

SAGGIO – ESSAYS

FROM A DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVE: THE PEDAGOGIES OF OTHERS FOR AN INTERCULTURAL AND SUSTAINABLE RELATIONSHIP AMONG HUMANITY, NATURE AND SOCIETY

di Isabella Pescarmona, Giulia Gozzelino*

Nel quadro dello sviluppo sostenibile promosso dall'Agenda 2030, il contributo entra in dialogo con le proposte culturali, sociali ed economiche del *Buen vivir* (Ecuador e Bolivia) e dell'*Ubuntu* (Sud Africa) come occasione di riflessione pedagogica e interculturale. Ascoltare diverse interpretazioni di sviluppo umano, realizzate in comunità (attraverso prassi di responsabilità, educazione e partecipazione) e in equilibrio con l'ambiente (nel rispetto dei diritti della natura), non è solo un modo per conoscere la storia degli altri, ma diventa un atto di giustizia sociale se si riconosce il diritto di dar voce ad *altre* visioni e si mette in discussione la nostra prospettiva, basata su un assunto individualista ed eurocentrico. Nuovi sguardi ci insegnano la necessità di nutrire la diversità culturale, sociale e biologica come responsabilità pedagogica ed economica per educare alla ricerca di risposte alternative e aprire le porte dell'*oikos* al mondo.

In the frame of Sustainable Development promoted by the Agenda 2030, the paper will enter into dialogue with the cultural, social and economic proposals of *Buen vivir* (Ecuador and Bolivia) and of *Ubuntu* (South Africa) as an opportunity for a pedagogical and inter-cultural reflection. Listening to different Human Development's perspectives, carried out in community (through prac-

* This contribution, fully shared by the two authors, was drawn up as follows: paragraphs 1 and 4 by Isabella Pescarmona, and paragraphs 2 and 3 by Giulia Gozzelino.

tices of responsibility, education and participation) and in balance with the environment (by respecting Nature's Rights), is not only a way of knowing Others' history, but it becomes an action for social justice, when we recognize the value of giving voice to other visions and problematize our own usual perspective, grounded in an individualistic and Eurocentric assumption. This new "looking glass" may teach us the need to nurture cultural, social and biological diversity as a pedagogical and economic responsibility, in order to educate to search alternative answers and open the *oikos'* doors to the world.

1. Sustainable development: a common issue for an intercultural challenge

Nowadays, sustainability is a concept that finds its way in the majority of international and national documents and guidelines. Its original focus on ecological balance has widened to progressively include economic and social development, to the point of describing sustainable development as a «development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs» (United Nation, 1987, p. 16). From the Brundtland Commission on Environment and Development (United Nation, 1987) to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (United Nation, 2015a), the issues related to climate change hazards and to worsening socio-economic inequalities has raised growing attention. The above mentioned international documents identify and discuss the rules, strategies, policies and institutions that can shape how humans interact with the environment. Furthermore, they address a range of social needs, such as education, health and job opportunities, in order to promote socio-economic prosperity while protecting the planet. The main goal is to promote a paradigm shift capable of responding to biodiversity loss and climate crisis and, at the same time, ensuring fair, peaceful and sustainable societies.

This leads to foster a debate "climate justice" (European Union, 2018; United Nation, 2015b). There is, in fact, a strict rela-

tionship between climate change and social inequality. Initial inequality may cause the disadvantaged groups (due to gender, age, race, ethnicity or vulnerable subsistence livelihood) to suffer disproportionately from the adverse effects of climate change, resulting in a greater subsequent increase of their susceptibility to environmental damage and, conversely, in a decrease in their ability to cope and recover from that damage (Islam & Winkel, 2017). The problem has its origins in the inequalities of power, within our societies and across countries, and the way those inequalities have distinctive environmental consequences for the marginalized and the impoverished groups or populations, not rarely denigrated as “Others”. This is particularly true for Indigenous people whose survival lies in the protection of the environment. For them, climate change may be a threat to their lives as well as to their knowledge system and socio-cultural practices, as they often have no control over the use of their territories and resources and have historically had little voice in decision making processes (Unesco, 2016). Not surprisingly, the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People (2007) claims that «Indigenous peoples have the right to the conservation and protection of the environment and the productive capacity of their lands or territories and resources» (art. 29).

Indeed, the protection of the environment has strong implications for the implementation of Human Rights around the world (Gianolla, 2013). The right to sustainable development and the right to a healthy and ecologically balanced environment are identified as a third generation of Human Rights, and they are protected with different degrees of intensity by various legal documents. For example, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) refers to the right to an «adequate standard of living» (art. 25), and the Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989) asserts the relevance of the environment and pollution in relation to the nutrition and health of the child and of the child’s right to receive an education that includes the respect for Nature (art. 24). This issue progressively moves up the human rights international Agenda, by connecting environmental protection to the well-

being of people and economic growth, and by highlighting the contribution that education could make. Education is, in fact, recognized as playing a key role in promoting global citizenship, i.e. empowering learners to assume active roles to face global challenges and become responsible for a more just and sustainable world (Council of Europe, 2019; Gandolfi & Rizzi, 2013; Iavarone, Malavasi, Orefice & Pinto Minerva, 2017).

Thus, the need for a socio-economic and cultural paradigm shift to increase the quality of life has been claimed in the Agenda 2030, and it becomes more urgent now, as the coronavirus pandemic highlights the dysfunctionality of the mainstream economic system and is jeopardizing the lives of billions of people around the globe, by driving the 17 Goals further away. This time of uncertainty requires a radical rethink about the concept of “sustainability” and “sustainable development”. These terms are used widely spread, but they are too often taken for granted and not appropriately analyzed. One of the main critiques points out that these concepts find their roots in the underpinning assumption of development as “growth” or “progress”, and “economic growth” in particular, marked by a linear and indefinite evolution (Gudynas, 2016). Although this model is presented as universally valid, it is the expression of the paradigm of modernity and neoliberal ideology, which is founded in European/Western ontology. The focus on “capitalistic consumption”, “modernization”, “employability”, and “human capital” approaches to development reveals how the global market, society and education are strictly interconnected in the dominant discourse, and how this development could come at the expense of the environment and of Others. It reduces the understanding of the world to the Western conception, by ignoring or trivializing other cultural and socio-political ideas and experiences, and it leads to question its real opportunities for achieving quality of life for all (Brown & McCowan, 2018).

Besides, the mainstream approach to human rights in itself underlies the supposition that the environment should be protected due to its instrumental role in relation to the well-being of human beings. The Western tradition accords the highest dignity

to human beings, excluding non-humans from the discussion. Nature is often considered merely as a resource. It is seen as a backdrop to the implementation of Human Rights – a view that continues to facilitate its exploitation and damage. However, this anthropocentric vision may have negative implications on the capacity of human rights to fulfil their mandate, and it may turn into an inadequate response to current global challenges (Gianolla, 2013). As Pannikar (1982) has already stated, «there is certainly a *universal human nature* but, first of all, this nature does not need to be segregated and fundamentally distinct from the nature of all living beings [...]. We speak of the law of nature; why not also of her Rights?» (p. 81).

Therefore, the question is how to eradicate a strict anthropocentric and Eurocentric approach and how to search alternatives for a sustainable development, in order to give rise to a new way of reasoning to protect the environment *per se* and the existence of humanity itself.

Education could help us try new paths. This is not because it offers definite answers or ready-to-use solutions, but because of the way it can shape our view and our approach to this issue. In particular, intercultural education may provide the basis for alternative ways of thinking. It recognizes the value of other socio-cultural systems to enrich our understanding of the world and, at the same time, offers a way of looking at and relating to Others (Besley & Peters, 2012; Pescarmona, 2020). Listening to their interpretation of the world and to the different meanings they give to reality could become an opportunity for learning from differences, by exploring different conceptions of human dignity and the relationship between Nature and Humanity. It is also an occasion to educate ourselves to engage in a dialogue, which would resist any universal definition of what the best conception should be.

Thus, we should look elsewhere and find inspiration from Indigenous people's conceptions and the notions emerging from the cultural and political movements in Latin America and Africa – particularly from those people who are worst affected by climate change, but have developed different and worthwhile

(eco)sustainable models of life, which may challenge our traditional approach.

2. *Buen vivir: living in harmony, educating to diversity*

In different cultural contexts, a range of alternative conceptions of human and non-human dignity are recognized. An open and pedagogical look at the world, for listening to the words of Others, takes us to Central and South America and allows us to meet the concept of *Buen vivir* and the reflections it generates around the balance between people, communities, Nature and well-being.

Here we can discuss resources and inspirations that are trying to reinvent law, education and economy. *Buen vivir* translates the Quechua expression (from Ecuador) *Sumak kawsay* and the Aymara (from Bolivia) *Suma qamaña* as the search for harmony and collective well-being with nature to design a new perspective of social change, from a multi-national and intercultural vision. It is an indigenous Andean concept embedded in the ethical values of indigenous cultures and based on a worldview centred on humanity as an integral part of the natural and social environment. The concept concerns “good living”/“well-being”, in relation to respect for cultural diversity, peace and non-violence, as well as cultivation of the knowledge of ancestral cultures, through an emphasis on listening, dialogue, reciprocity, and generosity. *Sumak kawsay*, *Suma qamaña*, *Buen vivir* is a way of life that builds on interconnections between all dimensions of life, echoing the notions of respect for diversity, solidarity with people and with nature and a shared sense of humanity.

Buen vivir is not a synonym of quality of life in the Western traditional sense. It suggests living in a dynamic, changing, active manner. It is about harmonious coexistence and living with nature in accordance with the principles of reciprocity, complementarity, solidarity and relationality (Villalba, 2013). It focuses on the quality of human life and respect for Nature in strong contrast to

the Western traditional concept of development which is based on economic growth and on an anthropocentric focus. Starting from the history and the experiences of indigenous communities, *Buen vivir* pays particular attention to mother nature, *pachamama*, no longer seen as a simple means of achieving development and sustainability, but considered as the ultimate goal and the center of all life. It is not limited to the respect for nature, but it involves reflecting on a model that incorporates many facets of a good life, sociality, solidarity, diversity, human rights, ecological justice and so on (Baranquero, 2012). The notion of *pachamama*, the recognition of nature as a subject of law, in fact, represents one of the most significant contributions made by the Constitutions of Ecuador (2008) and Bolivia (2009) to Latin American jurisprudence within the framework of the notion of *Buen vivir* (Díaz Martínez & Chacón Cancino, 2013); these recognitions and changes question economy, philosophy, pedagogy about the choices that we can face, in this historical moment, for present and future generations.

Buen vivir results from a recovery of indigenous knowledge and sensibilities as a reaction against conventional development and as a bet on a substantial alternative. It is an organizing principle that allows tying innovative aspects and those continuities and even inertia that are combined in the new proposal (Leòn, 2010). It is a civilization and cultural project, antithetical to capitalism, modernity and its notion of progress, which integrates utopias and social programs in harmony with nature and the community, articulating ways of consumption, behaviors and conducts not degrading towards Others or the environment. The Ecuadorian Constitution affirms that *Buen vivir* requires individuals, communities, peoples and nationalities to actually enjoy the rights, and exercise their responsibilities under the *interculturalidad*, respect for diversity and harmonious coexistence with nature. *Buen vivir* is also *interculturalidad*: a project that places emphasis on relationships, communication and learning between people and community of knowledge, values, traditions, to encourage fullness development of individuals and groups' capacities, breaking with the hegemonic scheme of dominant and subordinate culture. It is a process

that aspires to grow the knowledge's interrelation of each cultural group with the others, which strengthens their respective identities and interaction between them to place all groups on an effective parity plan (Baldin & De Vido, 2019).

Ecuador and Bolivia's experiences show us the possibility of questioning our economic and cultural model in depth and asking pedagogical questions in view of a change in the system. The very act of valuing anti-hegemonic worldviews and knowledge is an important part of decolonising education and of building a new world: it requires a new vision and the opening to the plurality of modes of knowing and living that the world offers (Brown & McCowan, 2018). Cultural dialogue is considered the main expression of *Buen vivir* pedagogical approach that promotes intercultural and democratic exchange throughout the country and in the world. Taking up the experiences of Freire (1973; 2002), this approach would engage problem-posing to decolonise education, critical dialogue, the transformation of teacher-student relations, and the incorporation of indigenous knowledge. At school, people are called to become «critical, auto-critical, reflexive, proactive, innovative» (Lopez Cardozo, 2015), teachers are also social researchers exploring democracy and integral inclusion.

We reflect on the possibility of intercultural and educational practices where other types of knowledge, other ways of being and understanding the world, other ways of learning play a part (Villagómez & Cunha de Campos, 2014). Listening to *Buen vivir* – and narrating its history of transformation, resistance, emancipation, liberation and dialogue – demands creative educational spaces and social, intercultural experiments where people can feel protagonists of a process, involved in a cultural exchange by being active agents of a new vision in the complexity of our world.

3. *Ubuntu: person and community*

In keeping with the belief that there is a need to include alternative paradigms in education that are less positivistic, Eurocen-

tric and individualistic, we push ourselves to seize other stimuli on the relationship between economics and pedagogy originating from the Ubuntu perspective in Africa.

Ubuntu is a bantu, xulu and xhosa word that expresses wholeness – *ubu* – and oneness – *ntu* (Shumba, 2011). *Ubuntu* is defined as a form of human engagement that allows for critical thinking, non-domination and the optimal development of human relationships (Letseka, 2011), meaning that «each individual’s humanity is ideally expressed in relationship with others; Ubuntu is then to be aware of one’s own being but also of one’s duties towards one’s neighbor» (Baken, 2015, p. 5). *Ubuntu* is an African ethic, a humanist philosophy, and a way of life that emphasizes and enhances a sense of community, cooperation, compassion, collective look and respect for the dignity of personhood (Barrett, 2008; Ubuntu Network, 2007). The translation is difficult, «because the African world view is not easily and neatly categorized [...] any attempt to define Ubuntu is merely a simplification of a more expansive, flexible and philosophically accommodative idea» (Mokgoro, 1997, p. 16). It connotes community, human dignity and welfare as central to development efforts; it stresses the connectedness and interdependence of the human community: cooperation, solidarity, humaneness, harmonious existence with all people and creation (Shumba, 2011). *Ubuntu* can be summarized as the belief in a link that connects all humanity: what we are is the fruit of the life of an infinity of other people; according to a famous interpretation, *Umuntu ngumuntu ngabantu*, a person is a person through another person’s eyes, he’s a person through other people. We can understand the person in a kind of communal or relational humanity; everyone is someone thanks to other people, “I am because we are”. The *Ubuntu* thinking originates in southern Africa but it forms part of many African belief systems and serves as a foundation for education. With Ubuntu, the relationship between a person and their community is interdependent and mutually beneficial (Unesco, 2016).

An *Ubuntu* frame increases the power of education to provide greater equality of opportunity and quality of life for all citizens:

the concept of *Ubuntu*, with its emphasis on inclusiveness, equity and equality, is central to Africa's pursuit of quality education goal (Biraimah, 2016). However, the potential of the *Ubuntu* community spirit is not limited to the African continent and to the Global South: broad perspectives invite us to a reflection on the worldwide usefulness of alternative conceptual and pedagogical schemes.

In schools and in education, *Ubuntu* is described as an inclusive approach which calls for dignity and respect in our mutual relationships with Others, and its values can play a critical role in terms of effective and efficient teaching and learning. The *Ubuntu* paradigm can impact on the field of international education and development: these include cultivation of humility; appreciation for knowledge, expertise, local culture and skills of natives; incentivising reflective practices and exchanges; diversifying the field to include locals, minorities, female, vulnerable subject (Piper, 2016). It can help to balance the challenges presented by a globally interconnected world on the one hand, and it can be the restoration, rejuvenation and reimagining of traditional African values that had become eroded during the colonial and apartheid periods, on the other hand (Le Grange, 2011).

It is important to underline that *Ubuntu* is not a homologating paradigm through which the community prevails over the person: individual diversity finds space in comparison and relationship. «In a dualistic model, both have their value, in balancing “the self” and “self in relation to the other”» (Van Norren, 2014, p. 259). People have the freedom to be together in a way that enhances everyone's capability to transform themselves in their society.

In this perspective, originality and self-expression find space in community. Diversity creates enrichment and reciprocity: the exchange with the *other* allows self-understanding and facilitates to take shape as a person (Milani, 2000). Educational experiences, focuses on the application of *Ubuntu* (sharing, love, respect) as a teaching strategy, elicit support and cooperation among learners. If educational activity and interactions are based on the precepts

of *Ubuntu*, they may encourage the practice of enhancement of differences, promote social cohesion and fight apartheid, racism, ethnicity and xenophobia (Quan-Baffour, 2014).

Ubuntu can be closely related to the human rights theory and global education, adding a relational dimension, emphasizing the role of duties in relation to rights, by «proposing a fundamental reshaping of our thinking, where market competition is complemented by cooperation; and where acting out of “self-interest” is balanced by the notion of “not existing without the other”». This encourages us towards «better self-realization as a community, to come closer to the ideal, and to reach our full human potential as society and as individuals» (Van Norren, 2014, p. 264). It is time to listen to African voices claiming that we are profoundly interconnected and morally responsible for one another.

4. Towards a new paradigm for educating and communicating for a sustainable life

The precarious unsustainable condition in which the world finds itself today requires more than ever before that we acknowledge solutions that would recognize our deep interdependence with Nature and with people from different part of the world. A real sustainability can only be achieved by working together, promoting a critical awareness of the role of different local cultures and their pedagogies, and by critically interrogate the Western root of development and its potential to enclose the common good.

Adopting an intercultural approach can be a means for learning a lesson from elsewhere, which may challenge the Eurocentric and anthropocentric concept of economic progress and development as universal aspirations. Furthermore, it drives the idea of different possible lifestyles based on the recognition of the human worth, communal relationships and a strong reverence for the natural environment. Above all, it can provide an opportunity to engage with international agendas in novel ways, by laying the foundation for a critical dialogue and for the construction of new

spaces for citizen participation and collective learning processes to face global common problems.

Indeed, listening to meridian pedagogies (Gozzelino, 2020; Loiodice & Annacontini, 2017), in particular the *Buen Vivir* and *Ubuntu* perspectives that are carried out in community and in balance with the environment, is not only a way of knowing Others' worldviews, but it becomes an action for social justice, when we recognize the value of giving voice to other visions that are often silenced or marginalized in the current international debate. It can stimulate an explicit discussion on power relationships, which leads to a socio-economic and educational project that emphasizes the relationships, communication and lifelong learning among different people and different worldviews.

This is at the core of the concept of *interculturalidad*: instead of being a vehicle for the dissemination of principles that are postulated to be universal, it strengthens the different identity of each cultural group and the interaction with each other, by assuming an equal status among all the participants in the debate. Such an exchange can empower the capacity of each group to participate to the sustainable development debate and contribute to formulate new socio-economic and educational policies. Likewise, as Ubuntu pedagogy and cosmovision reminds, properly within a web of relationships, between people and with the non-human world, and in balance with different personal approaches, searching for new ways for living together is possible.

Sharing different experiences and life views may contribute to develop an *ecology of knowledges*, which «starts with the assumption that all practices of relations among human beings, as well as between human beings and Nature, imply more than one form of knowledge» (Santos, 2012, p. 57). It recognizes the limits of one's own understanding of the world and remains open to the possibility of enriching the initial vision thanks to an intercultural dialogue. Then, this approach means opening spaces for collective learning and moving towards an epistemological pluralism, which avoid rigid boundaries between worldviews and acknowledging different forms of knowing. Different perspectives could ground

education for development and build a new paradigm to a more sustainable world, because it is precisely the richness of diversities our real inheritance and guarantee of survival.

Thus, the pedagogies of Others may teach us the need to nurture cultural, social and biological diversity as a pedagogical and socio-economic responsibility. They may educate to search alternative sustainable answers and imagine possible futures in the spirit of reciprocity and inter-connectivity, and so open our *oikos*' doors to the world.

Bibliography

- Baken L. (2015). The African Philosophy of Ubuntu in South African Education. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 15(1). Available in: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/274374017_The_African_Philosophy_of_Ubuntu_in_South_African_Education [19 october 2020].
- Baldin S., & De Vido S. (2019). Strumenti di gestione della diversità culturale dei popoli indigeni in America Latina: note sull'interculturalità. *DPCE online*, 2, 1305-1320. Available in: <http://www.dpceonline.it/index.php/dpceonline/article/view/733> [19 october 2020].
- Baranquero A. (2012). From Communication for Development to Eco-social Justice and *Buen Vivir*. *Cuadernos de Información y Comunicación*, 17, 63-78.
- Besley T., & Peters M. (2012) (Eds.). *Handbook of Interculturalism, Education and Dialogue*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Biraimah K.L. (2016). Moving beyond a destructive past to a decolonised and inclusive future: The role of *ubuntu*-style education in providing culturally relevant pedagogy for Namibia. *International Review of Education*, 62, 45-62.
- Brown E., & McCowan T. (2018). Buen vivir: reimagining education and shifting paradigms. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 48(2), 317-323.
- Council of Europe (2019). *Global Education Guidelines. Concept and Methodologies on Global Education for Educators and Policy Markers*. Stras-

- bourg: EU. Available in: <https://rm.coe.int/prems-089719-global-education-guide-a4/1680973101> [19 october 2020].
- Díaz Martínez K., & Chacón Cancino P. (2013). Buen Vivir en América Latina Naturaleza, Comunidad y Conflictos Ambientales. *Revista Grafía*, 10(2), 49-67.
- European Union (2018). Opinion of the European Economic and Social Committee on “Climate Justice” (own-initiative opinion) (2018/C 081/04). *Official Journal of the European Union*, (C 81, 2.3.2018), 22-28. Available in: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv:OJ.C_.2018.081.01.0022.01.ENG [19 october 2020].
- Freire P. (1973). *Education for critical consciousness*. New York: The Seabury Press.
- Freire P. (2002). *La Pedagogia degli oppressi*. Torino: Edizioni Gruppo Abele.
- Gandolfi S., & Rizzi F. (2013). *Diritti dell'uomo e cooperazione internazionale: l'etica della reciprocità*. Bergamo: Sestante.
- Gianolla C. (2013). Human rights and nature: intercultural perspectives and international aspirations. *Journal of Human Rights and the Environment*, 4(1), 58-78.
- Gozzelino G. (2020). *In viaggio verso Sud. Una ricerca tra pedagogia e cooperazione internazionale*. Bari: Progedit.
- Gudynas E. (2016). Beyond Varieties of Development: Disputes and Alternatives. *Third World Quarterly*, 37(4), 721-732.
- Iavarone M.L., Malvasi P., Orefice P., & Pinto Minerva F. (2017) (a cura di). *Pedagogia dell'Ambiente 2017. Tra sviluppo umano e responsabilità sociale*. Lecce-Brescia: Pensa MultiMedia.
- Islam S.N., & Winkel J. (2017). Climate Change and Social Inequality (ST/ESA/2017/DWP/152). *UN/DESA Working Papers*. Available in: https://www.un.org/esa/desa/papers/2017/wp152_2017.pdf [19 october 2020].
- Le Grange L. (2011). The Philosophy of Ubuntu and Education in South Africa. In W. Veugelers (Ed.), *Education and Humanism. Linking Autonomy and Humanity* (pp. 67-78). Dordrecht: Sense Publisher, Springer.
- León I. (2010). *Buen Vivir y Cambios Civilizatorios*. Quito: FEDAEPS.
- Loiodice I., & Annacontini G. (2017) (a cura di). *Pedagogie meridiane. Educare tra emancipazione e immaginazione*. Bari: Progedit.

- Lopez Cardozo M.A.T. (2015). Bolivian Teachers' Agency: Soldiers of Liberation or Guards of Coloniality and Continuation. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 23(4), 1-24.
- Milani L. (2000). *Competenza pedagogica e progettualità educativa*. Brescia: Editrice La Scuola.
- Pannikar R. (1982). Is the notion of Human Rights a Western Concept? *Diogenes*, 30(120), 75-102.
- Pescarmona I. (2020). *Crescere al plurale. Uno studio interculturale sulla prima infanzia*. Bari: Progedit.
- Piper B. (2016). International education is a broken field: Can ubuntu education bring solutions? *International Review of Education*, 62, 101-111.
- Quan-Baffour K.P. (2014) Unity in Diversity: Ubuntu in the Classroom to Promote Learning among Adults from Diverse Backgrounds. *Studies of Tribes and Tribals*, 12(2), 239-243.
- Santos B. De Sousa (2012). Public Sphere and Epistemologies of the South. *Africa Development*, XXXVII(1), 43-67.
- Unesco (2016). *Indigenous knowledge and implications for the sustainable development agenda. Global Education Monitoring Report*. Available in: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000245623> [19 october 2020].
- UNGA (1948). *The Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. Paris.
- United Nations (1987). *Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development: Our Common Future*. Available in: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/5987our-common-future.pdf> [19 october 2020].
- United Nations (1989). *Convenzione ONU sui Diritti dell'Infanzia e dell'Adolescenza*. New York.
- United Nation (2007). *Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People*.
- United Nation (2015a). *Transforming our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. New York. Available in: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/post2015/transformingourworld> [19 october 2020].
- Van Norren D.E. (2014) The nexus between Ubuntu and Global Public Goods: its relevance for the post 2015 development Agenda. *Development Studies Research. An Open Access Journal*, 1(1), 255-266.
- Villagómez M.S., & Cunha de Campos R. (2014). Buen Vivir y Educación para la practica de la Interculturalidad en el Ecuador. Otras prácticas Pedagógicas son necesarias. *Alteridad*, 9(1), 35-42.

Villalba U. (2013). *Buen Vivir vs Development: A Paradigm Shift in the Andes?* *Third World Quarterly*, 34(8), 1427-1442.