Original article

Being with the Other: Education in Diversity, Interculturality and Human Fragilities

Germán Guarín Jurado [a], Miguel Alberto González González [a, *] &
Gonzalo Tamayo Giraldo [a]

[a] Faculty of Social and Human Sciences, Universidad de Manizales, Colombia

Abstract

The following article offers a perspective on otherness from the standpoint of education in diversity and interculturality, with an understanding of human fragilities and the ancient, modern, and contemporary quests to understand ourselves amid religious, economic, legal, political, and cultural differences. It includes an analysis of diversity and its variants, interculturality, and its importance for 21st-century societies that often fall into homogenizations and demonizations of the other, the new, and what disrupts every day, scientific, and cultural realities. Some conclusions are provided in that search, not of perfect peace or seamless coexistence, but convinced that we are full of challenges, moving from the idealizations to the plural and challenging realities of a humanity that learns to live amid differences.

Keywords: Social Fragility, Intercultural Studies, Diversity, Education, Languages.

* Corresponding author:

Miguel Alberto González González, Faculty of Social and Human Sciences, Universidad de Manizales, Colombia.
Email: miguelg@umanizales.edu.co

INTRODUCTION

Thinking the self with the other in terms of education, diversity, interculturality, and human fragility is, in a way, to ask ourselves about a 21st-century humanism, -one that is no longer satisfied with the knowledge built in the ancient Greece, imperial Rome, Renaissance Italy, idealistic Germany, Napoleonic France, or pragmatic Anglo-Saxon cultures, but rather one that requires inspiration from new emergent humanities arising in the global Souths and in the expanded Easts.

Getting into the intercultural education, the linguistic culture, the diversity, the human fragility are the dimensions this text explores drawing on the thinkers of 21st-century humanities.

Being-with-other and with-the-other, radically other, radically different from ourselves, is one of the greatest epistemological, ethical, and political challenges of our time; it is situated on the horizons of the possible, even of what seems impossible and implausible. Ultimately, it relates to the difficult lessons of living together, of configurating between-us the society, the civilization we desire among us; in the plurality of the world, the cosmos and the universe, in the linguistic richness that constitutes us, being-with-others, with the-other, is a foundational ontic and ontological premise, not absolute, that inaugurates a different humanity, expanded to everything previously excluded from the ideals of a superior man, an august and narrow human effigy reduced to today's unsustainable canons.

Openness to education and intercultural studies

The intercultural studies are interested in the various human ways of coming together around the world of culture and how those cultures interact with one another.

Education in the realms of culture is not a new issue; the Greeks took the first organized steps to make education—paideia—a space for the expansion of their culture.

The value of languages

What a fine language is mine, what a good language we inherited from the grim conquerors… they strode across the tremendous mountain ranges, across the wild Americas, searching for potatoes, sausages, beans, black tobacco, gold, corn, fried eggs, with that ravenous appetite that has never been seen again in the world… they devoured everything, along with religions, pyramids, tribes, idolatries just like those they carried in their great bags… We came out losing… we came out winning… they took the gold and left us the gold… they took everything and left us everything… they left us the words. Pablo Neruda.

Losing and winning, winning and losing is the constant question posed by the colonized and conquered peoples by powers that, in their time, impose everything but also leave something behind; they leave some knowledge. Gadamer (2000) speaks about the linguistic richness that constitutes us as humanity; he does so in his critical reading of the European legacy, beyond science, viewing it as a legacy of languages, of languages that are plural and open, from which it becomes essential to recognize

the other, the other that is always different from ourselves, both in personal life history and in the collective history of society, civilization, and culture.

For this reason, the metaphor of linguistic Babel is used today to refer to the different cultural language of the world, each one a koiné: a cultural language of the world, a cosmovision, a comprehensive perspective of the world, different, radically other, whether in Spanish, Portuguese, English, Turkish, French, German, Celt, Nasa Yuwe, Inca, Maya, Aztec, Latin, Greek, so many native languages that acquire value today in the cultural studies and intercultural studies in in Europe, America, Asia, Oceania, Africa, allowing us to relate within a global world-system, cosmopolitan, bridging the rural and the urban, across many ancestral territories.

In the different languages resides the radically other that constitutes us as humanity, the other from each other, of ourselves; recognizing this is essential, recognizing the right to one's own language, without imposing hegemonic languages, "…so that the other is not invisible, does not remain invisible." (Gadamer, 2000, 37). It is a great challenge today "…to defend the entirety of our cultural wealth, to protect it from threats, perhaps, and to prepare ourselves for humanity's imminent mission." (Gadamer, 2000, p. 30), and to value the present nature of our placement in the world as human beings.

With the linguistic pluralism, humanity is safeguarded from dogmatisms, absolutisms, totalitarianisms, and cultural hegemonies; today, it is not about justifying any scientific, political, or cultural superiority, but about preserving the existence on Earth, the Earth itself, and living together within the entirety of culture: "we have to learn to respect others and what is different. Or in other words, we have to learn not to always be right" (Gadamer, 2000, pág. 37). For each person in both personal and social life, it is imperative to learn not to be right, learn to lose in the game, learn it from childhood to better resolve the issues of adult life, its conflicts, its problems.

The different koine, the different linguistic cultures of the world, the plurality of European languages, which is Gadamer's emphasis, and of non-European languages, allow "the other to come closer in their diversity." (2000, p. 37), making it possible to live with the other, live together in differences: "This closeness of the other concerns us, despite all differences.". (Gadamer, 2000, p. 37).

The search for what is one's own: immersing oneself in popular thinking

The so-called Gravity of Thought (Kusch, 1977) invites to think from the ground, from everyday philosophical places, from our existential home, from our territories and communities, therefore finding those major words, those minor words, of our language, our languages, our lives. The grounding of thinking is a de-idealization, de-universalization of critical thinking, enlightened, educational thought, a call to our own words, a call to our own keys for interpreting reality, to what the social sciences today call other thinking categories, a call to our own linguistic representations of reality, which, from what is ours, gain universality about what our shared humanity is.

The gravitas of thought entails a phenomenology of popular thinking, a positioning in the externality of Kantian and neo-Kantian transcendental reason, moving beyond apriorisms and recognizing the possibilities of thinking outside imperial thought. Emphasizing the externality of thought is an intuition found in thinkers like Dilthey (2003), Husserl (1992) and his life-world, Heidegger (1986) with his being-in-the-world, in time, here and now, Levinas (2002) in *Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority*, Ortega y Gasset with his self and circumstances (1960), Dussel (2007), who draws on Levinas's concept of externality for his philosophy of liberation and the Global South, Zemelman (2007) with his concepts of historicity and mediation, and Leopoldo Zea (2003) and his treatment of the humanism of the other person outside classical Western humanism. It's not about referencing the essential attributes of the rational human but about thinking the human situated in Africa, America, Asia, anywhere in the world: an analytic of what happens to us, here, now, *in situ*, in our existential homes.

This is not a folkloric fact; it demands a disposition to think philosophically, a willingness to think about popular life and to discern our place in the world, our being-in-the-world. It is about thinking from that distortion, the deformation we represent according to the European model, as a need for meaning, an ontology of being-poor: the being-poor, Kusch notes, is a consecrated invalidity in the universal, aprioristic thinking, that extends to all humanity. What relation exists between this being-poor and being-finite? They connote the experience of invalidity, a fall, a certain inertia, as part of the effort to think about the totality that philosophy so often addresses.

Let us quote Kusch (1977, p. 39):

Immersing oneself in popular thought also means embracing a tradition crafted by an anonymous collective in the midst of which we go about our daily lives. It is understanding the everyday gestures and language, which are also our gestures and our language, yet it also conveys a meaning that belongs to everyone and, for that very reason, contains the essence of a philosophy.

This is a philosophy of natural consciousness, of mythical consciousness, of historical and symbolic consciousness that helps us think about our place in the world from the everyday realities of our days, from our languages, our places.

Critic of the Westernization of culture

It is necessary to unveil the intrinsic concept of a philosophical field within a metaphysical horizon, which is an intuition of the human in America, Africa, Asia, Oceania, and Europe, with a general sense; our constitutive being in diverse America, Asia, Oceania, and Africa, Europe, is the idea of a special place of enunciation, but more than that, it is the possibility of a global sense of being humanity. If this is how we think, it is easy to say that the consideration of the Eurocentric Western man is neither exhaustive nor exclusive.

The critique of the Westernization of culture questions what it means to be human in America, Africa, Asia, and forgotten Europe, exploring the possibility of a unique philosophical anthropology, and the local episode of being human in the particular historical and cultural geos, situated beyond imperial thought. What is it like, how does it think, for a resident in American cities like Bogotá, Buenos Aires, Mexico City, Santiago de Chile, San José de Costa Rica—just to name a few examples—in the American provinces such as Manizales, Salta, Iguala, Concepción, Heredia, in Asian and African provinces, in rural settings, in ancestral territories and communities? Thus, it is about reconstituting what it means to be human from provincial territories, not just from the great metropolises.

The phenomenology of popular thought that this implies, according to Kusch, opens up to a speculative, metaphysical horizon, in light of the question: What is man? What is the American man? What is the universal man in question? What is humanism? And it is answered from America, from Africa, Asia, Oceania, the Pacific and the Caribbean, the Indian Ocean: "In this sense, thinking the human in America is to start from the total interiority of the problem, even if this is viewed as exterior by imperial thought" (Kusch, 1977, p. 35). These points of view transcend the analytical saturation of the problem in Western discussion.

This philosophical will to think about our humanity, which is not folkloric but arises from the popular, is based on what affects us; from this affectation emerges the need for meaning, for awareness: natural consciousness, mythical consciousness, historical consciousness, symbolic consciousness.

Perhaps in those structural affections of subjects, we are affected peoples; the internal concepts of our own philosophical and anthropological field, with a general, universal, speculative horizon, are found there. Every affectation is inherent to a situation. We are affected peoples, subjects affected in situation. This compels us to think from the concrete, just as Descartes, Kusch reminds us, he thought from the stove next to which he had the idea for his *Discourse on the Method*.

> The stove evidently refers to the circumstance that allowed the cogito to be conceived, but also to Descartes' existential moment, as well as, among other things, the historical moment in which the idea had to emerge. And stove, existential moment, and historical moment trace a conditioned space, a sort of philosophical place where my vital doubt crystallizes around the stove amid a conceptual tangle that, at a given moment, forms a philosophical here and now. (Kusch, 1977, p. 41).

The above exemplifies what Kusch considers the moment of globality of a situated reflective act within the horizon of a universal philosophical project. What are our places, our affected situations, what are our affections, our philosophical projects, our educational projects? From the sacred place of the indigenous, from the territory of the peasant, from the everyday life of the city dweller, from the rural or urban home, from the situations that affect us, it is possible to think philosophically with a universal human horizon. And we must deny, not just affirm; every apophasis demands doubt.

What constitutes the essence of being human among us are the vital questions about who we are, affecting us as individuals, as peoples, and as communities and nations. These questions arise in philosophical spaces that challenge an external attribution of deficiency imposed on non-Eurocentric perspectives by the Western canon of philosophy and culture. They are questions of identity, constitution, and law—questions of sovereignty and citizenship, existential questions about being here and now.

To live with the other-to participate in the other

"We are all others and we are all ourselves." (Gadamer, 2000, p. 38); awareness of oneself, of others, of ourselves, is today the fullness of historical consciousness in the difficult learning of living together. This awareness is enriched by coexistence with diverse cultures and languages, religions and beliefs, by coexisting with the world and with others, with various and distinct worldviews. This closeness between others, between us, is sometimes forgotten, often forgotten. Therefore, it must be reiterated among human beings, communities, peoples, and nations.

It is not possible, not legitime, to speak about one only language, about one universal or global language, about one hegemonic language; not for Europe, nor for America, Africa, Asia, Oceania: "the language is primarily that which is spoken by the natural linguistic community, and only natural linguistic communities are in a position to construct together what unites them and what they recognize in others." (Gadamer, 2000, p. 38). Okey will never be said to everything; this applies to science, politics, poetry and love.

Philosophical sciences refer to those fields based of knowledge based on the plurality of linguistic traditions transmitted through language, according to Gadamer (2000). Therefore, we must value each linguistic community, recognize it and affirm its right to its native language, its origin; recognize its right to its cosmovision, its science, art and religion, its myths and poetry, its everyday speech, and its right to interpret and translate from its unique cultural language of the world.

For Gadamer (2000), this is an invitation to recognize oneself, to recognize others, to acknowledge all that can be conveyed through language- in poetry, philosophy, history, religion, costumes, law, and the entirety of culture. When it is not about dominating something or someone, "we will learn time and again to recognize the difference of the other." (Gadamer 2000, p. 40). We will learn to "participate in the other, to gain participation in the other." (Gadamer 2000, p. 40).

Whether or not we believe ourselves to be carriers of universal or plural reasons, we are fragile— a *sine qua non* condition of all cultures and of peoples affected by the global-world-system. Amid poverty, human misery, the pettiness inherent in surrounding hegemonies, and suffering in so many southern, alternative, and global territories, human fragilities become a force for placing and voicing what is human in the western suburbs of yesterday and today.

The human fragilities in the western suburbs of yesterday and today

When there are two, there are no certainties, and when the other is recognized as a 'second' in their own right, as a second sovereign, not merely an extension, an echo, an instrument, or a subordinate of mine, that uncertainty is acknowledged and accepted. Being two means accepting an undetermined future. Bauman (2007.P.37)

Our fragility has been placed in the realm of human suffering, in the realm of the unwanted, in the suburbs of emotionality. It is not possible for contemporary Western culture to allow itself to be moved by what is fragile, by harmlessness, by that which exalts the creative nature of humanity. It is unprecedented for Western culture to put itself in the place of its own fragility and that of others—to embrace it, to value it, to accompany it, to recognize it, and to create from it.

The above means thinking-feeling human finitude, considering that we are relational and contingent—that is, we need others to be-in-the-world, while acknowledging that things may or may not happen. This implies that attempting to control everything around us will be both biased and clearly unnecessary. Here lies one of the central aspects of being fragile: the capacity to know and recognize that we make mistakes, and that these, when understood, foster shared learning.

Fragilities are one of the aspects that define us as humanity; within them, the diversity of who we are is recreated, and the richness of the dialectic between difference and sameness that characterizes us as humans is expressed. It is on this foundation that interculturality relies to decolonize the hegemonic powers that subjugate collective action and intimidate individual feeling-thinking.

It is through the consideration of diversity and sameness that, culturally, we can delve into differences and divergences which, when engaged in dialogue, always find a debatable, generative, and constructive unfolding. Diversity in action, understanding, and recognition forms horizons, dreams, utopias—existential reasons for continuing to live in constant movement, in continuous progress, without extreme speeds that create such vertigo that we can no longer even see the path we tread. Extreme speeds in existence exhaust becoming, disrupt, and nearly negate time itself, producing accelerations that prevent us from feeling the world and inhabiting it. Every denied moment is a clear sign of unconsciousness and indifference, which, beyond forgetting others as messengers, withholds all capacity for self-reference. Let us examine what Mélich (2021) proposes on this topic:

Speed prevents the experience of the world. What it produces are experiences that succeed one another, without respite, without rest. To learn to see the world again, to learn to inhabit it, we must save it from both the denial of time and its extreme acceleration. (p.161)

Likewise, the denial of time prevents us from seeing the rhythm that occurs between duration and instant, elements of time that establish hopeful ways of being; therefore, the challenge is to configure

hope every time we walk in company, with the other who is different and illuminates the possibility of being in difference. In Freire's words (1992), this can be envisioned as follows:

> without disregarding the historical, economic, and social reasons that explain it, I do not understand human existence and the necessary struggle to improve it without hope and without dreams. Hope is an ontological necessity; despair is hope that, losing its direction, becomes a distortion of ontological necessity. As a program, despair immobilizes us and makes us succumb to the fatalism in which it is impossible to gather the essential forces for the creative struggle of the world. (p.24).

As an ontological necessity, hope not only mobilizes life but also addresses the meaning of being part of a co-constructed world, and, in conversational logic, it allows for the recognition of the extent of one's own actions when social life is configured in encounter. Hope, from the perspective of critical humanism, makes it history, becoming, and a fundamental part of human existence. In this sense, Tamayo Giraldo, G. and Guarín Jurado, G. (2023), propose:

> Critical humanism allows us to understand ourselves in the encounter with all human beings to whom, due to a Eurocentric doctrinal humanism, their humanity has been denied, as Leopoldo Zea (2003) tells us. Humanism today is not a strictly idealistic doctrine; it is a phenomenological, existential, critical attitude, on a strictly human scale, that places the human in its rightful limit and place, in its own fallibility, adds Morey, in situation, in plurality, which coincides with Zea and Zemelman, alongside Jean Paul Sartre, who makes critical humanism a historicized, existential humanism that acknowledges that humanity is not only in man, and even less so in the way the West has proclaimed. (p. 44).

A hopeful humanism that, through its generative conversations, emancipates and, by stretching life, pulls it out of the agonizing lethargy of hopelessness, provoking an approach to existence, to one's own history with memory, and to life put into collective action. In the words of Guarín (2018):

> The subject knows himself in the active memory of his time, his history, and his destiny, almost biographically, in the autonomous reflection of the memories and possibilities that bring him into action; that is what is presented in letter VII, the case of Socrates. The maieutic not only elaborates the possibility of a question–answer game, not only develops his technique, but also fosters a testimony of life, self-critical of himself, of his place in the world, critical of his time. The technique is inscribed in a conversation, in a dialogue, in a testimony, where thinking differently prevails, the meaning of life. (p. 88).

The conversations summon, allowing us to dialogue about what happens humanly; conversing radicalizes the human interculturally, prudently separating us from violence and helping us advance in humanity. It is through words that we construct the world we inhabit, and it is with them that we navigate an existence in search of meaning. Words and fragility serve as the anteroom to a new enchantment of both our own and shared world. In the same way, the empathetic listening that should accompany every conversation allows us to transcend that dialogical dynamic of the deaf, which only reinforces self-absorbed monologues that do not generate reflexivity and self-reference. In this sense, Tamayo G., et al. (2023), propose:

Empathetic listening is important in human relationships for three reasons outlined below. First, it demonstrates immediacy in recognizing the emotions and situations of individuals; second, it makes the speaker feel better because they are being understood and valued; finally, the person who is listened to empathetically acknowledges the effort, time, and energy that the listener invests to understand them. (p. 182)

It is through fragility and empathetic listening that we confront our emotions; they, passionate and proud, also recreate what we are as men and women. They, calm and serene, put us in front of the humanity that accompanies us when we inevitably find ourselves inhabiting the collective world.

It is the fragilities, conversations, hope, and human emotions that bring us closer to the idea of transformation, to learning, to new beginnings. In other words, their recognition helps us evolve as humanity, considering that starting from scratch is not possible; there is always something at the beginning, which makes us irreducibly historical. With them, we recognize that the other—who is different—will always be fundamental for the co-construction of what we are as a planet. It is within the global world-system that we know ourselves to be accompanied, and in cooperation, we become aware of the necessity of the other who walks with us. It is a journey from the conscious "I" to the creative "we," which is, in other words, a becoming; it is a movement forward. In this regard, Zemelman (2011) states:

… the other is sought from the possibility created by the need for the other. In this way, historical consciousness transforms the relationship with others into a space of possibilities. And language turns the need to exist into the need to share (p. 78).

A conscious "I," which is not aware of everything, approaches the other with humanity, halting the indifference that prevents us from knowing ourselves and that, above all, denies—through indifference—the possibility of being and being in the world with the necessary candor that all shared creation requires. It is a going and returning, a journey to the co-inhabited world and a return to the interior of the one who consciously recreates that world which has been constructed collectively. To exist and to insist; that is the issue that interculturality, as an expanded option of diversity, grants us.

Interculturality, multiculturality and pluriculturality

When thinking about interculturality, at first glance, it might be confused with multi- and pluriculturality, so some clarifications are necessary to differentiate them. Interculturality means *between cultures*, but it is not simply a contact between cultures; rather, it is an exchange established on equitable terms, in conditions of equality. In addition to being a goal to reach, interculturality should be understood as an ongoing process of relationship, communication, and learning among people, groups, knowledge, values, and different traditions, aimed at fostering, building, and encouraging mutual respect and the full development of individuals' capacities, beyond their cultural and social differences. Interculturality seeks to break with the hegemonic history of a dominant culture and subordinated others

and, in this way, to strengthen traditionally excluded identities in order to build, in everyday life, a respectful and legitimate coexistence among all groups in society (Walsh, 2007).

Multiculturalism is a definitive, descriptive expression. It refers to the multiplicity of cultures that exist within a given space—whether local, regional, national, or international—without necessarily involving any relationship between them. Multiculturalism is understood as cultural relativism, meaning a separation or segregation between cultures without any relational aspect. This conception of multiculturalism is built within two very different political contexts. One addresses the demands of subordinated cultural groups within national society, through programs, treaties, and special rights as responses to exclusion: a multiculturalism based on the search for something of one's own under the banner of justice and equality, of non-interference and preservation of one's own identity. The other political context stems from the conceptual foundations of the liberal state, where everyone supposedly shares the same rights. In this context, the tolerance of the "other" without interference is considered sufficient to allow the national (and monocultural) society to function without major conflict, issues, or resistance. In multiculturalism, groups feel alien to the country where they find themselves.

Pluriculturality suggests a historical and current plurality, in which several cultures coexist within a territorial space and, together, form a national whole, identifying with the country they inhabit. Although the distinction between the multi- and the pluri is subtle and minimal, the key difference is that the former refers to a collection of distinct cultures, often with yuxtaposed forms of social organization (Tourine, 1990), while the latter emphasizes plurality both between and within cultures themselves. In other words, multiculturalism typically refers to, in a descriptive way, the existence of distinct cultural groups that, in social and political practice, remain separated, divided and opposed, whereas pluriculturalism indicates a coexistence of cultures within the same territorial space, although without deep equitable interrelation.

Diversity and interculturality

Diversity is the very essence of humanity; it is one of its intrinsic traits, as each individual expresses autonomy in their ways of thinking, witnessing, feeling, acting, submitting, revealing, and rebelling. Nevertheless, each individual will always share certain dimensions with their vital social space, that is, with their cultural territory. Biological conditions bring us closer together; DNA readings show how adjacent we are, the number of shared traits and biotypic similarities. However, these traits are not homogenizing, nor is the cultural environment homogenizing. The ways in which we interpret future events, experience the present, or reconcile the past vary, making cultural diversity a quest for a foundational order that demands naming and re-signifying plural languages. This search places the disparate world of things, opened up to unknown dynamics, into a polemic tension. Still, it cannot ignore the human condition of hoping for the unprecedented and possible.

Thus, the notion of diversity, as González (2016) recalls, gains strength as a foundation for building a democratic environment that embraces diverse knowledge, requiring empathetic listening, which leads to respect and dignity for the human condition. This entails shared struggles to cultivate skills, respect for different abilities, the strengthening of vocations, and recognition of learning styles, so that individual, socioeconomic, ethnic, gender, and linguistic differences do not become grounds for discrimination or idealization.

Diversity comes from the Latin diversitas, in English diversity, in French diversité, in german verschiedenheit, in Italian diversitá-, which generally, translates to any form of otherness, difference, or disimilarity. Diversity is that which is distinctive, different, distant.

González (2016) explains that:

Diversity is the constellation of objects, languages, cultures, feeling bodies that love, hate, desire, and think. Universes of epistemes, of doxas, and of rooted or symbolic ways of thinking. Nebulae of worldviews, of world-hearings, of world-feelings, of chaotic states, of chaos-intuitions, of chaos-feelings; galaxies of ideas, feelings, and reasonings that challenge human and non-human existence in all its manifestations (p. 24).

Thus, the diversities between the inside, the outside, and the borders, as Devalle (2006) notes, mean that "Diversity, considered as a value, involves guiding education toward the principles of equality, justice, and freedom, all of which establish a permanent commitment to cultures and minority groups" (p. 39). This implies that the fight for the great ideals of humanity should not be limited to the privileged.

According to González (2016), it is understood that there are: a) Biological and non-biological diversities—biodiversities; b) Cultural diversities or expressions of diversity; c) Epistemic diversities; d) Digital diversities and cyber diversities; e) Mental and metaphysical diversities. Each of these dimensions integrates all forms that exist and do not exist, that are tangible or intangible, audible or inaudible, smellable or unsmellable, tasteable or untasteable, imaginable and unimaginable.

Gonzalez (2016) writes that the Diversities in their simbolizations, encompass, among many organizative-simbolic forms:

Biological diversities – biodiversities and non-biological… Cultural diversities or cultural expressions of diversity… Epistemic diversities… Digital diversities and cyber-diversities… Mental and metaphysical diversities. (pp. 26-30)

From these organizational forms, diversities inquire into many other social and cultural dynamics, not to judge but to learn how to navigate together, both intimately and externally. In Skliar (2005), intimacy and otherness go hand in hand; it is language that creates interaction or tension in that relationship. Events and occurrences also play a role, but it is through words that we are able to access the intimate, the other, and the plural aspects of others and ourselves.

To educate ourselves in the search for what is our own, acknowledging our fragilities, cultures, and accepting diversity.

The great challenge in education is to go beyond theories and ideals to re-signify personal and communal every day realities, recognizing ourselves as fragile beings, seekers of our own identities, and defenders of diversity and interculturality.

Any educational process that evades understanding, dialogue, and interaction between cultures risks fostering a radicalism whose consequences manifest as exclusion, fragmentation, and hatred.

An education that ignores diversities and adheres to universals, hegemonies, and social-cultural superiorities guarantees the planning of a war to come.

To educate ourselves to live in togetherness, to accept the different and the diverse, to reference ourselves amid cultures, languages, religions, politics, and sciences, in the midst of diversities. Always in a state of expectancy, of the unprecedented, of the unknown, since "Curiosity can overcome fear" (Vallejo, 2021, p. 213).

Conclusions

Fragilities are a constitutive part of who we are, and they especially manifest in encounters and relationships, which implies recognizing the other as fundamental to our own knowledge. The suburbs where fragilities have been placed in the West will be the times and spaces where collective learning becomes recognizable, launching humanity into a different state—one that acknowledges goodness in action, the viable unprecedented, and hope as a path to make human diversity evident.

Getting into the discussed divergences allows us to find a deliberative and constructive collective occurrence, with a tendency to discover new possibilities that are closely linked to what is perceived with the other when the difference that unites them is recognized in depth.

To seek connections that dignify both individual and collective life, pulling it from the agonizing lethargy of hopelessness, the central invitation—one that serves as a provocation—will be to bring existence closer to one's own history with memory, to a life engaged in collective action, and to an existence dedicated to a humanity committed to otherness and its consistencies.

Full humanity, in its possibilities, finds in the viable unprecedented a plausible horizon of meaning, constructing life together in the sensitive intelligence of conflict, diversities, and divergences, including both nearby and distant interculturalities that surprise even ourselves. There remains a certain enigma in this—the very mystery of the human and the non-human, in its splendors, its opacities, and its chiaroscuro.

Our multiple and diverse languages, our different ways of speaking, our various existential homes and cultural territories, open us up to horizons of vital meaning, to human horizons unfolding in many

directions. Our future as humanity does not respond to a single, pre-fabricated or to-be-fabricated destiny in terms of one perspective or a single cosmovision. Human unidimensionality is not possible, nor is homogenization, even though we may use the fear of these to give them life.

REFERENCES

Bauman, Z. (2007). Amor líquido. Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Devalle de Rendo, A y Vega V. (2006). Una escuela en y para la diversidad. El entramado de la diversidad. Buenos Aires: Aique Grupo Editor.

Dilthey, W. (2003). La esencia de la filosofía. Buenos Aires. Editorial Lozada. Biblioteca de obras maestras del pensamiento.

Dussel, E; Zemelman, H y otros (2007). ¿Cómo y quiénes producen conocimiento en América latina? Mexico: IPECAL.

Freire, P. (1992). Pedagogía de la esperanza. Siglo XXI. Argentina, Buenos Aires.

Gadamer, H. G. (2000). La Herencia de Europa. Barcelona: Ed. Península.

González G, M. A. (2016). Aprender a vivir juntos. Lenguajes para pensar diversidades e inclusiones. (2016). ISBN: 978-987-538-465-1. DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.1.1991.7208. Buenos Aires: Noveduc Ediciones. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/301356743_Aprender_a_vivir_juntos_Lengua jes_para_pensar_diversidades_e_inclusiones

Guarín J, G. (2011). Epistemología hermenéutica en la interdisciplinariedad contemporánea. Manizales: Universidad Católica de Manizales.

Guarín, G. J (2018), La formación de sujetos. Edit. Universidad de Manizales, Manizales-Colombia.

Heidegger, M. (1986). Ser y tiempo. Mexico: Fondo de cultura económica.

Husserl, E. (1992). Invitación a la fenomenología. Barcelona. Ediciones Paidós.

Kusch, R. (1977). Esbozo para una Antropología Filosófica Latinoamericana. En: Revista de Filosofía Latinoamericana y Ciencias Sociales. No. 5-6 January- December.

Levinas, E. (2002). Totalidad e infinito: ensayo sobre la exterioridad. Salamanca. Ediciones Sígueme.

Mèlich, J. C. (2021). La fragilidad del mundo. Tusquets Editores. Barcelona-Spain.

Neruda, P. (2024). Las Palabras. Revista Altazor. Revista Electrónica de Literatura. Year 4. May.

Ortega y Gasset, J (1960). ¿Qué es Filosofía? Madrid. Ediciones Paulinas.

Skliar, C. (2005). La intimidad y la alteridad. Buenos Aires: Miño y Dávila.

Tamayo Giraldo, G. y Guarín Jurado, G. (2023). El Humanismo, la formación y el reconocimiento de las diversidades humanas. Areté. Revista Digital del Doctorado en Educación de la Universidad Central de Venezuela. 9 (18) 37-56 http://ve.scielo.org/pdf/arete/v9n18/2443-4566-arete-9-18-37.pdf

Tamayo G, G., González G, M. A., & Osorio L, A. A. (2023). Caminos para la acreditación del profesorado universitario: escucha empática, confianza y diversidad. Revista Interuniversitaria De Formación Del Profesorado. Continuación De La Antigua Revista De Escuelas Normales, 98(37.1). https://doi.org/10.47553/rifop.v98i37.1.98297

Touraine, A. (1990). Movimientos sociales hoy. Barcelona: Editorial Hacer.

Vallejo, I. (2021). El infinito en un junco. Bogotá: Penguin Random House.

Walsh, C. (2007). Interculturalidad, colonialidad y educación. Revista Educación y pedagogía, vol. XIX, Núm. 48, pp. 25-35 En: https://www.flacsoandes.edu.ec/sites/default/files/agora/files/1265909654.interculturalidad__colonialidad_y_educacion_0.pdf

Zea, L. (2003). La filosofía americana como filosofía sin más. Buenos Aires. Siglo veintiuno editores.

Zemelman, H. M (2011). Los horizontes de la razón. Anthropos. Barcelona. Spain.