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What is at stake at this time is what type of interlocution we are able to create, among fields of work, cultures, social and professional contexts, and spaces of struggle. Each of these places, in dialogue with the others, can help us shed light on each of our blind spots. Some two decades ago, crude postcolonial theorists who migrated to the north opened the Eurocentric conversation, constructed categories of cultural negotiation such as translation, creolization, intermedial space or hybridity. To that end, they resorted to their border position as essential for their mediating agency, which was consolidated at the global level as the locus of alterity. One of their main goals was the very institutionalisation of the postcolonial perspective within hegemonic academic spaces; this was consecrated with suspicion by many Latin American intellectuals who did not find any interest in the local struggles of each context. The postcolonial perspective, persistently discredited as exhausted, helped all the same to build legitimacy to acknowledge the incomplete histories eclipsed by modernity. At an international level it became impossible to conceal the emergences of each of these problems. Today this perspective has expanded and has seeped into various local contexts, where it has been appropriated, questioned and interacted. In some cases it became urgent to radicalise the regimes of alterity and to question the guarantee offered by the perspectives and cultural mediation and how they favoured an accidental appropriation, always eager for new concepts to feed back on itself. Even though discursive discourses gave impetus to the possibility of knowing non-western and western knowledge, this never ceased to use western epistemological frames of reference for assessment, and did not attempt to explore particular to every culture: there was talk about ethno-mathematics, ethnography and ethno-education. 1

We began to ask ourselves whether these conversations did indeed modify the scientific language or the museum context or the presentation of the national, or if they rather strengthened them, and we questioned modern academic language and the persistence of its colonial structures of exploitation of resources. Doubts arose about the possibility to decolonialize Marxism, hybridity, nation, as well as western thought and its institutions, also established on the foundations of extractivism and negation of difference. In this context indigenous perspectives gradually gained more space, showing the limitations of the colonial grammar in our thinking and opening the debate about the possibility to construct epistemic diversity. I have been invited to edit the 7th issue of the journal Re-visions to contribute to this debate, in my belief that local contexts build conceptual tools with a considerable potential to keep growing together in this global conversation of transformation. I feel that the demands coming deeper into the regimes of alterity, on the one hand, to avoid self-determinations as representatives of other alterities that we do not occupy, concealing the complexity of the internal relations and the different layers of south in one same north. It demands not taking for granted that occupying the locus of otherness necessarily implies questioning the hegemonic structures; it also demands to understand the mobility of the places of excursus in accordance with each geography, to avoid fixation. On the other hand, we believe it is necessary to theorize and debate about how supremacy places/discourses are constructed in each national context and what their collusions are with academic production.

The texts presented in this issue address these topics: the possibility to engender identity struggles from cultural contexts; the possibility to create other types of university and concepts of knowledge negotiation; the limitations of those in the law; the limitations of our vocabulary and our grammar; and how, in the face of the separability of extractivist modernity, the possibility to create encounters, to decolonialize History by means of micro-narratives, of orality, memory or of popular culture, all of them in dialogue with contemporary art. There is a potentiality to learn to become another in the conversation with our interlocutors whose memory is that of the writer who founded a new concept of Re-visions, but also the opposite: the fear of the impossibility of communicating. Let us not worry about this, it is not about communicating but rather about meeting”. For this I believe, one has to be ready to learn, above all, to meet, without having to share the same methodologies, allowing for their mutual influence, to learn to respect the irreducibility of our interlocutors, to be ready to unveil and learn new vocabularies and their role, to work from the negotiation with the limited resources of a southern European university.
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