; without forgetting at the same time, the need to fight for the transformation of the structural conditions that maintain the current discriminatory and exclusive order of coloniality.

Therefore intercultural raised thus has to face two fronts of struggle, one outward which involves addressing the structural conditions of domination, against all forms of coloniality of power and knowledge, and the other to the generally neglected interiority, which questions all forms of coloniality of being, which raises the need to start walking and transform the inner courtyards of our own subjectivity as a requirement for the affirmation of our own diversities, identities and differences, from there to open up to otherness, the dialogic relationship and confrontation with the other.

This transformation of the ethos necessarily involves a reapropriation of the meaning of our subjectivity subject today, alienated and unstructured exercise of the power of the merchandise. There is an urgent and pressing task of decolonization, inside to start a different way of living and loving life and enjoy it in interrelation and coexistence with others. When we lose the sense of our own existence and alienate our subjectivity, the dominant power triumphs and makes us despite our radical speeches, their unconscious players. I believe that following some contemporary reflections on the problem of ideology (Dardot, 2015) can argue that the greatest triumph that obtained the power of
capital in recent times has been the conquest of our subjectivity, understood as coloniality of being, for the control and discipline of subjectivities, of affectivity, of imaginary and bodies in order to empty of humanity and annul the potential of our creative and transformative imagination of the world.

Therefore, one of the fundamental tasks that touches us from ethics and intercultural perspective raised and proposals from the victims of this modern capitalist world system, is to launch a revolutionary transformation of sense in terms of our own subjectivities, initiate a transformation ethos, that allows us to release our subjectivity to recover us / as same / as, and rebuild the everyday scenario empowerment as a different for our lives and for individual and collective history sense. It’s time to generate processes of alienation, desujetamiento to grow in freedom and to be masters of our own desires, our own fears, our own hopes, our own imaginary, of our own bodies, ultimately our own lives. When we are ourselves / as, we will be better able to assume higher as our commitment towards life, the same that we have not been able to meet with integrity, because our subjectivities are fragmented and divided.

The challenge of multiculturalism is to transform the devices into instruments, dogmas program proposals, projects horizons to transform lives, is to build human beings different willing to insurgency in one form or another of thinking, feeling, do, to be, to mean, to live life and fight for it; so only utopia that seems impossible, possible boost struggles that transforms us into all dimensions of life.

We must work on building an intercultural proposal multicolored society, able to pick up the heat of social diversities. This is not only theoretical, but fundamentally political challenge born of the peoples and nationalities commits us all / as we seek wheat and effective in our daily struggles from personal and organizational spaces.

1.6. Conclusions

We can conclude that to understand the problem of multiculturalism, we do not start the problem of diversity or difference in itself, but the structural-racial problem. That is, the recognition that the difference is built inside a colony structure and matrix racialized and hierarchical power: and seen things, multiculturalism as-political-epistemic ethical project is process that we build from the people, in contrast to the functional multiculturalism exerted from above, from international organizations, the state, etc. Therefore, we address multiculturalism as "tool" for the transformation of the structures, institutions and social relations, and building conditions to be, be, think, know, learn, feel and live differently.

That is to say, critique as process and project Interculturality allows us to rebuild hope and make possible our "dreams" and desires, transcending the level of what since has been naturalized as the only way to live life. Interculturalism understood as critically constructed yet there is something to build.

Therefore, in our reflection the set as our strategy, action, relationship and ongoing process of negotiation between, in terms of respect, legitimacy, symmetry, equity and equality.

The approach and practice that emerges from the critical multiculturalism is not functional model of existing society but radically questioning. Therefore, critical multiculturalism becomes a contribution to question power, its pattern of racialization and the difference has been constructed accordingly. It is imploding from the difference in the colonial structures of power as a challenge, proposal, process and project; It is reconceptualizing and re-establish social structures and epistemic stocks, which staged logical and equitable relationship, diverse cultural practices and ways of thinking, acting and living.

Therefore, multiculturalism understands as the project design and proposal as the society, such as political, social project, epistemic and ethical does not stop at the discursive level but becomes praxis of liberation from individuals (victims of the modern world system) to be constituted in such their specific socio-historical practices.
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