Cuji, Luis Fernando

Can a monocultural institution become an intercultural one? Successes and challenges of intercultural university initiatives in Ecuador

Tertium comparationis 19 (2013) 2, S. 240-262

in Kooperation mit / in cooperation with:

WAXMANN
www.waxmann.com

http://www.waxmann.com

Mitglied der
Leibniz
Leibniz-Gemeinschaft

Can a monocultural institution become an intercultural one? Successes and challenges of intercultural university initiatives in Ecuador[1]

Luis Fernando Cuji

Universidad de Buenos Aires

Abstract

Various sectors have advanced the idea of transforming conventional universities into intercultural institutions of higher education that can take into consideration the ethnic diversity of Ecuador with respect to participants, forms of knowledge and methods. The implementation of three approaches through which the university and diversity are related demonstrates the complexities inherent to the monocultural character of higher education and the challenges associated with its transformation, given the context of a hegemonic, essentialist and universal conception of identity and knowledge. Using accounts from ethnographic research, this article presents two achievements that entail challenges for the implementation of these initiatives. The author underscores the danger of depoliticizing potentially fruitful ideas and struggles in order to defend the principles of vision and division that underlie social inequalities in Latin America.

1. Background

Ecuador is a multi-ethnic and multi-cultural country. Approximately 7 % of its population self-identifies as indigenous, belonging to one of the fourteen indigenous nationalities of the country; about 7.2 % and 7.4 % self-identify as *montubio*[2] and afro-descendant, respectively. Approximately 6.1 % of the population declares itself to be white, and 71.9 % declares to be *mestizo*.[3] Ecuador has four natural geographic regions. These are the Pacific Coast, the Andean highlands, Amazonia, which is the rainforest region located in the Ecuadorian Amazon basin, and the Galapagos Islands. Although some areas are more densely populated by certain ethnic groups, the groups identified above migrate from one region to another, and so in each region there are at least three of the five groups mentioned above.[4]

In its opening article, the Constitution states that Ecuador "is a constitutional state of rights and justice; a social, democratic, sovereign, independent, unitary, *intercultural*, *pluri-national* [emphasis by the author] and secular state" (Asamblea Constituyente, 2008). This article illustrates the state's interests in joining regional efforts to thematize the ethnic question, aimed at making ethnic diversity socially and politically visible, especially for the indigenous and afro-descendant peoples present in the country. This visibility has been achieved through the actions of ethnic organizations, international development agencies, as well as academic and progressive religious circles. Moreover, these efforts are consistent with a regional tendency in Latin America to put the ethnic question on the table, especially in the second half of the 20th century (Almeida, 1993; Bretón Solo de Zaldívar, 2001).

The efforts of indigenous groups and other organizations and agencies like the ones mentioned above, contributed to framing cultural diversity as a matter of political dispute in both a material and symbolic sense. From the beginning of the struggle, education has been a major focal point. The struggles in education have aimed at promoting changes to improve the situation of excluded, subordinated and poor groups and individuals with different ethnic and racial markers. First, activist organizations demanded access for minorities to traditional education institutions. Later, as political leaders emerged among ethnic organizations, their demands evolved and began to challenge existent education paradigms, in favor of an educational model that indigenous peoples could identify with. Parallel 'intercultural' systems where created alongside conventional institutions.

Influenced by theoretical traditions from Europe and the United States (Dietz & Mateos Cortés, 2011), and by politically oriented *indigenista* Latin American agendas (Giraudo & Martín-Sánchez, 2011), different actors proposed the creation of intercultural institutions or the transformation of existing institutions into intercultural ones. The different schemes proposed for this transformation varied in form and in the way 'intercultural' was to be understood. In general, however, the intercultural agenda constituted a plan for the transformation of *all* education institutions, not just those created for ethnic minorities. Intercultural institutions soon expanded and encompassed all levels of education. At the same time, the idea of the existence of only one universal and hegemonic form of knowledge was challenged. In this climate, education activists proposed the creation of Intercultural Initiatives of Higher Education (IIHE). These initiatives consisted of higher education institutes, programs and universities that implement a variety of mechanisms to incorporate individuals, forms of knowledge and methodologies from different ethnic backgrounds.[5]

The different IIHE began to undertake the challenges and dangers that come with the introduction of cultural diversity into higher education within the context

of conventional higher education institutions with different standards and levels of quality. The system consists of 57 universities, 285 higher education institutes and three state agencies responsible for education.[6] Nine universities and 15 institutes of the system either offer intercultural programs or are institutions entirely devoted to promote cultural diversity (García, 2004).[7]

In this paper archival information and ethnographic fieldwork are used, conducted in the following institutions: *Universidad Politécnica Salesiana (UPS)*, a university of the Salesian Congregation; *Universidad San Francisco de Quito (USFQ)*, a private university in Quito; and *Universidad Intercultural de las Nacionalidades y Pueblos Indígenas Amawtay Wasi (UINPI)*,[8] a university founded and managed by representatives of the Ecuadorian indigenous movement. The analysis presented here aims to discuss the achievements and challenges that various IIHE face and the different approaches that they have. The intention is not to criticize or delegitimize their efforts. Rather, it is intended to contribute to the implementation of their much needed projects.[9]

The Bilingual Intercultural Education program (BIE) at UPS started in 1995 and is offered in six different campuses located in areas with significant indigenous population. It is one of the most important programs because it has persisted over time, has a wide geographic scope and has the highest number of students enrolled (Farfán, 2008). USFQ is an elite institution, known for its outstanding academic ranking. In 2005, it officially established its Ethnic Diversity Program which gives scholarships to members of indigenous, afro-descendants and montubio populations. The program also provides tutoring for individuals of the ethnic minorities mentioned above (see www.usfq.edu.ec/diversidad_etnica/). In the case of UINPI, the idea of establishing an intercultural indigenous university was first proposed 15 years ago. However, it was in 2004 when UINPI was officially recognized by the Ecuadorian state as a formal education institution. From the onset, it opened different campuses simultaneously and gradually started offering either distance education programs or class-'in site' programs. Of all IIHE, UINPI is the most ambitious initiative in terms of its goals for the transformation of conventional educational institutions and paradigms (UIAW, 2004; Sarango, 2008, 2009).

The IIHE mentioned above are not necessarily comparable with one another. They all represent more or less ambitious and explicit alternatives for the incorporation of diverse forms of knowledge into formal educational structures. How are the different cultures that interact in these institutions identified? What criteria are used for identification? How are these criteria established and what kind of practices stem from them? How are non-Western forms of knowledge incorporated in academic institutions? Under which circumstances can a monocultural institution be transformed into an intercultural one? In the pages that follow, some elements are

suggested to take into consideration in order to provide some answers to these questions.

Despite the author's interest in theories of inter-ethnic relations, here the focus will be on the comparison of the practices and discourses of different agents that participate in the implementation of IIHE. The focus will be on their practices and on the discourses about the projects and policies that promote the incorporation of historically excluded and subordinate populations. For this reason, it seems that discussing the kind of education that individuals receive and its implications for both the individual and his or her ethnic group, is more important than advocating for any given theoretical perspective about intercultural relations.

2. Identity achievements and the danger of essentialism

Terms such as multi-, pluri- and interculturality imply the existence of various groups that are ethnically or racially distinct. That is the meaning of these terms in Ecuador, in particular, and in Latin America in general. As an aspect of the indigenous and afro-descendant struggle for official recognition by the state of their presence and cultural significance, intercultural education has contributed to the affirmation, development and recreation of subordinate cultures, and to the transmission of these cultures to their members. Intercultural education has contributed to the 're-ethnization' and valorization of the indigenous and afro cultures. It has contributed to a kind of valorization that can promote symmetrical relations between subordinate cultures and the dominant Western, white and mestizo culture.

Indigenous and non-indigenous intellectuals from different *fields* have contributed to the advancement of this struggle. Furthermore, this claim has been theoretically elaborated on, and it now constitutes an articulated body of knowledge that contains diverse, nuanced theoretical approaches. Some of these have been called Latin American cultural studies, de-colonial studies, *indigenista* studies, intercultural studies, ethno-education, etc. (literature on the topic is abundant: Montaluisa, 2008; Mignolo, 2003; Estermann, 1998; Walsh, 2009; CEDET, 2011). Beyond the theoretical level, this claim has been converted into a framework for action for political representatives and education agents who promote the training of political leaders. In what follows, this framework for action will be called a 'strategy of ethnization' (SE). This SE is manifested in different ways in the different universities. Sometimes it constitutes a set of criteria to provide benefits to certain students; other times it means offering courses on the culture and history of indigenous and afro-descendant peoples; it also sometimes simply implies attitudes that show appreciation for ethnic clothing and cuisine; and, lastly, other times it involves actions that publicly reprehend discriminatory practices and verbal expressions. All of

these expressions of the SE are grounded on an implicit consensus about the criteria to define cultures and the boundaries established between them. The conducted fieldwork in intercultural education institutions allows pointing to: (1) the complexities behind this implicit consensus; (2) the way these complexities have been simplified; and (3) the efficient way in which this consensus operates in everyday relations.

2.1 Implicit consensus and substantiation of identities

With joining UPS university representatives – at the beginning of the research project – for a tour through the different campuses where the BIE program is offered, representatives where inquired about how they know which individuals belong to which indigenous nationality, and which nationalities are represented in each campus. The director's response was intriguing. When asked about how she knew who was indigenous, she responded in a very casual tone: "you can tell by the way they look".

The meaning of 'the way they look' is more problematic than what this casual answer conveys. In this answer, both the criteria for social classification and the different ways these criteria are used are at play. The expression 'the way they look' reveals the degree to which certain *principles of vision and division* of differences are internalized and put to work mechanically. Stating that physical appearance is used as a criterion for identification makes it clear, from the beginning, that there are physical features associated to defined criteria. What do people see when they identify others?

Different agents (university administration, faculty and students) answered in the same way – "you can tell by the way they look". It seems like people's clothing, their facial features, their height, the color of their skin, their hair, in sum, a number of phenotypic and non-phenotypic attributes provide classificatory information that has been previously associated with a cultural identity. Interestingly, different agents have different and sometimes contradictory criteria depending on the context, and not necessarily on their own ethnic background. For example, classification criteria seem to depend on: (1) the predominance of general classificatory principles; (2) the social position of the different agents in the classificatory structure; (3) the weight that has been socially assigned to each classificatory principle; and (4) the power and vested interests of the different agents.

The ideas that different agents have about their contexts speak to the way classificatory criteria are used. At UINPI, the university director considers that in the Tabacundo campus, the majority of the students are indigenous (Sarango, 2008, p. 269). One of the faculty members mentioned: "Here everyone is a descendant of indigenous peoples, but ideologically, they are mestizos. They are ultimately mesti-

zos" (Interview, UINPI Professor, May 3rd, 2009). A student in the same campus said: "Everyone here is mestizo" (Interview, UINPI Student, May 16th, 2009). Why do these differences in perception occur?

> I have to say that I am half indigenous because I feel that the ones who do have a direct connection with the … indigenous culture … experience that reality in a particular way, as opposed to an ordinary mestizo who blended in a long time ago, who lives in the city and has nothing to do with the indigenous culture. In my case, despite the fact that I studied in the city, a typical weekend for me was going back to the farm to work … I used to go to the *chacra*[10] and I used to help with the harvest. I ate yuca, bananas and even today I still eat *carne de monte*,[11] and so that identity cannot be taken away from me … I feel that mestizos forgot about the indigenous that we all have within. For me, I realized that when I came here to study at USFQ. Before that, I never had any problem with identifying myself. In Puyo, where I grew up, because it was a small town, I never had to make a distinction between who was white, black, yellow or green. My cousins were all indigenous. I used to play with them barefoot. We would eat anything. That was never an issue for me … I never wondered why they were a little … well, they are not so different than me because I still have some indigenous features, although I've changed a little bit. But when I came to Quito, to the city, it was shocking to me to see that *people here are very selective* and, when I started to attend USFQ the shock was a little bit more dramatic because here you can find wealthy people, and many of them are white, have blonde hair and blue eyes, but they are still Ecuadorian … I don't know if they say that they are mestizos, but I guess they say they are white. And there I was with my dark skin. At that time I was slightly thicker and had long hair … just like every other Kichwa woman. I obviously stood out because of that and also because of my size. In that moment, being part of the Ethnic Diversity program was for me like being with the people that I had always been with. In Puyo, I was always used to being with indigenous people, and here I made groups with them as well. In that moment I felt like I belonged to my people, the indigenous, and not to others … We missed the food … It was not the same here. If I had friends from Quito, we would be very different in many aspects … The majority of the friends that I made in this university were from the Amazon or from the Coast. Just a few of them were from the Highlands. That's because with the people from the Highlands we didn't miss the same things and we didn't understand each other very well … In terms of personalities, as a culture we are a bit more open. We say things straightforward. Perhaps sometimes we are too hard or we take offense more seriously, but we are very direct in what we say. Here in the Highlands, I don't think that's the case … So, in that moment, I started to identify myself with the indigenous. I started to love the indigenous. I started to feel much more special, and that helped me a lot to become more involved in the program. And now I work here [at USFQ] (Interview Diana Chavez, USFQ alumni, September 28th, 2012).

Peter Wade (2000) describes how notions of race and ethnicity have depended on various categories in order to substantiate their hierarchies and classificatory structures. Notions such as lineage, phenotype, clothing, social class, territory, language, and life style are used to 'identify' those who are indigenous, mestizo, afro, white,

etc. Diana's account allows to see the interplay between these criteria in the structure of the discourse of identification.

Historically there has never been one single criterion for classification; nor has one criterion been replaced by another in a linear fashion. On the contrary, it has been the entanglement of all or many criteria which has produced different conceptions of ethnically distinct cultures and the boundaries between them. Thus, any given culture exists as a function of the entanglement of these legitimized criteria. Therefore, if certain agents perform classificatory operations using different combinations of criteria, any given individual or group will be classified according to each particular combination. The way relationships among individuals are established will depend on the value and place given to different criteria in the social hierarchy. Social positions are assigned in this way.

What has been referred to as the 'colonial consensus' is the consensus that attributes the highest value and the highest position to features such as white, European, urban, etc. This consensus has been exposed and challenged by various authors (Quijano, 2002; Mignolo, 2003; Walsh, 2009). It consists of a number of assumptions that have been used to buttress its 'strategy of ethnization' (SE). However, the colonial consensus rests upon another, more implicit one that is far more general and more difficult to change. This implicit consensus consists of the belief in the stability of the criteria for classification and in the existence of hierarchical structure of these criteria. Paradoxically, the SE needs to reinforce this belief, but in doing so, it becomes relatively inefficient.

As one can see in Diana's interview, her interactions with others at USFQ helped her strengthen her identity and recognize her indigenous background. Moreover she likes to identify herself as indigenous as opposed to mestizo. Now, if one reads her words closely, paying attention to the terms she uses to refer to the variation of characteristics, one notices a certain ambiguity with respect to the stability or variability of the features that she describes. She says that no one can change her eating habits and that she still maintains her ethnic features, although she has changed a little. This ambiguity occurs because, in her account, there are two sources of classificatory information that produce contradicting results. On the one hand, she believes that cultures are well-defined and stable entities, that is, she endorses the implicit consensus described above. On the other hand, due to her relational experience, she notices how some features change. For that reason, in her discourse, when she talks about culture in general, she refers to stable criteria, but when she talks about a particular case, she refers to criteria as changing entities. The moment that she puts together the different sources of classificatory information, cultures become stable while individuals become variable. Nevertheless, both are variable.

In common discourse, one refers to the world as a substantiated being. One uses adjectives to describe its elements. One hardly ever thinks explicitly of the way the universe is defined based on relations. This form of relational definition is not evident to us.[12] When culture is determined through physical criteria – bodily or non-bodily traits –, it acquires a certain substance. When this is coupled with the faith in stable criteria, one is left with no other alternative but the essentialization of cultures and, with that, the conception of cultures as discrete (in the mathematical sense), almost natural classes. This, in turn, leaves individuals with the task of adhering to cultures in a discrete way. In practice, however, one can *play* with those cultural notions, as they are not discrete. Moreover the non-linear combination of classificatory principles contradicts the idea of stable criteria that the SE seems to require and reinforce. The work of scholars such as De La Cadena (2004) or Wade, show that "the boundary between indigenous and mestizo can be trespassed by manipulating those notions" (Wade, 2000, p. 48).[13] In the case of the afro identity, which seems to be more stable because of the stability of certain phenotypic traits (skin color, specially), "it is not correct to assume that racial definitions are completely fixed because they are related to bodily traits" (Wade, 2000, p. 49). They are variable just like the value assigned to them when the classificatory operation takes place.

The SE partially achieves its goal in the case of Diana. She recognizes her indigenous background, but at the same time she sees herself increasingly different with respect to the most stable aspects of the indigenous culture. One notices this because of the way she conjugates verbs when she talks about the changes that she has experienced. For instance, she says that she *used to* go to the *chacra*, she *had* long hair, etc. In sum, in her discourse she recognizes her indigenous background, and in practice, she becomes increasingly more mestizo – today she lives in the city, she has changed a little bit, she doesn't have long hair anymore, etc.

2.2   Other directions in the shifting of identities

The purpose of the SE is to make individuals self-conscious about their indigenous or afro identity by making them internalize ideas about culture and ethnic classificatory criteria. It is a strategy that changes the subjective configuration of the agents, which is a psychological operation. This goal is only partially accomplished because any given individual can recognize and celebrate their indigenous identity on the level of their discourse and separate from it in everyday practice. Moreover, this happens because in the discourse on substantiated identities the criteria used to identify cultures seem to be stable and discrete, even essentialist; while in practice, classificatory criteria are not stable and, therefore, neither are cultures. There is another reason why the SE does not achieve its goal completely: Identities shift in

different directions because different agents have their own classification structure, and they often *play* with classification criteria in their interactions with others. Sometimes agents even use criteria that they disapprove of when used by others.

> For me, bilingual education has been a way to discover myself as a human being … For serendipitous reasons my sister quit [her studies at UPS] … She considers herself mestiza. *My entire family considers themselves mestizos with the exception of my father* … Since I was little I wanted to know where I came from. I saw other people saying that they have a genealogical tree, like the Alvarez or the Molinas. They say that they are white and, in my case, being the granddaughter of one of them and the daughter of an indigenous, there was always an issue. My grandfather used to say to me, "you are the daughter of the *longo*[14] Pulloquinga …" I was curious to know where I was from. I wanted to know who I really was, whether I was the Indian that my grandfather used to call me … or, like my mother used to say, "of course not, you are an Alvarez just like the rest of us". And so I think that the desire that I had to know who I was, was fulfilled there [at UPS], and that's why I say that I am indigenous (Alicia Pulloquinga, UPS alumni April 26th, 2009).

Here the SE operates in the direction mestizo-indigenous. Alicia used to think of herself as mestiza because of the way she dressed, because she lived in the city and because of her mother's ethnic background. At the university, she began to identify with her indigenous identity, giving more importance to her lineage and appreciating more fully her father's background. The dynamics of the categories mentioned above are evident here. The belief that some criteria are more stable or valid than others is evident as well. It should not be overlook the fact that in these dynamics, power relations are very present.

> I consider myself mestizo here. I mean, with him [an anthropologist who received his degree from UPS and is now a professor at UINPI] we tried to define myself. He said to me, "you don't wear indigenous clothes". But I said that I have an indigenous last name [Simbaña Cusco] and therefore I am indigenous. But then he explained to me that in order to be *truly* indigenous one must speak an indigenous language and wear indigenous clothes. Therefore no one is indigenous here … *I have no culture because I am mestizo* (Wilson Simbaña Cusco, student at UINPI, May 16th, 2009).

When trying to define his identity, Wilson gave more weight to his lineage. For him, his last name defined his identity. But after taking classes with an anthropologist who talked about culture in his lectures, the weight shifted to clothing and language. That made him question his ethnic identity. That is, he went through a process of 'de-ethnization' in terms of the goal of the SE. The new framework made him consider himself a mestizo. The direction here is indigenous-mestizo.

Intercultural education has a psychological function. Although that is an explicit and intentional function, intercultural education does not take into consideration the following. First, the process of assuming an indigenous or afro identity, that is, the process of 'ethnization', can be as violent for an individual as assuming the white

identity. It can produce a 'cultural vacuum'. Second, inducing individuals by the use of force (physical, economic and/or psychological) to prioritize the classificatory criteria of those who hold power in everyday relations over their own criteria, is exerting the same type of violence (material and symbolic) that is criticized by decolonial and *indigenista* scholars. It occurs in the opposite direction, but it is exerted upon the same disenfranchised subjects. And third, if the idea of the stability of cultures and their boundaries is endorsed and transmitted, then mestizos are located in a conflict position that tends to imply violence and discrimination. Furthermore, this renews racial prejudices based on the idea of purity.

This occurs because all people are part of the implicit consensus that states that classificatory criteria are stable and discrete, just like their substantive hierarchical structure. All people act, identify others and establish relations using those *principles of vision and division*, even when – and despite the fact that – they work to improve the situation of excluded and subordinated populations. All people operate in this way, even if they are part of that subordinated population. The SE reinforces this implicit consensus and, in this way, it can renew racist practices.

2.3 Making the other heterogeneous, making differences gradual

It is not suggested that the authors who have elaborated the theoretical tenets that underlie the SE are not aware of the danger of the essentialization of cultures because authors are aware of this danger and avoid it explicitly (Estermann, 1998; Walsh, 2009). On the contrary, it is argued that agents who do not elaborate the SE theoretically, understand and practice it in a way that tends, almost inevitably, to reinforce the implicit consensus and to reproduce the process of essentialization of cultures. This is a danger for these agents in their everyday intercultural interactions, precisely where they define culture according to the assumptions of the SE.

Our participation in the consensus is latent and is manifested in everyday interactions. For example, it takes place when a professor seeks a legitimate interlocutor in the classroom to talk about indigenous issues and addresses a student who is wearing ethnic clothes. But when students are not dressed in that fashion, they are not considered interlocutors. Another example is when language or clothing (and not self-identification or lineage) are used as criteria to allocate economic bonuses to different faculty members; or when only certain programs are offered to certain ethnic populations, for instance agriculture for indigenous people, or physical education for afro-descendants. A further example is when a foreign afro-descendant individual is more valued than an Ecuadorian afro-descendant.

It is not suggested that these programs or programs at other universities and their agents and practices should disappear. It is argued that the history of colonialism in Latin America and the particular life histories of different subjects who grew

up in societies with a colonial past, produce the *principles of vision and division* which lead people to believe that cultures and their boundaries are stable. In political practices and, especially, in everyday interactions, all people exert a new kind of domination upon ethnic populations, under the guise of the idea that they serve a good purpose.

The superiority status of the white, the ambiguity in the position of the mestizo and the homogeneity of the indigenous and the afro identities, are issues that still need to be addressed by the psychological function of bilingual education and by its theoretical apparatus, which endorses the SE. These issues will not be resolved by praising the indigenous and the afro identities of the past, but by integrating the white and the mestizo identities to the rest of the ethnic categories. In doing this, mestizo and white will be considered different categories but related to each other (white-mestizo) and, especially, to the afro and indigenous categories. This is how one can make differences gradual and make others heterogeneous.

The meaning that is attributed to the expression 'the way they look' is established through the experiences that agents have in their interactions with others, and not so much through the discourses that could be elaborated about those others. That meaning could be changed if those experiences had occurred in a different way. What could help to transform this meaning is not just formal education or political and anti-discrimination training, but facilitating true interactions with other cultures and their contexts. In the cases of Alicia and Diana one can see that their ethnic position shifted when they experienced interactions with people of a different background as well as with people that they could relate to. Relationships, for them, became more respectful or 'more selective'.[15] An account of a mestizo student at UPS who started in the Otavalo campus (in the northern highlands) and then transferred to Latacunga (another campus in the central highlands) is interesting, as it speaks to the cultural differences and the way interactions in those contexts allow individuals to be aware of differences, conflicts and homogenized representations that are lumped together under the label of 'the indigenous'. The same is true for the superior cultural position of the mestizo.

> Here the university is different because [in Otavalo] there are schools only for indigenous people and there are also schools for mestizos. But at the university, perhaps, there are more indigenous people than mestizos. I felt a little underestimated because of that. I thought, I won't be able to feel included; it will be difficult for me to fit in with the indigenous … My sister-in-law helped me a lot, and eventually I was able to fit in … I was worried about my kichwa and she used to tell me that it is just a language like any other one, and that I just had to start learning from the beginning … In the end, I was very happy right from the start with my indigenous peers and all that … Besides, they are very open people. I mean, they look at you a little strange … It's like it's not common for them to see a mestizo mingling with them … and that's why coming to Latacunga was shocking for

me. I thought it was going to be the same here. *I thought that they were going to be the same because they were indigenous, too*. I thought that everything was going to be okay, that I was going to be in the same environment, *but it was not like that …* It was hard for me to fit in here (Interview Student PAC March 14th, 2009).

It was only through her interactions with two different groups of indigenous people (both of which were part of the Kichwa nation), that this mestizo student noticed that she had homogenized all indigenous peoples. Besides, she learned that indigenous people find it strange that a mestizo would want to "mingle with them". Recall that Diana could only establish the difference between herself (who's half indigenous) and the indigenous from Puyo when she interacted with mestizos that did not fit with the idea that she had about others and about the whites.

These differences provide little support for the idea that cultures are discrete entities. Rather, they speak to the interdependence of their definitions and boundaries. IIHE are one step ahead compared to conventional academic institutions because, in these initatives, cultures coexist and interact in a meaningful and consistent manner. This brings about challenges that conventional institutions cannot even begin to imagine. For instance, after everyday conflicts of inter-ethnic relations have been made visible, how can the university address these conflicts as an institution, avoiding responses like indoctrination, repression or sublimation that would eventually reinforce essentialism?

It is not assumed that the theoretical elaboration of the SE, which could be also called the 'ethnic argument', and its application to practice are useless or far from reality. More or less stable ideals about identities exist because they bear some resemblance with reality. However, they are variable and have contradictory political uses if they are conceptualized as essentialized entities. If some actors have attained certain benefits from these ideals, that is thanks to the result of processes of political mobilization for the advancement of certain agendas, and not because of the substantive content of the ethnic argument. One alternative to avoid the danger of essentializing is the political, temporal, contextual and participatory determination of the different criteria that define cultures, in such a way that certain issues can be addressed, such as the subordination of the indigenous and the afro, the supremacy of the white and the ambiguity of the mestizo. *All* of these issues should be addressed, not just one of them.

The ambiguous status of the mestizo is manifested in the prejudices that are transmitted and reinforced in society. IIHE do not escape these dynamics. Rather, they are institutional places where prejudices are reinforced. For instance, faculty members and students reproduce prejudices through phrases that refer to mestizos as the improved race, the group with no culture, or the group that has been assimi-

lated to the white or the Western. The typical 'we are all mestizos' is another example of the phrases that void the substantive content of the ethnic argument.

The words of a professor at UPS convey the paradox in the argument. The argument is weak and needs to be address from a political standpoint: "Here, to the university and to the faculty, everyone is the same. *There aren't any* differences" (Interview Professor UPS, March 7th, 2009). The ethnic argument needs to review its scope and limitations because, in practice, what constitutes its explicit purpose – to promote the existence of intercultural relations between individuals of different ethnic groups – becomes its implicit content. Besides, identification criteria become stable and apolitical, which legitimizes the criteria of the subaltern subjects.

3. Diversity of forms of knowledge and universalist hegemony

Ethnic political struggles are not restricted to the inclusion of individuals with ethnic markers. An important struggle involves the transformation of things at the epistemic level. That is, for the inclusion of other forms of knowledge. This is an area in which the ethnic argument finds significant resistance. The efforts of indigenous movements, afro-descendant organizations and, especially, certain academic circles, aim to legitimize non-Western and non-scientific forms of knowledge[16] in academia. These efforts also aim to transform hegemonic structures and the goals of production and reproduction of knowledge in conventional higher education institutions. Different agents that *play* at different levels in different *fields* converge in this project of transformation. Authors such as Macas (2005), Lander (2000), Fornet-Betancourt (2001), Santos (2005), Mato (2008), among others, use – and contribute to the development of – the ethnic argument, applying it to the production, reproduction and use of different forms of knowledge. An analysis of the application of the argument to IIHE contributes to reflecting on (1) the scope and limits of the argument; and (2) the differences in terms of position, power and *illusio* of the agents that participate in the intercultural education endeavor.

The institutions analyzed here have different ways to incorporate other forms of knowledge. Their differences speak to their different positions in the debate. USFQ is not interested in incorporating forms of ethnically-identified knowledge, but instead it accepts that anything could be analyzed in academia as long as the analytic exercise is a rigorous one. This implies a conventional academic understanding of the meaning of 'rigorous'. UPS acknowledges the differences and different needs of populations of different ethnic and cultural backgrounds. For this reason, it employs a strategy that could be described as 'additive' in the sense that it tries to incorporate different forms of knowledge by adding ethnic topics and subjects to the conventional curriculum. Moreover, this entails an effort to design a particular kind

of curriculum. UINP, on the other hand, takes what could be called a 'generative' strategy. That is, it tries to actively contribute to the development and transmission of indigenous science, as well as Western science.

Nevertheless, the differences in strategy of the IIHE for the inclusion of other forms of knowledge are not clear-cut, and the strategies are not mutually exclusive. There are two relevant aspects about these practices, which are also related to the inclusion of individuals. First, certain epistemic issues about the kind of incorporation that is pursued are addressed. Second, the different goals that drive that inclusion are discussed.

3.1 Programs, agents and gateways

Formal education institutions have been historically characterized by their Western monocultural approach. However, these institutions are major gateways for the incorporation of non-Western forms of knowledge. This occurs because of a particular combination of factors. First, regardless of its positive or negative uses, anthropology, among other social sciences, has a colonial heritage that cultivates a certain curiosity for *otherness*. Second, education has become a strategic realm for the ethnic political struggle. Anthropology's contribution has been its concern with *the other* and their culture, in a way that would foster a certain appreciation for other forms of knowledge, other worldviews, other traditions, creations, etc. Pedagogy, on the other hand, has been functional in the transmission of legitimate cultural elements, legitimized or potentially legitimized elements. Both of these disciplines, anthropology and pedagogy, have made possible the recognition of non-Western contents and their dissemination in academia.

The history of disciplines shows how subdivisions have been created within and between disciplines to reflect the efforts to incorporate non-Western knowledge. Fields with names like medical anthropology, the anthropology of law, intercultural philosophy, ethnic education, ethnic psychology, cultural studies and ethnic studies, among others, refer to knowledge about populations with particular ethnic backgrounds and their ideas and practices regarding health, law, the subjective, worldviews, etc. Some of these fields have emerged and, historically, have become preferred by, and offered to, indigenous and afro-descendant individuals.

Also, many academic programs have been created in response to the need of social movement organizations to professionalize their leaders in fields like law, education, industrial agriculture, agroecology, anthropology, linguistics, etc. In order to make this possible, funds have been provided by development agencies in the form of scholarships, grants and support for programs and research (Bretón Solo de Zaldívar, 2001).

In the effort to incorporate other forms of knowledge one can distinguish at least eight types of roles that reflect different forms of agency. These are: indigenous peoples and afro-descendants who possess different forms of knowledge; political leaders and social movements that demand the inclusion of those forms of knowledge; people in academia who conduct research about them, try to systematize them and contribute to their development; professors who transmit them; development agencies that provide financial support; the state, or other public actors, that legitimize or delegitimize the methods and results of other forms of knowledge; students who learn them and reproduce them; and other social agents that use them or could potentially use them. The categories in this list are not mutually exclusive, since any individual, institution or organization could perform more than one role at a time.[17]

Given the dynamics of the *academic and scientific field* and its strategic position, and given the importance of knowledge in contemporary societies, the circulation of knowledge is relevant not only for political purposes but also for social and economic ends. The circulation of knowledge includes its production, reproduction, uses, legitimization and appropriation. The dangers associated with this circulation are, on the one hand, the subordinate inclusion of some forms of knowledge, and, on the other, the inclusion of some forms of knowledge but not of their agents.

3.2   Subordinate inclusion and universalist ideals

Anthropology, pedagogy, and other social sciences and humanities, have promoted the incorporation of other forms of knowledge into academia; however, in restricting these forms of knowledge to the sphere of academia, these disciplines have also subordinated them due to universal ideals about what constitutes legitimate knowledge. Restricting other forms of knowledge to academic institutions involves incorporating them as exotic and interesting cultural elements. These forms of knowledge are considered exotic, curious, and superstitious; but, ultimately, they are beliefs that cannot be scientifically justified.

During the fieldwork at the universities previously mentioned, one came across many examples of subjects and topics that were incorporated from the standpoint of the universal Western knowledge, which was used to assess forms of knowledge that were not considered scientific. There is also an association between Western knowledge and scientific knowledge, which implies an appropriation of the scientific as exclusively Western. From the outset, this strategy accepts a subordinate position of subaltern forms of knowledge. And this, in turn, means accepting certain principles of validity that confer legitimacy. This is a very complex issue which has been addressed by some of the authors mentioned above. It should be

pointed out that this kind of incorporation of different forms of knowledge not only misrepresents these other forms, but also subordinates the ones who possess them.

A student at USFQ who is in the final stages of law school mentioned an episode that illustrates how indigenous knowledge can be accepted, delegitimized and subordinated, and how those who possess this knowledge are subordinated as well, perhaps because of who they are. Beliza Coro's thesis focuses on indigenous justice, the extraordinary resource of protection in Ecuadorian law, and the juridical subordination of the former to the latter.

> First, my thesis explains what indigenous justice is and how it works, avoiding the stereotypes that people see on TV … Then I analyze institutional control … We live in a constitutional state of rights …, and in this section I delve into where the idea of a constitutional state of rights comes from … I begin with describing how, in the past, kings would have to ask for permission …, then I describe how the idea of a charter emerged to write down the rights and duties that shape the agreement to live together as a society. At that point you start adding certain checks and balances that can be applied to the power of different authorities, including, in this case, indigenous authorities as well. Regarding indigenous philosophy, we talk about a well-defined kind of philosophy …, but that doesn't mean that with the framework of indigenous justice we can allow all sorts of actions, because that would contradict the constitution and constitutional rights … (Beliza Coro, USFQ alumni, September 28th, 2012).

The universalization of Greco-Roman law, French law, American law or any other law, and its use as a common measure and limit to conceptions of the law or social coexistence within cultures that do not share a similar historical process or values, are problems that the philosophy of law and legal anthropology directly address. These problems will not be unpacked here given the lack of space, the objectives of this article and the lack of proper training required to address these issues in a substantive and fruitful way. However, what this article does show is that the aforementioned student, who identifies herself as indigenous, simultaneously acquires both an indigenous conception of justice and a Western conception of justice, without realizing that one is politically, but not epistemologically, subordinate to the other. Furthermore, in the everyday practice of inclusion, not only is the indigenous conception of justice delegitimized, but so is its possessor.

> When I had to explain the concept of 'living well', …, when I was explaining what the philosophy of 'living well', of *sumac kawsay*, means in the Constitution [2008], I had to explain – as the only indigenous student in my class – what this means, what our indigenous philosophy is all about … I felt a bit bad because when I was presenting, a classmate said … I was telling the class about frogs and their importance to us. When frogs make noise and jump around, that means it's going to rain … I was explaining this to the class when all of a sudden, a classmate said, "well, that's ridiculous". He completely minimized the importance of what I had said, and he said, "I'm not going to ask the frogs if it's going to rain if we have meteorologists". Or another time, when someone said, "how can we ex-

pect someone who hasn't received an education to know any better". More than discrimination, it was a lack of comprehension on both sides of [indigenous] knowledge. For example, the topic of the indigenous justice system was very controversial. Several times I had to scream when I defended what it meant because they had to understand that it exists. And they would say, "why does it exist? It should be erased. It should be prohibited". And those were my classmates … Perhaps many of my classmates saw it as something that did not belong in Ecuador, as something that could not be accepted. The power to tell them no, that [the indigenous justice system] really does exist, and that they had to understand that it exists, and that if you're going to be a lawyer you have to understand that there is [an indigenous justice system] … [For them, that is] invalid. "If it exists, it's only for them [the indigenous], not for us [mestizos or whites]". But just as I understand what is yours, you should also understand what is mine (Beliza Coro, USFQ, September 28th, 2012).

Legal pluralism is a relevant field within the social sciences, especially in anthropology; however, it is not an important subject or field within law schools, even at universities with intercultural programs or law schools. Therefore, although non-Western justice systems are included in anthropological studies as different forms of epistemological pluralism, these systems are subordinated or rejected altogether in law school programs, where legitimate law is studied, the law that will be practiced in society. After all, an anthropologist would not be allowed to practice the law or serve as an attorney or judge. Furthermore, the agents who legitimize this law education system do not allow degrees or law programs that relativize non-Western conceptions. That is what occurred when UINPI was being reviewed for acceptance. Initially, UINPI had proposed to offer a law program; however, after the expert reports were completed, it was eliminated (Sarango, 2009).

Beliza had to defend the indigenous worldview and system of justice within the field of law, where she noticed that it was misunderstood or rejected altogether, and it was within this field that she had to subordinate certain principles to others. However, it is precisely within the field of law that the indigenous system of justice must be legitimized, through a dialogue that is aware of, but not restricted to, the asymmetries of power, and the symbolic, cultural, social, academic and even epistemic capital that certain conceptions of justice possess over others, especially the conceptions of the legitimizing agents. The same argument could be made for other subfields as well.

Is it possible for the ethnic argument to be extended into other areas of knowledge? This question is posed considering that in the case of the law, the ethnic argument works quite well and is based on the notion of epistemic pluralism, but it is not totally accepted in everyday social practice. It is a question that cannot be answered *a priori* with any certainty. But above all, it is a question that accepts the idea of the universalization of a certain kind of scientific knowledge that has managed to attain a superior position.

There are good reasons to cast doubt about the universality of any type of knowledge (Mato, 2008), including any form of ethnic knowledge, precisely because all forms of knowledge are temporally, spatially and culturally conditioned by the circumstances. This idea has been put forward by the advocates of the development and inclusion of indigenous and afro-descendant forms of knowledge. However, all of the actors who participate in the debate, or those who can actually legitimately participate in it, have received a type of education that has promoted not only certain contents, but especially certain *principles of vision and division* that make up their academic common sense (*doxa* and *illusio*). Often, these actors also find themselves in contradictory positions.

History and the philosophy of science are useful to identify the reasons why a certain kind of science has acquired this universalistic pretention (Giere, 1995), while precisely the very same scientific disciplines show that knowledge structures change (Kuhn, 2004). In this light it is reasonable to expect that another change could result from the incorporation of the knowledge of other cultures, even if some of their elements are rejected, forgotten or debunked. The key point is not that these elements be considered useless or false, but rather the fact that they are thoughtful concepts that bear a relationship with certain agents and their ends. It would not be very productive to pretend that non-Western or non-scientific forms of knowledge can yield the same exact results as scientific knowledge.

3.3 Different goals of epistemic pluralism

The diverse objectives that actors pursue when they are part of the circulation of ethnically-distinct forms of knowledge are an important issue for the kind of inclusion that is intended to be achieved. The author became interested in this topic when seeing the interaction between faculty members, students and other people in academia (through their works) in the classrooms of the IIHE.

The class on ancestral architecture, which is part of the Architecture program of UINPI at the campus in Tabacundo, is about the technical and cultural aspects of structures built in the Andes by different Pre-Hispanic civilizations. The author had the opportunity to sit in some of the sessions about the architecture of the pyramids of *Cochasqui*. The professor's presentation was based on Estermann's interpretation of the Andean man (1998). The students in the session were far more interested in the software (Autocad) that was used to draw the pyramids of *Cochasqui* than in the pyramids themselves and their meaning. Moreover, their meaning was being portrayed as something of the past, even though Estermann himself points to the fact that these structures were built by a contemporary living culture. The students requested that a copy of the software be given to them, and they also asked for more training in it so they could use it for things that they could use or sell.

The different actors that intervene in the IIHE do not have the same objectives when they promote the circulation of ethnic knowledge, even when no one would have any reason to oppose the incorporation of other forms of knowledge or desire a subordinate kind of inclusion. Those different objectives and interests, along with the different power that actors have and the different *fields* in which they *play*, are the reason why some forms of knowledge circulate in certain ways, while others don't circulate at all. Indigenous and afro-descendant peoples, academicians, politics, professors, students, development agencies, the state, etc., all are engaged in disputes in their own *fields*. Therefore, it is reasonable to expect that all individuals develop, present and use different forms of knowledge in ways that benefit them depending on their position in the respective *field* (Bourdieu, 2003, 2005). This dynamic produces contradictions that affect, to a greater or lesser extent, individuals and groups that possess less power and a *specific capital*, and therefore, that occupy less privileged positions.

Some agents defend the ethnic argument or ethnic knowledge in general, in a way that procures them more visibility or a better position in the *academic field* or in the *political field*. This desire for a better position can make professors use the argument in an essentialized or universalized way. Students, on the other hand, sometimes do not assimilate ethnic forms of knowledge because of their practical or contextual interests; other times they assimilate them in a subordinate way; and, finally, due to learning subordinate forms of knowledge, they sometimes end up receiving a subordinate kind of education (Cuji, 2011). This last situation produces the very consequences that the ethnic argument fights against and tries to transform.

4.   Conclusions against essentialisms and universalisms

The visibilization and positioning of ethnic communities is the main purpose of ethnic social struggles, particularly in higher education. This endeavor faces the challenge of addressing the essentialized differentiation of cultures and their limits. This differentiation makes problematic the implementation of the SE in IIHE, which could involuntarily reinforce subaltern classificatory criteria and renew forms of racial discrimination.

The incorporation of indigenous and afro-descendant forms of knowledge can easily reproduce the subordinate position because of universal ideals attributed to science and sometimes accepted by those who take part in struggles for the incorporation of ethnic knowledge. This kind of inclusion not only misrepresents those forms of knowledge, but also subordinates those who possess them.

The essentialist and universal principles of *vision and division* allow for the subordination of indigenous and afro-descendant identities. If indigenous and afro identities are celebrated or valorized under those same principles of *vision and division*, the objective of interculturality is not achieved, as that would only result in administrating differences, sublimating symbolic differences and maintaining material differences.

The idea that making subordinated populations the object of academic work is enough to transform their situation of subordination has been widely spread and internalized. However, the condition of subordination or exclusion is a relational condition, not an essentialist one. Therefore, tackling only one aspect of the issue will always be insufficient. Furthermore, this approach addresses the population that has always been the object of symbolic violence – which is inevitable in education –, but it does not deal with the population in position of superiority. One needs to discuss and put in practice questions regarding what makes individuals similar and what makes them different, and what are the implications of those similarities and differences. This discussion must be put forward to challenge liberal conceptions of equality and racist prejudices. Cultural differences are not just a matter of ethnicity, and homogenizing the indigenous, the afro, the mestizo and the white, for political reasons can lead people to lose sight of contextual aspects that can bring cultures closer to one another.

This is very relevant when it comes to envisioning a kind of education that addresses the needs and objectives of the entire population in general.

IIHE are one step ahead of conventional universities with respect to the problem of making visible intercultural relationships, their conflicts and benefits. They are one step closer to solving these issues. For all of these reasons, they must be supported; however, in supporting them, people need to clearly state the positions they participate from, and individuals need to be willing to change themselves before changing the rest.

Notes

1. The article has been translated from Spanish into English by Javier Rodríguez and Nicolle Etchart.
2. The term 'Montubio' refers to the different indigenous groups that are located in the Ecuadorian Coastal region (as opposed to the indigenous from the Andean highlands). The term was recently (2010) established as a racial category by the National Institute of Statistics and Census.
3. Data from the National Census 2010 carried out by the National Institute of Statistics (INEC), available at www.inec.gob.ec. 'Mestizo' is a racial category that has come to be understood as the mixture of white and indigenous. Culturally, however, there are several complexities associated with the mestizo identity.

4. These three groups are usually indigenous peoples, afro-descendants and mestizos. Montu-bios are located in the rural areas of the Coast and were officially recognized as a separate ethnic group in 2010. Information about them is scarce. Whites are not a group that has a strong presence and their case will be addressed in this paper.

5. Approaches were not limited to the concept of inclusion. However, the most accepted position among indigenous, afro-descendants and elites involved defending the concept of 'non-subordinate inclusion'. That is, the non-subordinate inclusion of ethnic minorities into society and their non-subordinate recognition by the Ecuadorian state. Non-subordinate inclusion means maintaining a certain level of autonomy and difference (or increasing it). Subsequent debates were maintained about the potential structural transformations that this kind of inclusion would bring about.

6. Official information about the system of higher education is available at www.senescyt.gob.ec

7. This is also the context where discussions about IIHE take place. Discussions are often about program content and about the extent to which they can be transformed in conventional higher education institutions. See the project 'Cultural Diversity and Interculturality in Higher Education in Latin America' of UNESCO-IESALSC. Publications of the project are available at www.iesalc.unesco.org.ve

8. Amawtay Wasi is a Kichwa expression that means 'House of Wisdom'.

9. Mostly, the theoretical concepts of Pierre Bourdieu are used, appearing in italics throughout the text.

10. *Chacra* is the Kichwa expression for a small plot of land.

11. Sometimes translated as 'bush meat', to eat *carne de monte* means to consume various kinds of animal protein found in the wild.

12. This idea is related to certain classic notions such as *epistemological obstacle* (Bachelard, 1948, p. 115) and *reification* or *subjective alienation*, elaborated by authors in the Marxist and Psychoanalytic traditions.

13. The page number in the citation corresponds to the Spanish edition of the book; see references.

14. 'Longo' is a derogatory expression sometimes used to refer to indigenous people or individuals of indigenous background.

15. This seems to be a nuanced way to say that people are racist or discriminatory, but this way protects the subject of discrimination, the one who discriminates and racism as a phenomenon.

16. The adjectives 'Western' and 'scientific' are not necessarily equivalent, but in some literature and in common practice they tend to be used interchangeably.

17. Rappaport describes the complex intercultural composition of the indigenous movement and the diversity of their demands. Furthermore, he shows that relationships among agents are not romantically harmonious. Thus, one could explore the alliances, dialogues and misunderstandings that occur between "regional and local indigenous cultural activists, regional and local indigenous political leaders, members of the clergy, other allies and academic interlocutors" (2008, p. 34), and other agents or types of agents.

References

Almeida, J. (1993). *Sismo étnico en el Ecuador. Varias perspectivas.* Quito: Ediciones abya-Yala. CEDIME.

Asamblea Constituyente. (2008). *Constitución del Ecuador.* Quito: Asamblea Constituyente del Ecuador.

Bachelard, G. (1948). *La formación del espíritu científico. Contribución a un psicoanálisis del conocimiento objetivo.* México D.F.: Siglo XXI Editores.

Bourdieu, P. (2003). *El oficio del científico.* Barcelona: Anagrama.

Bourdieu, P. (2005). *Intelectuales, política y poder.* Buenos Aires: Editorial Eudeba.

Bretón Solo de Zaldívar, V. (2001). *Cooperación al desarrollo y demandas étnicas en los Andes ecuatorianos: Ensayos sobre indigenismo, desarrollo rural y neoindigenismo.* Quito: FLACSO- sede Ecuador.

CEDET (Centro de desarrollo étnico). (2011). *Desde adentro: Etnoeducación e interculturalidad en el Perú y América Latina.* Lima: CEDET Centro de desarrollo étnico.

Cuji, L.F. (2011). Decisiones, omisiones y contradicciones. Interculturalidad y políticas públicas en educación superior en Ecuador. En D. Mato, *Educación superior y Pueblos Indígenas y Afrodescendientes en América Latina. Normas, políticas y prácticas* (pp. 207–240). Caracas: Instituto Internacional de la UNESCO para la Educación Superior en América Latina y el Caribe (IESALC-UNESCO).

De La Cadena, M. (2004). *Indígenas Mestizos, raza y cultura en el cusco.* Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.

Dietz, G. & Mateos Cortés, L.S. (2011). *Interculturalidad y educación intercultural en México: Un análisis de los discursos nacionales e internacionales en su impacto en los modelos educativos mexicanos.* México D.F.: Secretaría de Educación Pública.

Estermann, J. (1998). *Filosofía andina: Estudio intercultural de la sabiduria autóctona andina.* Quito: Ediciones Abya-Yala.

Farfán, M. (2008). Experiencia del programa académico Cotopaxi, formación en educación intercultural bilingüe de la universidad politécnica Salesiana. En D. Mato, *Diversidad cultural e interculturalidad en educación superior.* Caracas: UNESCO-IESALC.

Fornet-Betancourt, R. (2001). *Transformación intercultural de la filosofía: Ejercicios teóricos y prácticos de filosofía intercultural desde Latinoamérica en el contexto de la globalización.* Bilbao: Editorial Desclée de Brouwer S.A.

García, F. (2004). *La educación superior indígena en Ecuador.* Quito: Instituto Internacional de la UNESCO para la Educación Superior en América Latina y el Caribe – IESALC.

Giere, R. (1995). The skeptical perspective: Science without laws of nature. En F. Weinert (Ed.), *Laws of nature: Essays on the philosophical, scientific and historical dimensions* (pp. 120–138). Berlin: De Gruyter.

Giraudo, L. & Martín-Sánchez, J. (2011). *La ambivalente historia del indigenismo: Campo interamericano y trayectorias nacionales 1940–1970.* Lima: IEP Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.

Kuhn, T. (2004). *La estructura de las revoluciones científicas.* México D.F.: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Lander, E. (2000). *La colonialidad del saber: Eurocentrismo y ciencias sociales. Perspectivas latinoamericanas.* Buenos Aires: CLACSO.

Macas, L. (2005). La necesidad política de una reconstrucción epistémica de los saberes ancestrales. En P. Dávalos, *Pueblos indígenas, estado y democracia.* Buenos Aires: CLACSO.

Mato, D. (2008). No hay saber 'universal', la colaboración intercultural es imprescindible. (D. d. Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana-Iztapalapa, Ed.) *Alteridades, 18* (35), 101–116.

Mignolo, W. (2003). *Historias locales/diseños globales: Colonialidad, conocimientos subalternos y pensamiento fronterizo.* Madrid: Akal.

Montaluisa, L. (2008). Trayectoria histórica de la educación bilingüe en Ecuador. En V.C. Vélez, *Educación intercultural bilingüe y participación social.* Quito: CARE internacional.

Quijano, A. (2002). El regreso del futuro y las cuestiones del conocimiento. En C. Walsh, F. Schiwy & S. Castro-Gómez, *Indisciplinar las ciencias sociales: Geopolítica del conocimiento y colonialidad del poder. Perspectivas desde lo andino.* Quito: Editorial Abya-Yala.

Rappaport, J. (2008). *Utopías interculturales, intelectuales públicos, experimentos con la cultura y pluralismo étnico en Colombia.* Popayán: Editorial Universidad del Rosario.

Santos, Boaventura de Sousa (2005). *La universidad en el siglo XXI, para una reforma democrática y emancipadora de la Universidad.* México D.F.: UNAM.

Sarango, L.F. (2008). La experiencia de la universidad intercultural de las nacionalidades indígenas 'Amawtay Wasi'. En D. Mato, *Diversidad cultural e interculturalidad en educación superior. Experiencias en América Latina.* Caracas: UNESCO-IESALC.

Sarango, L.F. (2009). Universidad intercultural de las nacionalidades y pueblos indígenas 'Amawtay Wasi'. En D. Mato, *Instituciones interculturales de educación superior en América Latina. Procesos de construcción, logros, innovaciones y desafíos.* Caracas: UNESCO-IESALC.

UIAW (Universidad Intercultural Amawtay Wasi). (Ed.). (2004). *'Aprender en la sabiduría y el buen vivir' Universidad Intercultural Amawtay Wasi*. (J. García, A. Lozano, J. Olivera & C. Ruiz, Edits.) Quito: UNESCO.

Wade, P. (2000). *Raza y etnicidad en Latinoamérica.* Quito: Ediciones Abya-Yala.

Walsh, C. (2009). *Interculturalidad, estado y sociedad, luchas (de) coloniales de nuestra época.* Quito: Abya-Yala.