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Abstract

It is about a strategy whose core is the use of force to scale, in search of homogenizing social, political, economic values, and even spiritual models. So much so, that this use of violence or restructuring social pedagogy, which is based on terror, precedes it and follows it, a development planning, a rigorous prospective analysis of the “global” economy. Everything is calculated, projected, and measured, so that every action undertaken in order to homogenize society, as a whole, is linked in terms of times, dynamics, and results.
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The “hegemonic order project” is compelling. It is notable in the transit violent events, which we have experienced in the countryside and the city, in harsh urban life conditions, so hard and violent, on the growing outskirts: the exclusion, lack of opportunities, etc.

Likewise, we have witnessed in the city, how the pace of life is increasingly faster, more crowded, with higher insecurity levels, in which the values of the neighborhood, solidarity has been diluted, and the family weakens due to the heavy loads of the system, which obliges us even “to get by,” not to bear children because they are a setback for the new project imposed and the system makes the symbolic direct link between children and poverty.

This imposed order project aims to achieve desires, aspirations, goals, and it teaches a series of values, which repeat by all means, at any possible time (possessing, the shopping enjoyment, competition, success) leaving open the possibility of the use of “any means” to achieve these goals imposed, no matter that we even have to yield to enmity, rupture of affective family links, disloyalty, lack of solidarity, breaking with those “other values,” which make me human.

This order project has managed to move forward, and at the same time, it has managed to capture the idea of “the self,” which makes the fight for emancipation far more complex.

Therefore, the need to adopt a method, which unveils what underlies it. Then, the fact of being and building with others as a community of sense, it makes an interaction possible, which feeds that necessary will of knowing, which activates the will of power.

Education at all levels, as a system, does not escape these hegemonic ordering logics, on the contrary, it is its core and guarantee of reproduction.

We must be aware of all this

In this sense, Lechner makes emphasis on that revolutionary dimension of the recovery of the subjectivity and if we read this dimension from Latin America, the need to “understand” that understanding arises, which allows to see what lays behind the phenomenon, to what is described, what is not seen, but which holds what is seen. That is to say, to be able to see the background of what exists and of what on this continent "takes place", which outright put us under the tension: imposed dominating project – in permanence – vs the “controversial and never-finished construction of the desired order.”

Thus it is that, “a subjectivity, which does not examine itself, which does not talk about the sense that current and future coexistence may have, which subtracts its raison d’être from politics (...)” renounces to politics as the collective effort to build a community of citizens and is satisfied with the management of everyday business.” (Lechner, 1991).

The recovery of one’s own

In view of the “hegemonic order” a “desired and multiple order” moves along it, which can be seen between the cracks, which open to the efficient and effective “imposed hegemonic order,” personal struggles, workers, men, women, peasants, etc., in everyday detailed, organized, structural struggles, etc. There, a concrete and at times, diluted search of other orders emerges, a sort of search of one’s own, the family - the affective component, nature, a liberating political power, the courage and strength of friendship, the stories, which makes sense of our close existential benchmarks, (these everyday heroes), the building of support networks, of respect, of solidarity, as well as the felt need to move beyond the “fatalistic immobilized imposed look,” all, elements of the feeling of the self, of the emancipatory struggle, which is still very unclear, but advances, of that construction of the desired order “there is no point in waiting for destiny to reach us since does not only the past cast shadows, but also the future” (Lechner, 1991). The own stories and the common stories reflected collectively, turn out to be key to recover the subject.
The overwhelming hegemonic power

The constant struggles for not being impoverished or for not being driving out of their house, or for not being out of their neighborhoods, is a “symptom” of a few intentions, which are not seen, but which are responsible for these phenomena, the undeniable presence of the hegemonic order project.”

Bauman & Dessal (2004) warn of a world that has become naturalized a human failure, a society, which is disconnected, trapped in fear of everything, to lose their jobs, not to be accepted, to be excluded, to fall into poverty, which is afraid of everything, a society whose dominant idea, whose order project has managed to establish a single fear, a fear of war, of violence, which are permanently repeated to me, and which demand from me “to give up my freedom” for the sake of safety, but safety in view of a certain threat, and which is latent to lose their lives, to suffer pain, and expulsion. That not only builds fears, but also the imagery of the “evil” or the other as a risk, a danger, and more of the thought as a highly dangerous element.

Castoriadis (1997) highlights how these stories, which emerge from the stories of the subject, are the result of the social and historical process not only of isolated individual experiences, but also of, warning that the crisis of sense is also the crisis of the identification process, of the creation of a “self,” whereas the realization of the individual and society has been broken.

It warns that insignificance advances, and that that “crisis of sense” is not only appreciated and is made evident at the individual level, but also at the collective level.

It now seems to prevail the despair, which is gradually taking over control of individual wills and especially in urban centers, something, which I have clear is that this society is in crisis, but I want to keep my small and apparent well-being.

That crisis, which others will call the crisis of civilization, crisis of the Western world, leads us to another key question and, which I identify in Castoriadis (1997), Can Western societies continue to be self-represented or not? Must they continue being able to build the type of individual necessary for the continuity of their interests? How feasible is this? How able will they be to understand their own crisis?

To think by building other possible worlds

Lechner warns that before these tensions and difficulties, which exist to make the changes and transformations possible in our social reality and current political systems, what remains is to imagine what and what the future would be like, the new order or not, a better possible world, and the fact of thinking about it, and of giving oneself the chance to reflect on it, is in fact a start, it is to start the daily grind, which will be carried out, in the long run.

This has already been happening and with strength in Latin America where we find:

1) A fight with regard to what has already been established, the State, institutions, which are being demanded by their essential function, for their work as a defender of rights, of the environment, etc.

2) In parallel, other ways, other organizations, other possible worlds are being built. Thus, some indigenous, peasant, urban, of defense of nature, water, wildlife movements, etc. are breaking new ground, which is the fruit of their collective actions. These processes seek autonomy, the reassessment of their culture, the affirmation of the identity of their peoples and social sectors. They also increase their capacity to form their own intellectuals. They take education in their hands and training of their leaders with their own pedagogical criteria, often inspired by popular education. Also, a very strong, new role for women is being shaped up, the concern for the organization of labor, and the relationship with nature, a marked distrust towards those traditional forms of organization, parties, churches, trade unions, which leads to the challenge of searching and weaving new forms of organization.
In this context, education, training, research, the so-called University, their senses must be redesigned. They should be open to think, to win, and to take on new challenges, as well as to read the needs of the context, the ethical demands posed to them, to tackle this concrete reality, to reconfigure their role, their place, from a critical view. They must “realize” this context in order to manage to articulate actions from an ethical, political, and releasing position.
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