

 <https://doi.org/10.56238/alookdevelopv1-013>

José Manuel Salum Tomé

PhD.

Doctor in Education

Catholic University of Temuco

E-mail: josesalum@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

When you think of the other and the other, they are not due to the same power and hegemonies, and this other is identified as a face, there is the possibility of guiding behavior or ethics, along the paths of diversity, understood. It is like the discovery of diversity and otherness in education, which are the most appropriate ways to understand that the

autonomous self, is in debt, under the figure of hostage. Humanity has begun a path that has no possible reserve and this consists of opening, via postmodernity, a type of thought that is capable of generating scenarios of recognition of what is different, as a discovery that benefits everyone and everyone greatly. To propose that otherness is the basis on which diversity is built, is now an open route in education and to travel that makes life more meaningful because of the ethical recognition of the other and the other that will accompany me in a path of history.

Keywords: Alterity, Diversity, Education, Human rights, Recognition, Inclusion.

1 INTRODUCTION

From the early writings of Descartes, Locke, and Kant to contemporary discussions of mind and brain, philosophers have given strong support to the reality of a bounded being. In many ways the hallmark of Western philosophy was its presumption of dualism: mind and world, subject and object, self and other. Moreover, the field of philosophy is also nourished by the dispute, and while the individualistic view of human functioning has been dominant, there are significant fugitives, several of whom have become textual companions in developing proposals for relational beings. My conviction for existentialism has the work of Maurice Merleau-Ponty (1970) who, although he placed individual consciousness at the center of his thoughts, also postulates a conscience deeply inhabited by the other. From the above, the perception we have of the other contains in itself an awareness of being perceived by the other. When we observe the other during a conversation, for example, we are also conscious of being observing and both forms of consciousness are inextricable. Or, in the same vein, the consciousness of touching another person embodies in itself the consciousness of being touched by another.

Martin Heidegger's work (1962) is closely related. As for Merleau-Ponty, a large part of Heidegger's analysis treats the phenomenological world of consciousness and at the same time, the latter attempted to subvert the traditional subject/object dichotomy, in which conscious subjects contrast with a world apart from external objects. For Heidegger, consciousness is always the

consciousness of something. If all objects of consciousness are removed, there is no consciousness; If all consciousness is eliminated, objects cease to exist.

Thus, subject and object are fundamentally coexisting and the insertion of hyphens between the words of their fundamental concept, being in the world, functions as a visual illustration of the conceptual rupture of the traditional binary model. Although coming from the terrain of American pragmatism, the work of John Dewey and Arthur Bentley agrees with the breaking innovation of Heidegger's binary model (1949). In their view, there is a mutually constituent relationship between the person and the object (mind and world) and both agreed to replace the traditional view of interaction (independent objects in causal relation to experience) with the concept of transaction.

Another very important school of thought is that which emanates from sociological and political theory and each choyo work is especially, important for its critique of liberal individualism, both in terms of its influence in cultural life and for its adequacy as an orientation to civil society and politics. About data to everyday life, the book *Habits of the Heart* by Robert Bellah (1989) and colleagues is fundamental in its significance. The book reveals in detail the insidious implications of individualistic ideology for human relationships. In addition, he collected the initiatives of the community movement headed by Amitai Etzioni (1993) and his colleagues. Here the emphasis is on the obligations we have to the community as opposed to claims to individual rights.

For another part, the work of the political theorist Michael Sandel (1996) and the philosopher Alasdair MacIntyre (1987) adds an important conceptual dimension to this movement as both focus attention on the deep location of the individual in relationships and find the idea of the gravely flawed free agent and unprey. All these works have been sources of incalculable value formí, although it manifests some discontent with the valorization of the favored community as an alternative to individualism. There is not only the problem of determining the limits of what constitutes one's community but there are additional complications resulting from the very establishment of those limits. Educational communities are also delimited entities and create the same types of conflicts that assist the public as essentially separate. In the case of community commitments as religious and political consequences can be disastrous.

There is an important difference that separates this work from all the preceding content (except Wittgenstein). All these philosophers have worked in a tradition dedicated to establishing bases, decir, foundations of reason, truth, human naturalness, and ethical values. Foundations that are sometimes called first philosophies. On the other hand, this writing has no such aspirations and although the form of writing may sometimes suggest otherwise, my aim is not to articulate what is simply or should be human nature. I do not pretend to be true or precise in traditional terms, but I hope to offer an attractive construction of the world, a vision that invites, or an entity of understanding all materialized or

embodied in relevant actions. The basis is not a series of beautiful marching orders or an invitation to dance.

2 THE PEDAGOGY OF OTHERNESS: A WAY TO ENABLE AND UNDERSTAND THE EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE OF THE PRESENT

Since its beginnings, pedagogy has been defined as the discipline that,

conceptualizes, applies, and experiments with knowledge about the knowledge that is specific in different cultures. It refers both to the teaching processes of the exhibition of science, and the exercise of knowledge, in the interiority of culture (López, Barragán, and Aguirre, 1990).

That is to say, pedagogy is specifically responsible for the methods and theories for the understanding of the educational issue, of the forms of teaching in educational practices, it is the one that allows us to reflect on the various realities in which the human being is built as a subject in continuous formation.

During much of the twentieth century, various perspectives were created and developed in terms of pedagogy and its teaching methods; So much so that pedagogical models such as developmental, behaviorist, social, or traditional appear to be able to give a satisfactory explanation to a portion of that educational reality, because,

Pedagogy has built, from its history, a series of models, as ideal representations of the real world of education, to explain theoretically it's doing, that is, to understand what exists. But these models are dynamic, they transform and can, at a certain moment, be imagined to be poured into the real world (González, 1999, p. 48).

And effectively they have been poured into reality in such a way that, in many cases, they have served for societies to embrace these models and can become fundamental axes of learning and teaching for the transformation of a context for the common good of all human beings.

This transformation may be mediated by a relatively new form of teaching, the pedagogy of otherness. This educational perspective is based on epistemological constructions of philosophy, and well a little has gone into generating a broad debate about the whole of Chile. This pedagogy has very clear pretensions regarding the academic work as such, while what it seeks is the recovery of the word of the other, that voice that has been silenced for a long time, for ideological, political issues, for the eternal conflict between power and knowledge that is gestated within the classrooms. What prevents any human being from manifesting his logos, his thought, his power in expression. The conception of otherness is manifested by an ethical relationship insofar as,

it is a responsible relationship with the other, and the educator is someone passionate about the word, about the transmission of the word, about welcoming and hospitality, and about giving (Mélích, 2002, p. 51).

The discourse of otherness in essence offers the possibility that within the classroom voices, thoughts, argumentative constructions, and conceptual clarity are intermingled. This pedagogy is the bearer of the Promethean dream, of knowledge that is no longer of a single individual, but of many men. The word of the other is poured out and drawn with the subsubjectivities of others, to create free people committed to change and transformation. By this,

The incurable melancholy with which students move has its root in the almost generalized complacency of thinkers or educators in the direction of negativity and suspicion, in the silence they offer as the only answer to the question that students ask and ask themselves about the meaning of life, in the lack of alternative they find in the face of the nihilism of the time. In the inability to grasp the nature of the reality that is theirs, in the pessimism that surrounds them when they express enthusiasm, passion, and desires. When they overflow with life, they want to impose castration, submission, and obedience. They are supposed to train free men, but they manufacture slaves (Onfray, 1999, p. 53).

To understand a specific pedagogical model, two aspects must be taken into account, such as didactics and curriculum. In this sense, these two concepts could be defined to provide clarity and lay the foundations of the various conceptions of educational work in much of the twentieth century and early twenty-first century. Because

The didactics are constituted from the teaching-educational process that takes place in the school institution. This process relates the world of life with the world of school from the goals that society sets to form a type of man, to which the school responds from its didactic strategies, it is much more than simple means of teaching (Onfray, 1999, p. 48).

Didactics is the discourse by which teaching has been thought and the most appropriate ways to transmit knowledge; and in turn, for the understanding of the various conceptions that the world has as a whole. This conception then corresponds to those forms in which those who know, project their knowledge to others through strategies that help the understanding and explanation of phenomena, not from the mere theoretical conceptualization, because that is the task carried out by pedagogy, but as the discourse that is directed more concretely towards educational action as such.

However, the other fundamental component in this educational triage is the curriculum, which is constituting a predominant defeat in the construction of precedents and plans that tienen as pretension registrar. Therefore,

all that happens in the school is its main guide that is built in the educational area (...) is the bridge between the real world and the world of the school; He enables the relationships between the past of humanity, to bring it to the present of the educational activities and project the future of the communities; Thus he establishes a multitude of relationships between the old and the new, between the known and the unknown, what was and what will be, between everyday knowledge and scientific knowledge. The sense of the educational and curricular organization and curriculum la experiencia del hombre en el mundo de la vida, of such a way that acquires a formative sense with specific orientation (Onfray, 1999, p. 50).

All of the above allows us to configure a solid formation in the human being so that he can understand the context he inhabits, and in turn, understand the epistemological diversity that accompanies it.

With the above, we can begin to configure the different views that have been established in terms of educational practices, the different discourses, and the specific claims that accompany each of the pedagogical models that have wanted to respond to and meet the needs of the educational field. Therefore, it is imperative to speak of the forms of teaching that have had a vast influence throughout the twentieth century and have allowed us to configure part of the educational tradition. In the first instance, the traditional model,

emphasizes the formation of the character of the students, through religious and moral teaching. It is concentrated on contents already elaborated, and what the student does is learn them from the teacher. In this model, the method and content, in a way, focus on the imitation and emulation of the good example, whose closest incarnation is found in the teacher (Onfray, 1999, p. 122).

This type of pedagogical vision is all put into practice in societies, which despite the great advances and the apparent change of mentality of their citizens, even he is fully confident that this method is very effective in learning the contents of a course, just by the mere repetition of what the teacher says. In this model what prevails in the didactic part is the process where the strategies start from;

the moral and intellectual legacy of humanity, with taxes goals for tradition; the contents are encyclopedic; the methods are transmissionist; In the forms, the teaching process prevails over the learning process, the work of the teacher over the student; the means are blackboard and chalk; and evaluation is rote and quantitative (Onfray, 1999, p. 53).

All this didactic vision remains in many places, but the new tools and processes of understanding the world do not allow knowledge to be encrypted in mere data or dates, or that learning means repeating any number of names of countries or politicians, without that having a relevant impact on the social context that each one inhabits. We must reformulate the ways of understanding knowledge, and know that it is always necessary to put it into practice so that it continues to have validity and be equally useful.

The behaviorist pedagogical model has a very close relationship with certain characteristics of the traditional model; However, it has its essential particularities because,

It developed in the highest phase of capitalism, with the aim of meticulously shaping the "productive" behavior of the individual. It is based on the setting and control of the achievement of "instructional" objectives.

The fragmented transmission of technical knowledge is carried out, through experimental training that uses "Educational Technology". They identify intellectual development with learning (Onfray, 1999, p. 122).

When we talk about educational technology here, we refer to the processes that are made effective for the teacher through planning and control; is a purely mechanical method that seeks to make knowledge feasible for the growth and improvement of the means of production imposed by the State of Chile.

3 CHANGE AND DIVERSITY

It is important to clarify that a culture and a pedagogy in Human Rights requires, unpostponably and inescapably, that we focus on our attention in founding themes: otherness and diversity. This view is not something fortuitous, an academic occurrence, the bell that is the result of a broad conceptual appeal in the Education of Human Rights, in the education for tolerance and discrimination, in multicultural education, and, overall, in a critical viewpoint to the reality that touches us to live daily. Since I must already point out that, although now lately in our societies we have begun to travel along the path of recognition of the Other as legitimate Other / Other and the existence of cultural and social diversity, still the challenge that lies ahead is complex and the obstacles to be saved are not minors.

We must not forget that generations there are denied the presence of the Otro/ Otro distinct, different even if it has marginalized and excluded and if there is unknown the multicultural, multiethnic, and multireligious character that defines our society. Unfortunately, education, from the process of homogenization, has historically been responsible for reproducing discrimination and intolerance. It seems that it will be spent on education if it has been discussed with the decision on the theme and has sought to gradually amend this situation, every time that hoy incorporates as part of public policies the respect for social, cultural, and religious diversity and the recognition of the inviolability of human dignity.

Insisting on the thesis proposed, it is my opinion that in the homogenization and concealment, in the invisibility of the Other and the ignorance of diversity, not only a fundamental right enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is violated, which states textually that "all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights, and endowments of reason and conscience, they must behave fraternally with each other", Bell That, in addition, is difficult and why not say it makes it impossible to build a democratic, tolerant and non-discriminatory society.

In summary, the alteridad y la diversidad are necessary conditions to build a culture and a democratic, inclusive, and respectful coexistence of the rights of the people. The mission of education is to deliver knowledge, contribute to the development of attitudes, and, above all, reinforce in students those social skills that allow them to relate as citizens of the same humanity in the recognition of the Other / Other as legitimate Other / Other.

3.1 OTHERNESS

The relationship of altered, in particular, referred to the culture and pedagogy of human rights, requires crossing philosophical, epistemological, and educational frontiers that require inquiring in a field of much complexity. I just tried to give some brushstrokes, in the good understanding that there will be concepts hinted and open to dialogue and reflection.

In the first place, and based on the thought of Emmanuel Levinas (2000), I will point out that recognizing the Other / Other as legitimate Other / Other is an ethical position and not ontological. For Levinas, after Auschwitz the philosophical concern — I would add, also the pedagogical one — cannot remain referred to the "ways of being", "to the understanding of being", but to ethics, that is, to the relationship of being, with the responsibility with the Other, with the encounter with the Other / Other. The responsibility in Lévinas is:

"The essential, first, fundamental structure of subjectivity, since it is in ethical terms that I describe subjectivity. Ethics here does not come as a supplement to a previous existential basis; It is in ethics understood as a responsibility, where the very knot of the subjective is knotted (...) Responsibility, as a responsibility to the Other, as. for, as responsibility for what is not my business or does not even concern me; which precisely conierne me, is addressed by m. as Rostro."

In Levinas' response, in my opinion, a central element in his position must be rescued: what it is to be a man. For him, to be hombre means in being, to live humanly communicates, go out of their way for el otro Otro/Otra. He even maintains that responsibility reaches the level of being responsible for the responsibility of the Other, it is incumbent on me... Since responsibility towards the Other is part of the essence of the subject, it is something inalienable. The self is "hostage" to the Other. As Levinas (2000) explains: "Responsibility is not a simple attribute of subjectivity as if it already existed in itself, before the ethical relationship. Subjectivity is not a for; It is initially for El Otro. The other is not close to me simply in space, or close as a relative, bell who essentially approaches me as long as I feel responsible for him."

As we pointed out, responsibility is linked to the Other. The question is, who is this Other? In terms of Hans Georg Gadamer (1976), the philosopher of modern hermeneutics, the knowledge of the Other refers to the Other / Other not as an "instrument", but as someone that can be used for its purposes, that can be made visible or arbitrarily invisible.

The Other is also not the "analog", which is considered as different, but always concerning myself, a reflection of myself. For Gadamer (1976), the knowledge of the Other is that of "openness", when one allows oneself to speak for the Other. It implies "the acknowledgment that I may be willing to assert in m. something against me, even though there is no other who will assert it against me."

The general tendency has been to reduce the Other to the same, or to use it for certain purposes or purposes in many cases in ignorance of the Other or hiding the true intentions of the relationship. To reduce the Other to myself is not only violence, but domination, it is to exercise over the Other an undue and arbitrary power. It is, in short, annihilate diversity by subsuming it to homogeneity.

For Levinas, the direct relationship with the Other does not mean thematizing him, considering him a knowable object or someone to whom he communicates knowledge. If you want to preserve the Other, you cannot reduce it to an object of knowledge or be experienced from an "egological" position.

In summary, the alteridad y la diversidad are necessary conditions to build a culture and a democratic, inclusive, and respectful coexistence of the rights of the people.

3.2 DIVERSITY

Diversity is part of the process of transformation that the discourse of modernity is undergoing and that some have called the discourse of postmodernity, which is the "announcement of a new epoch, after modernity". Some consider that the discourse of modernity; Characterized as a hegemonic discourse unifying and totalizing, typical of illuminist and instrumental reason, begins to run out.

Others, in a more open position, perceive the current time as a seminal time, in which great cultural transformations are taking place. In this context, José Joaquín Brunner identifies the interior of modernity to the neo-community ideology. as that responds to the experience of communities integrated by autonomous individuals (those whose liberation is postulated) and in this way differs from the structures of traditional communities, which are characterized by being hierarchical, with traditional forms of domination, whose legitimacy rested on the sanctity of the inherited powers. The rationality that prevails in neo-community ideologies is more communicative than instrumental: it seeks to construct identities and integrate the individual into an association that moves its resources to realize its value. Says Brunner (1992);

"Often these ideologies are linked to social groups 'disinherited' by modernization, whose rights they proclaim and whose condition they seek to transform or liberate. But at the same time, this ideology.as reach expressions that appeal to diverse groups that are at the center of modernity: communities of life, generational and gender groups, deprofessionalization movements, certain religious movements, therapeutic communities, "counter-cultures" of various kinds in the fields of health, food, and the use of appropriate technology of "communication" of knowledge".

In short, we are witnessing the emergence of a great variety of identities that some have defined as "post-materialists" and in that ubican, for example, environmental groups, third edad, groups that fight for tolerance and no discrimination, groups of defense of rights: women, indigenous, homosexuals, and lesbians, among others.

Diversity presupposes questioning conformism, social asymmetries, also, injustices. In this sense, the message of diversity is not neutral.

Assuming diversity as a relationship means, for now, accepting inter and multiculturalism as a new paradigm of social organization where concepts such as social responsibility, active citizenship, empowerment, participation

Citizen and deliberative democracy are redefined and invigorated. Diversity is produced in the most diverse fields: social, cultural, philosophical, religious, moral, and political Diversity, which is sometimes defined as plurality, "is a factual fact of every society.

in which there is a non-coincident variety of beliefs, convictions, feelings, and views on matters that rise to important importance such as the origin and purpose of human life; man's relationship to a possible divinity; the idea of a good life and the means necessary to achieve it; The organization and distribution of power.

Now, as it is indicated, historically has made serious attempts to deny diversity, to hinder its increase and its expressiveness, and to stigmatize it as a phenomenon that could put on the survival of a unitary social project. Sometimes it is usually hidden, made invisible, or even combated and eliminated. Totalitarian, authoritarian, and dictatorial regimes have been characterized, precisely, by these anti-diversity behaviors. Think, for example, of Nazi racism that employed the physical elimination of all those who did not consent to the criteria of the "master race"; in the military dictatorships of Latin America that prescribed, with the use of force and the violation of fundamental rights, all political manifestations that did not conform to the security project; In the regimes of the countries that prohibited, hid and sanctioned those cultural manifestations that departed from the official canons.

All of these attempts to suppress diversity have been accompanied by severe violations of human dignity and human rights. The diversity of distinct cultural and social groups (with discontinuous ties but which are simultaneously present, the existence of a culture integrated by diverse traditions) has been a characteristic of the Latin American world. Multiethnicity, multi-religiosity, multiculturalism, and multiclass have been and still are present in the history of Latin America. However, the tendency has been to deny diversity: homogenize it, fragment it, marginalize it, disseminate it, and make it invisible. In the name of order, national unity, "modernizing" and "civilizing" pursuits, diversity has not only been denied and rejected but it has been fought and censored.

One of the most severe manifestations of the denial of diversity is and has been that of discrimination, built on prejudices and irrational stereotypes that have been installed in culture, attitudes, and behaviors in a very profound way.

Historical reasons of the most diverse nature have led to certain groups of people being intensely threatened or violated in their rights and have been subjected to very severe discrimination in an institutionalized and systematic manner.

This is the case for women, people of color, the Jews, religious minority groups, homosexuals and lesbians, the disabled, the poor, the young, and people belonging to the third age. This situation has led (and why not say it, has required) the elaboration of a series of international instruments aimed at prohibiting and eradicating systematic discrimination. In this regard, special measures have been adopted with the exclusive purpose of accelerating the de facto equality of these groups (positive action).

4 OTHERNESS, CONDITION OF DIVERSITY

It could be said that otherness is a necessary, although not sufficient, condition for the relationship with diversity. There is no possibility of relating to diversity if there is no capacity, first, to recognize the Other as a legitimate Other, and secondly, if there is no responsibility, assumption, or apprehension of the Other as Face.

In invisibility, concealment, in the silencing of the Other, the relationship of diversity is impracticable. In the same way, if the Other becomes an Equal, if it is subsumed to the Same if it is analogized, if it is instrumentalized... The relationship of diversity is distorted, it becomes a deceitful relationship, lacking possibilities for development and growth. This happens, for example, when the differences are made more folk when there is no opportunity for diversity to manifest itself in its fullness; when the diversity is hierarchized, establishing levels of superiority. That is, when it is said: I accept diversity, but there are diverse and diverse!

Now, the relationship of diversity with the responsibility of the Other is due, in my opinion, to understand how a relationship with Another is a plural: an us-us, a you-you, them. It is the Face in the plural⁹. Consequently, in my opinion, we are always related to Others, with a multiplicity of Others. In an open society, as there we want to build, we will always be in the presence of many Others. It is a relation that is assigned to us, embraces us, embraces us, and understands us. We cannot, even if we want to unless we are measured in a barrel, in a ghetto, in a tunnel of self-loneliness, of self-exclusion, do without diversity. If it imposes on us. Therefore, we will have to live with it. But this coexistence cannot be one of imposition, but of commitment; it cannot be an obligation, but a binding; It cannot be an inevitable fatalism, nor can it be an approximation as an object of knowledge that is expressed in the phrase: how beautiful diversity is!

It is a coexistence in the responsibility to which Levinas alluded. A responsibility without reciprocity. A responsibility with others that enriches me, but that is not conditioned to this enrichment.

Responsibility to Others, even though they are sometimes distant from my own identity. It is the search for approximations, for communication, even if it means breaking some of my identity schemes. In a responsibility with breakdown, with a breakdown of my identity, but without abandonment of it.

I wish to return to what was stated in the introduction and note that in the perspective of the cultural and pedagogical implantation of a single-national model, education is characterized historically by having transmitted a scheme of meanings and symbolic representations that correspond to the culture of the culturally dominant groups of society. In this way, if there is disavowed the diverse character that makes up our society. This lack of knowledge has been charged, in a notorious way, by the disqualification and devaluation of any cultural manifestation that moves away from the homogenizing nucleus, in which all kinds of prefeicios have been generated that have resulted in discriminations installed deep in the national being of Our Country. It is not unknown to anyone how many prejudices have been raised against all those who depart from the dominant culture.

However, it should be noted that public policies have made, I think, for the first time, a frontal criticism of the reproductive nature of the education of inequalities, inequality, and social injustices. It has been found that discrimination, ethnocentrism, marginalization, and homogenization have been predominant characteristics of the educational service.

However, the road left by resorted is long. The question is how this discourse becomes a consistent educational practice, a culture a pedagogy of diversity and otherness. Without wishing to simplify, I think that Human Rights Education has a very important proactive role to play in this regard. For now, you must identify and note that diversity is a right enshrined in multiple national and international instruments. It requires linking this right with another series of social, cultural, economic, and political rights and showing the tensions that the validity of these rights has in a society that promotes homogenization for domination.

True, Education in Human Rights founded on the recognition of the Other and the respect and promotion of social, cultural, and religious diversity is a long road, but not impossible.

In summary, the alteridad y la diversidad are necessary conditions to build a culture and a democratic, inclusive, and respectful coexistence of the rights of the people. The mission of social education is to deliver knowledge, contribute to the development of attitudes, and, above all, reinforce in students those social skills that allow them to relate as citizens of the same humanity in the recognition of diversity.

5 CONCLUSION

The educational and pedagogical tradition has bequeathed us many things, some of which

It is necessary to forget others that it is imperative to maintain. Therefore, the question arises as to whether a conception of formation anchored and established in presuppositions of time ago could still be preserved, or if the dynamics of society as a whole provide the essential characteristics for another way of conceiving reality to be activated.

Therefore, it is possible that the pedagogy of alterity can become over time a proposal that favorably dynamizes teaching and learning practices, thanks to its conception focused on dialogue and thought, with its conceptual and epistemological presuppositions that providing diverse variants in front of the formative task, leaving aside the perpetuation of an activity that is energized in most cases by an incessant tension between power and knowledge, forging the word and experience as firm builders of a change of perspective for our own daily educational life.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arellano, a. (2005). *La educación en tiempos débiles e inciertos*. Barcelona: antrophos.
- Bárcena, f. (2001). *La esfinge muda. El aprendizaje del dolor después de auschwitz*. Barcelona: antrophos.
- Bárcena, f. & mélich, j. (2000). *La educación como acontecimiento ético. Natalidad, narración y hospitalidad*. Barcelona: paidós.
- Brunner, José Joaquín (1992). “cartografías de la modernidad”, editorial dolmen. *La libertad de los modernos*, pág. 49. Este trabajo fue publicado en *estudios públicos*, n° 46, Santiago, Chile, págs. 56-57.
- Gadamer, Hans Georg (1976). *El círculo hermenéutico y el problema de los prejuicios*. Teoría. Universidad de Chile.
- González, e. (1999). *Corrientes pedagógicas contemporáneas*. Medellín: universidad de antioquia.
- Larrosa, j. (2003). *La experiencia de la lectura. Estudios sobre literatura y formación*. México: fondo de cultura económica.
- Lévinas, e. (1991). *Ética e infinito*. Madrid: la balsa de la medusa.
- Levinas, Emmanuel (2002). *Ética e infinito*, gráficas rógar, s. A. Madrid, España, segunda edición.
- López, p., barragán, b. & aguirre, y. (1990). *Módulo de pedagogía*. Medellín: funlam.
- Magendzo k., abraham (2003). *Manual de tolerancia y no discriminación*. Fundación ideas, editorial lom.
- Magendzo k., abraham (2004). *De miradas y mensajes a la educación en derechos humanos*. Editorial lom.
- Magendzo k., abraham y María Isabel Toledo (2004). *Intimidación entre estudiantes*. Editorial lom.
- Mélich, j. (2002). *Filosofía de la finitud*. Barcelona: herder.
- Not, I. (1983). *Las pedagogías del conocimiento*. México: fondo de cultura económica.
- Onfray, m. (1999). *El deseo de ser un volcán*. Buenos Aires: perfil libros.
- Skliar, c. & Larrosa, j. (2009). *Experiencia y alteridad en educación*. Santa Fe: homo sapiens ediciones
- Squella, Agustín (2000). “pluralidad, pluralismo y tolerancia en la sociedad actual”. En: *pluralismo, sociedad y democracia: la riqueza de la diversidad*. Colección fundación Felipe Herrera, Santiago de Chile, pág. 447.