

Interculturality in a context of transformation: notes from today's Bolivia

Noel Aguirre Ledezma

Translation: Servei de Llengües Modernes, Universitat de Girona

“We must be recognized as living people, not phantom communities”. Testimony from an indigenous participant in the “March for Territory and Dignity”, August 1990.

Perhaps now everyone understands that our call for a Constituent Assembly with the participation of all social sectors, without the mediation of the political parties, is what we need to begin to feel a part of the country. Maybe not even we understood that very well when we started working together: indigenous people, farmland workers and colonizers, women and men, people from the highlands and lowlands, because we have never really taken an active role in our own history. They say that you can't experience what you don't know. We think that it is better to participate in decisions than to be oblivious of what they are deciding for us. *Fragment of the blog of the “March for National Sovereignty, Territory and Dignity of Indigenous and Original Peoples”, May 2002.*

Interculturality. At first glance, the word, not its meaning, seems to be just one of the many terms repeatedly used of late, and it is likely thought that talking about interculturality in a neoliberal context or in a context of structural transformation is pretty much the same. However, from what actually happened and still occurs in Bolivia, it is clear that this word has several concepts and understandings that respond to the times and the contexts. Perhaps it is that interculturality might not be just another jargon word, but one that expresses realities that are part of our nations and countries.

Interculturality implies diversity, but also inequality and conflict, the struggle for power and a constant fight against euphemisms that are a guise for exclusion, rather than inclusion.

1. Baselines for the debate and the proposals

1.1. Bolivia: from the Colony to the Republic and the Plurinational State

The history of Bolivia is an example of how, through struggle fought in different periods of oppression, discrimination and exclusion, the concept of interculturality is created by “delving into and changing” various structural aspects. Let’s examine some relevant aspects of this reality.

One of the main halls of the Plurinational Legislative Assembly of Bolivia contains what at first glance seems to be just an “*innocent artistic painting*”, but in fact expresses the character and sentiment behind the creation of the Republic of Bolivia.



The Sala Mayor of the Casa de la Libertad (House of Freedom) in Sucre

The painting is set in the Sala Mayor of the *Casa de la Libertad* (House of Freedom) in Sucre, Bolivia and depicts the signing of the “*Act of Independence*” that gave rise to the creation of the Republic of Bolivia on August 6, 1825. At first glance, 30 people can be observed, all men, “*not even a token woman*”. Moreover, all but two are wearing the suits typical of the well-off social classes of the time, and there is

even a Levite, but not a single indigenous person or worker. Their uniform, even monotonous, way of dressing can be seen as a denial of cultural diversity. The exceptions are the two priests, one of whom is from the ecclesiastical hierarchy, standing next to the leader.

This image says it all. The Republic of Bolivia was founded by the men of the wealthy social classes, accompanied by two priests. It is worth noting that women, indigenous people and workers do not participate. This is the image of the creation of the colonial, monocultural Republic, one whose context obviously has no hint of interculturality.

Beyond that image, for a better understanding, let us review some of the history of Bolivia, which at different moments was concealed or denied to us.

As José Antonio Rivera Santiváñez writes in his text *Las tendencias del proceso constituyente en Bolivia* (*The tendencies of the constituent process in Bolivia*), the history of Bolivia, and even more so its creation, is marked by the exclusion and marginalization of the main social sectors. History teaches us that, on February 9, 1825, the Liberator Antonio José de Sucre issued a decree providing for the provinces of Upper Peru, today Bolivia, to consider their fate in an Assembly of Legislators, which ultimately involved the beginning of the founding of a constituent process. This Decree established that the Assembly “*would be made up of legislators elected at Parish and Provincial assemblies, whose election would be indirect or of the second degree, as citizens would elect four electors for each Parish, so that these in turn would choose the legislators; for this purpose the right to vote was enjoyed by citizens, who at that time were the men who knew how to read and write, were owners of property or had an annual income of 300 pesos or more; this meant that the large majority of indigenous people and peasant farmers, workers and artisans were not recognized as citizens. Therefore, those social sectors were excluded from the process or, said from another perspective, of the approximately one million inhabitants of the provinces of Upper Peru, only a small number of inhabitants participated as voters in the election of the voters, mainly Creoles and some mixed-race inhabitants who had the right of citizenship, who under no circumstance were more than 10% of the total population.*” (Rivera S., José Antonio)

In order to take part in the founding of the Republic, it was essential *to currently be a male citizen* (knowing how to read and write and owning a property or having a minimum annual income), *twenty-five years of age...*. This excluded women,

indigenous peoples, natives, peasant farmers, workers, etc., who together represented 90% of the population. How could interculturality be constructed in this way? The founding of the constituent process” *had an autocratic and undemocratic tenure* (Rivera S., José Antonio), opposed to the possibility of recognizing diversity and cultural identities and characterized by a clearly exclusionary attitude.

Félix Cárdenas, in his book *Mirando Indio. Aportes para el debate descolonizador* (*The Indigenous people: Contributions to the decolonization debate*), wrote “*The original sin of the nation states like Bolivia is the way they were born, the very vision from which they were conceived... Bolivia was a country founded without us, but also, Bolivia was a country founded against us, the indigenous people and workers of the land... Bolivia is a state without a nation and we are nations without a state...*”

This is how the Republic of Bolivia was founded and conceived, and how the first constitution of the nascent country was approved. In its fundamental characteristics, that conception of the Republic remained until 2006, the year in which the new Plurinational State was first conceived. Another image can explain this new period of Bolivian history.



On August 6, 2006, the Constituent Assembly was installed

On August 6, 2006, the Constituent Assembly was installed to draft a new constitution and give structure to a new state. Unlike the year 1825, the Constituent Assembly is constituted by 255 assembly members, men and women, elected by democratic vote; by indigenous peoples, natives, peasant farmers, city dwellers; by professionals, workers, producers and representatives of social organizations; by the different peoples, nations and intercultural communities of our country. At first sight, even the way of dressing expresses social and cultural diversity; there are ponchos, *polleras* (traditional large one-piece skirts), blankets, coats, ties, dresses, hats, *lluchus* (traditional woollen hats), etc. In their deliberations they spoke in Spanish, Aymara, Quechua, Guarani and other languages.

This Constituent Assembly expresses the diversity of Bolivia in its way of conceiving and understanding society, the state, the economy, politics, culture etc. It is the expression of the Plurinational State, in other words, the complementarity of the different nations that exist in Bolivia, the manifestation of interculturality, the resolution of one of main issues pending from the year 1825. The peoples, nations and intercultural communities have a state and the state represents the diversity of its population. The Political Constitution of the Plurinational State of Bolivia was approved in a Referendum held on January 25, 2009 with 61.43% of the votes. Subsequently, in that same year, on February 7th, the Constitution was enacted by President Evo Morales and published in the Official Gazette on February 9th, the date on which it became effective.

This is now the basis for the concept of interculturality in Bolivia, in the 21st century. This is the Plurinational State of Bolivia that turns the inadequate and impertinent concepts of the colonial and monocultural Republic on its head.

The *lesson learnt* "is that interculturality goes deep. At least in the vast majority of countries in the Americas, if not in a large part of the world, it means rethinking the very foundation of our countries, which requires a new social agreement. As it is instituted in Bolivia, interculturality (here it is worth emphasising, critical interculturality) may be better conceived and become a reality if a " *Plurinational, social, community-oriented state*... "is built; if an effort towards " *Decolonization and depatriarchalisation* "is made; if the " *Economy, justice, pluralistic education*... "are developed"; if *Direct and community-oriented democracy*... "is instituted; and if the " *Right to life, water, food, education, health*... "are constituted in the " *Fundamental rights*....

1.2. Interculturality: The dilemma of origin... “The two sides of the coin” and elements of a theoretical nature

In addition to what has been mentioned in the previous section on the subject of interculturality, it is also appropriate to make a reflection of a theoretical nature, while also taking into account historical and contextual aspects.

The term of interculturality, in itself, is not an automatic indication of transformation, and much less inclusion. Moreover, in many cases, it can be a covert way of legitimizing inequality, exclusion and discrimination. Not just any type of interculturality fosters inclusion.

As the Peruvian professor Fidel Tubino says, in different documents, *The new concept and approach of interculturality... starts from a very clear differentiation between functional interculturalism and critical interculturalism... Whereas functional interculturalism seeks to promote dialogue and tolerance, without examining the root causes of the social and cultural asymmetry currently in place, critical interculturalism seeks to suppress these causes through non-violent political methods. Social asymmetry and cultural discrimination make a true intercultural dialogue unattainable.*

An example of what Tubino means regarding functional interculturalism can be found in the principles of the Bolivian Educational Reform, which were established under Law 1565 of July 7, 1994, under the neoliberal policies in force at that time. In the section corresponding to the bases of Bolivian education, it states that *It is intercultural and bilingual, because it assumes the socio-cultural diversity of the country in an environment of respect among all Bolivians, men and women.* But, how would it be possible to conceive a critical interculturalism in a neoliberal context, which is conservative by nature?

Interculturality, in this context, was conceived as an issue basically related to language. So, for example, it was enough to translate Spanish texts into the native language without any concern for the cultural identity of the people and nations, or to teach the Aymara people more than just the Aymara language, while Spanish-speakers remained enthroned in their language. At other times, interculturality became a matter of folklore; interpreting a supposedly indigenous dance or dressing as an indigenous person became a frequent trait considered to be intercultural.

Beyond these expressions lies a fundamental issue: the coherence of the intercultural postulate with a neoliberal social, political and economic model. As Frei Betto mentions, in his article *Neoliberalism and culture*, neoliberalism's "plan for the atomization of society reduces the person to the condition of an individual disconnected from the socio-political-economic conjuncture in which they are found, considering them to be a mere consumer. This also extends, therefore, to the cultural sphere.

In a neoliberal context that favours those who have financial capital, in most cases of transnational origin, it can be said that one of the bases of education is interculturality, but obviously this will not affect structural matters of a social, economic, political or cultural nature, nor preserve the rights of the population as a whole. In other words, a model that is contrary to structural transformation can only be expected to constitute a functional interculturality. In order to be critical, interculturality requires a society that is transformed, which is precisely the wide variety of actions implemented in Bolivia since 2006, in what is called the *Cultural and Democratic Revolution*.

This differentiation of critical and functional interculturality also implies the revision of certain definitions that reduce our understanding of culture. For example, culture cannot be reduced merely to expressions of art, literature, philosophy and science, as it was conceived by rationalist currents, and even less so as a reason for classifying groups of people into the *cultured* and the *uncultured*. Culture assumes all modes of life and ways of thinking that relate to individuals and social groups.

Therefore, interculturality cannot be the cause for attitudes of a colonial mindset, which establishes assumptions that state that some social groups are better with others. In this regard, Felix Cárdenas, in his aforementioned book, points out: *They tell us that white is superior and that brown and black are inferior; they say they have the true art and what we do, clay pots and bowls, is mere craftsmanship. They have the real music and what we play, charangos and the pan flute, is mere folklore, they say. They tell us that they have the true medicine, and what we use as herbs, th'ola, tara tara... is mere witchcraft. They say, we have the true culture and what you have are... customs. We have the true religion, you have superstition. We have the true language and what you speak are dialects.*

These paragraphs show, among other aspects, that for interculturality to be considered as such, it has to affect structural aspects; question social, economic, political and cultural asymmetries; and become an instrument for the decolonization

of our societies.

2. Proposals, recovering history and practice

2.1. Rethinking the civilizing and the development model

Interculturality means rethinking the civilizing and the development model as responses to the structural crisis that has manifested itself in different ways and with increasing intensity. Interculturality, from the Bolivian reality, is thus expressed fundamentally by the recovery and re-appreciation of the conception of life, belonging to our cultures, that of “Living Well”.

Living Well is a means of questioning Western civilizing patterns conceived from colonialism and neoliberalism, as well as the development models of the so-called *civilization of progress* “that has tried to convince us that” *progress is undefined, therefore ensuring a future that always gets better*. Living Well questions the concept of functional interculturality.

Living Well is an alternative to the structural crisis that, on a global level, acquired different connotations: financial crisis, economic crisis, real estate crisis, environmental crisis, food crisis, ethical crisis, etc. Not only that, but in the attempts to disguise their effects, it argues that these periods of crisis reflect the cyclical nature of the economy, i.e. it is *normal* for there to be a downturn, since it will naturally be followed by an upturn, and so it continues. However, these periods of crisis are not isolated events, and nor are they followed by periods of prosperity.

The response to the civilizing crisis corresponds to the concept we have of life and, with it, of human beings: men and women, the community, Mother Nature and the cosmos. The answer is Living Well, from both a cosmocentric and biocentric vision. A proposal that begins with our cultures being beneficial to the world, to the *global* society.

Living Well, in Bolivia, is a substantial part of the *root policy* that bears heavily on the social agreement accepted among the inhabitants of its territory. It is a mandate of the Political Constitution of the Bolivian State that, in addition to recognizing the diversity of world views among its peoples and nations, affirms that an ethical-moral principle of pluralistic society is that of Living Well. *The State accepts and promotes as ethical-moral principles of pluralistic society: ama qhilla, ama llulla, ama suwa; suma qamaña (living well), ñandereko (harmonious life), teko*

kavi (good life), ivi maraei (land without evil) and qhapaj ñan (the noble path or life)(Art 8, paragraph I).

Living Well is a way of life, of relating to nature, of the complementarity between peoples. It is part of the philosophy and practice of indigenous peoples. But, in addition to the theoretical challenge, we face the practical challenge of the fight. Only by fighting will the peoples of the world defeat capitalism to save humanity... if we do not fight, if we do not overcome fear, we will let capitalism annihilate us; if we do not give our lives in this struggle, then... the lords of death will have triumphed.(MORALES Ayma Evo, *Prologo en Vivir bien: ¿Paradigma no capitalista?*(Prologue on Living Well: Non-capitalist paradigm?) written under the coordination of FARAH, Ivonne and VASAPOLLO, Luciano, CIDES – UMSA, La Paz – Bolivia, 2011.) It is part of the culture of life and a contribution to humanity, to the world, which arises out of the everyday lives of the native indigenous peoples.

From the contents of the National Development Plan *“Bolivia Digna, Soberana, Productiva y Democrática para Vivir Bien”*(Bolivia: Decent, Sovereign, Productive and Democratic for Living Well), after establishing the common aspects raised by the different cultures forming part of the Bolivian territory, Living Well ***“is the access and enjoyment of material goods and affective, subjective, intellectual and spiritual realization, in harmony with nature and in community with human beings.”***

2.2. Without intraculturality there is no interculturality

The recognition that our countries are diverse is, in itself, an achievement. However, if the analysis does not go beyond mere recognition, in the best of cases, we may just end up in a functional interculturality.

Beyond diversity lies inequality, which strangely and symptomatically is something that generally goes unmentioned. To *illustrate* this situation, we quote a paragraph from CERES, the Bolivian *Centro de Estudios de la Realidad Económico y Social*(Centre for Economic and Social Reality Studies) as part of the study called *Gender, mother tongue and income inequality“:* *“In the case of Latin America, Atal, Ñopo and Winder (2009) found, after an analysis of eighteen Latin American countries, that the income gap according to gender is between 9% and 28% against women, while the same gap in terms of ethnicity is between 13% and 38% against the indigenous population. They also have found that the income gap by gender is greater among workers in low-productivity sectors, while the income gap by*

ethnicity is greater among male workers in the rural sector.

At least in relation to material conditions, societies are not only diverse but profoundly unequal. So, under what conditions can a dialogue on equal footing be established between various groups if there are profound differences in income, access to basic services, employment and income opportunities, appreciation of cultural identity, etc.?

Therefore, an intercultural society cannot be built without intraculturality. Reality demonstrates that in order to establish a dialogue between diverse groups, it is necessary to strengthen social groups, peoples and indigenous nations (giving them back the rights denied throughout history).

According to Graciela Mazorco (2006), in the essay *Epistemological bases of intraculturality – interculturality*, “The subject of intra- and interculturality means that we have to change; we must awaken our dormant intraculturality. However, this means individual change, as each of us must make this change for ourselves, because each person is one autonomous, self-determined being. This *autopachakuti*”, or change within ourselves, means deconstructing the Western culture in us and rebuilding it by awakening the historical theory of unity. That memory lies in each one of us. This process must occur within ourselves, in our intraculturality”. This is complemented by the “General guidelines for an intra- and intercultural education from the wisdom of the Native Peoples of Bolivia and Latin America”, which states “When speaking of ‘intra’ education, the aim is to rescue the local culture. In this context, we must seek to understand all the wisdom of our indigenous people, workers of the lands, our grandparents and ancestors, and this should be used to create our own science and knowledge. This change in education must be established as a principle of the restitution of our cultures, such as Quechua, Aymara, Guaraní, etc. That would imply feeling where we are and where we have come from, and that way we could build a new science based on that reality. So, rather than being opposed to the dominant system, another life situation must be proposed based on our experience, our wisdom, our science and our culture.” (AGRUCO, 2006)

2.3. Building pluriversal knowledge

Different documents analysing the unresolved issues from past education policies carried out by the Ministry of Education of the Plurinational State of Bolivia (2014) indicate that, “throughout the history of the Republic, a disproportionate

appreciation of the knowledge of other contexts had taken precedence in Bolivia. On the other hand, indigenous knowledge, institutions and values were long considered “primitive” and inferior. Indigenous knowledge was considered a set of beliefs and superstitions in which the native people were trapped by their lack of education.”

For these reasons, the Avelino Siñani – Elizardo Pérez “Education Law, No. 070, enacted on 20 December 2010, in the section corresponding to its foundations, mentions that Bolivian education “is scientific, technical, technological and artistic, developing knowledge and wisdom from the world view of cultures of indigenous people who worked the land and the intercultural and Afro-Bolivian communities, as a complement to universal knowledge and wisdom, to contribute to the integral development of society.”

Interculturality, properly understood and applied, involves deconstructing Western knowledge and revitalizing local knowledge and wisdom, an interaction and complementarity between the so-called universal or scientific knowledge with the people’s own local knowledge and wisdom. In other words, interculturality requires that established knowledge be subverted.

3. Intra- and Intercultural Education in Bolivia

Finally, some brief comments on intracultural and intercultural education in Bolivia.

3.1. The favourable legal framework for intracultural and intercultural education in Bolivia

Intracultural and intercultural education in Bolivia has a favourable legal framework. For example, the Political Constitution of the State (CPE in its Spanish initials), among other aspects, determines:

- *“Bolivia is founded upon political, economic, legal, cultural and linguistic plurality and pluralism, within the comprehensive process of the country.”* (CPE Art. 1)
- *“The Bolivian nation is made up of all the Bolivian men and women, the indigenous nations and peoples who worked the land, and the intercultural and Afro-Bolivian communities, who together constitute the Bolivian people.”* (CPE Art. 3)
- *“The official languages of the State are Spanish and all the languages of the*

indigenous nations and peoples who work the land...”(CPE Art. 5, I)

As for the Avelino Siñani – Elizardo Pérez Education Law (LASEP in its Spanish acronym), it establishes as mandates:

- *“Everyone has the right to receive education... without discrimination.”*(LASEP Art. 1, I)
- *(Education) is decolonizing, liberating, revolutionary, anti-imperialist and de-patriarchalizing and is a means of transforming economic and social structures; focused on the cultural reaffirmation of the native indigenous nations and peoples who work the land and the intercultural and Afro-Bolivian communities in the construction of the Plurinational State and Living Well.*(LASEP, Bases of education, Art. 3, 1)
- *It is unique, diverse and plural...*(LASEP Art. 3, 4) *It is intracultural, intercultural and plurilingual throughout the entire educational system...*(LASEP Art. 3, 7) *It is productive and territorial...*(LASEP Art. 3, 9) *It is education of life and in life, for Living Well...*(LASEP Art. 3, 11)

3.2. “Socio-community productive” education in Bolivia

In epistemological, conceptual and methodological terms, “socio-community productive” education becomes a pillar for intra- and intercultural education. Let us examine some aspects that support this affirmation.

- **Education - social** . Education, while ignoring people’s individuality, is a product of social interaction; it is a social fact. It is democratic, pluralistic and inclusive because it guarantees an education that is relevant to the diverse population. It guarantees everyone the right to education, from a concept of education throughout life, in all its aspects.
- **Education - community** . Education returns to the values, principles and identity of Bolivia’s indigenous nations and peoples who work the land, such as complementarity, reciprocity, territory and territoriality, as well as the individual-community relationship.
- **Education - productive** . Educational processes that, among others, develop the ability to create, the tangible and the non-tangible, the material and the intellectual. One that relates practice to theory, the technical to the humanistic.

Productive socio-community education that cannot be exempt from values and

principles; education with cultural relevance and social relevance to Living Well. As determined by the Political Constitution of the State, *“Education of life and in life, for Living Well”*.

3.3. The Bolivian Productive Socio - Community Education starts from a holistic conception of the dimensions of the human being that is conducive to the development of intra and interculturality

The holistic nature in the person-community-mother earth/nature-cosmos dimensions and relationship also determines the holistic character of all human beings. Our cultures teach us that people, in their holistic nature, are constituted by four dimensions: Spiritual, Knowledge, Politics and Production, which educationally speaking are transformed in the dimensions of BEING, KNOWING, DECIDING AND DOING.

Being, constituted mainly by principles, values and identity. Knowing, which assumes that all people have the ability to create, adapt and recreate knowledge and wisdom. Deciding, the ability to assume the organization, the exercise of politics and power, as well as coexistence with the community. Making, the creation and production of physical and intellectual materials.



These dimensions, converted into the pillar of educational thought of the educational model and the curriculum of the Bolivian Educational System, are the

basis for building and developing an education that in itself is intra- and intercultural.

3.4. Productive Socio-Community Education, as determined by the Education Law No. 070, consists of three levels of curricular application openly favourable to intraculturality and interculturality: Core Curriculum, Regionalized Curriculum and Diversified Curriculum.

The Core Curriculum, supported by the Political Constitution of the State and the Law of Education, articulates the plurality of the State and establishes the principles, foundations, fields and areas of knowledge and wisdom, the main mandatory subjects for the entire Plurinational Education System of Bolivia.

On the other hand, the Regionalized Curriculum is conceived as the construction of meanings in dialogue and complementarity between the Core Curriculum and the knowledge and wisdom of the respective region, containing a set of plans and programmes that are complemented by the Core Curriculum of the Plurinational Educational System of Bolivia. It is constructed fundamentally under the responsibility of the native indigenous nations and peoples who work the land, according to their sociocultural and linguistic context, territorial vocations and productive potential.

Finally, the Diversified Curriculum incorporates the particularities of the knowledge and wisdom of each local context, responds to the needs, expectations and interests of the population at the local level and is designed and developed within the framework of what is established in the Core Curriculum of Plurinational Educational System of Bolivia and the Regionalized Curriculum.

This curricular structure allows for a dialogue between the local, regional, national and international fields of knowledge and wisdom, with the necessary participation and decision-making of the key players at each of these levels.

3.5. The Plurinational Institute for the Study of Languages and Culture (IPLC in its Spanish initials)

Intra and intercultural education requires the decision-making of native indigenous nations and peoples who know the land and the formulation of Regionalized Curricula by these organizations.

To this end, Article 88 of the Education Law, in effect since December 2010, determines the creation of the *Plurinational Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures as a decentralized entity of the Ministry of Education, which will develop linguistic and cultural research processes*. It also defines the powers for the Plurinational Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures to create “language and cultural institutes for each native indigenous nation or peoples who work the lands for the standardization, research and development of their languages and cultures, which will be financed and supported by the autonomous territorial entities”.

Standards, which in reality have converted one Plurinational Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures led by the native indigenous nations and peoples themselves, into practically 30 Institutes of Languages and Cultures from a total of 36 languages recognized by the Political Constitution of the State and more than 20 standardized and approved Regionalized Curricula, which include: Chiquitano, Guaraní, Quechua, Ayoreo, Aymara, Guarayo, Moxo, Uru, Afro-Bolivian, Yuracaré, Reyesano, Tacana, Machinere, Yaminawa, Cavineña, Pacahuara, etc. The Regionalized Curricula of indigenous peoples have a different structure, based on their world view and identity and cover all areas of the core curriculum in complementarity with their ancestral knowledge.

This work is complemented by the actions carried out by the Educational Councils of the Native Peoples (CEPOs in their Spanish initials), instances of social participation that, to quote this organization, respond to “*three facets: a) the struggles waged by the native indigenous peoples in defence of land and territory; b) the restitution of the language and culture, which derived from processes of critical reflection on rural education and especially on strategies related to the use of the native language applied in the country through different bilingual education experiences; c) the strengthening of the political and social organizations of the native indigenous peoples.*”

CEPOs played a preponderant role in the national workshops and departmental congresses on education that gave rise to a proposal contained in the book *Por una educación indígena originaria. Hacia la autodeterminación ideológica, política, territorial y cultural* (A native indigenous education. Working towards ideological, political, territorial and cultural self-determination) : “*This proposal served as a basis to articulate the political advocacy work that CEPOs carried out from 2006-2010 in the Constituent Assembly for the definition of the educational system in the new Political Constitution of the State and in the new*” Avelino Siñani and

Elizardo Pérez “Education Law, incorporating in the final document, approved in the National Congress of Education in 2006, the following aspects: the plurinational nature of the educational system; the orientation of education towards productivity; the community nature of educational management; the relationship of the levels of territorial planning according to the socio-cultural reality of the country. The active participation of the Indigenous Educational Bloc was also able to forward its claim to the right to an education that recognizes the spirituality of each student’s culture.”

This is the path of intraculturality and interculturality in the Plurinational State of Bolivia. A long journey, which is also committed to advancing towards the constitution of a society with social, economic, political and cultural equality. A path that is often not understood precisely by those who, within the framework of functional interculturality, do not accept a dialogue that recognizes the changes that were achieved in Bolivia.