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The three documents are very rich and touch on too many points for me to tackle them in detail. I hope I will be able to provide more useful precise feedback in our discussions.

Generally speaking, I would find the following points paramount:

1) Raise awareness that we move from a Universe to a Pluriverse

We live in a world where pluralism and interculturalism are on the rise. We could say that we are entering a ‘pluriverse’. Nevertheless, we continue to think a lot in terms of our modern world vision of the ‘universe’. In the terms of Boaventura de Sousa Santos, what we are moving toward is a ‘heterotopia’: we discover a new world through a displacement from the center to the margins of our current systems of knowledge and practice. On the one hand, this is a shock as we are not used to it. On the other hand, it reveals amazing potentialities (ex: pluripolarisation of the world, taking into account, through the incentive to ‘participation’, of ‘informal practices’, ‘traditional knowledge’ etc.). It seems paramount to me to recognize this paradigmatic shift as the new emerging horizon where any project on human rights and intercultural dialogue can make sense.

2) The link of pluralism and dialogue

The ‘pluriverse’ is rooted neither in universalism nor in relativism: it is rooted in pluralism, the understanding that we are one AND many at the same time. Pluralism is not only an intellectual problem or a challenge for public policies (see the debates on interculturalism / multiculturalism). It is a way of seeing the world as going beyond our reasoning about it. The world is fundamentally
pluralistic. Even if we only take into account the human world, we realize that while we do share reason, at the same time we share the ability of constructing very different world views which will orient the way that we use reason. Pluralism thus calls for a method of dialogue which is not only a debate in the field of Reason/Logos (right / wrong etc.) but which entails the mutual discovery of our underlying horizons of meaning / Mythos which remain invisible to us as long as they are not confronted to different ones. Raimon Panikkar thus proposes to complement a dialectical dialogue by a dialogical dialogue, the first focusing on objects, the second focusing on the subjects that dialogue and that mutually uncover each other during the encounter.

Acknowledging the horizon of pluralism and the related renewed approach to dialogue gives rise to an important distinction: *intercultural theorization* and *intercultural approach*.

In an *intercultural theorization*, we start from our world view, open up to another world view. Then, we translate what we have perceived through the other cultural window into our cultural window, thus opening it up more (ex: we translate other ways of organizing society as “legal pluralism” etc. but applying our categories our creating our categories to make sense of them).

In the *intercultural approach*, we recognize that even though we may translate between different windows – and although this is paramount and mutually enriching – the different windows will always exist. How to deal then with the in-between of windows? (ex: how to dialogue between Western anthropocentred Law and Indian cosmocentred Dharma?).

An intercultural theory, or intercultural opening up of our frameworks is paramount. But we fool ourselves if we think that the challenge ends here. Even the ways of learning or conveying ‘interculturality’ may be very different from one culture to another. Frames, forms are important. There is not only one way of learning, of sharing, of dialoguing. How to articulate this with the idea of ‘best practices’?

3) The need to link intercultural dialogue to socio-politico-legal reflections

Culture or interculturality is not something out there to be organized by a ‘neutral’, ‘universal’ ‘non-cultural’ system. Law, economics, politics, human rights, development etc. are also culture. I must underline that in my view this does not take away from their value. But if we want to tackle the questions of interculturality seriously, we must recognize that everything is cultural, while at the
same time recognizing that everything is *not only* cultural. And we must always keep in mind that culture is an evolving and complex reality.

The teachings of the anthropology of law may be very enlightening here as the core of the discipline has been and still is the understanding of the link between law, culture, society.

### 4) The need to recognize the cultural shock and the existential aspect of intercultural dialogue

It seems paramount to emphasize a point which is very often neglected. To put it in a nutshell, let me quote Robert Vachon, former director of the Intercultural Institute of Montréal and of its journal *Interculture*: “Intercultural dialogue is crucifying… but liberating.” There is a tendency not to talk too much about the “crucifying” part. We always insist on the enrichment, the peace building, the sharing etc. But there is always an intercultural shock… if we really dialogue and do not stay in our comfort zone just pretending to dialogue. According to our situation we may be more or less forced to open up to another culture. It is never easy, as well as it is not easy to belong to multiple cultures. Intercultural dialogue shakes us in our deepest convictions and thus leads us to existential crises which trigger us to change – to use the vocabulary from above : we leave one mythos, one invisible horizon of understanding that structured our world for another one. To some extent each intercultural journey is leaving a universe and entering a pluriverse… or/and discovering the pluriverse underlying our universe.

The existential aspect of intercultural dialogue points to the importance of promoting respect for the human being in all its dimensions, and also for its fragility and its link to all others. Unfortunately, this seems to be exactly at the opposite of what can be observed in the world of teaching and research (the one I know better being an academic) where it is about making people ‘strong’ and ‘effective’ in a system and where the human aspect gets more and more pushed aside.

### 5) Alterity, complexity, interculturality and humanity as four poles, or four cultural disarmaments on the path of intercultural dialogue

In my two decades of researching and teaching in the field of intercultural dialogue in relationship to law, governance, globalization, sustainable development and the meeting of different knowledge systems, these four poles emerged. Each of them can be expanded into hours and hours of
discussions and into thousands and thousands of pages. They are the basic seeds of an intercultural journey as I understand it, or its ‘cornerstones’.

**Alterity:** recognizing that our culture is not the only one. There are other cultures. We must “disarm” our culture and recognize the existence of others. This also entails to make an effort to understand another culture from its own point of view. This endeavor takes a more structural turn.

**Complexity:** recognizing that everything is not only cultural. We have to disarm the notion of culture in its pretension to globalize, to crystallize, to freeze identities and to get stuck on these aspects only. Cultures are changing, interacting – human rights issues are to be understood culturally AND at the same time socially, economically, historically, politically. This endeavor is a more dynamic approach.

**Interculturality:** recognizing that pluralism goes beyond our intellect. It is not only an intellectual problem. It is an existential reality. Pluralism is irreducible. We do share a world. We do all share from our own window. The different windows will always exist. There can never be a 360° perspective. How to disarm on an existential level and open up to the mystery of life? This endeavor entails a more existential approach.

**Humanity:** this may be a very Western point – it is very dear to me being a Westerner and becoming aware little by little that all my intercultural endeavor actually is rooted in the understanding that we are all humans. If I did not have this basic understanding, I would not care about the other and his/her point of view. I may still respect it and accept it. “They’re different.” But it wouldn’t touch me deeply if I was not questioned by the fact that it is another human being who sees or experiences things so differently from myself and thus challenges, questions, enriches my own humanity. This pole also invites us to be very humble and to recognize how fragile we are individually and collectively. This fragility for me is not something bad – on the contrary: it is what allows us to open up to ourselves, others, our surroundings, life. It is a root for responsibility: response-ability.

This is a very succinct presentation of points that I find paramount. All these points can be developed much more. You can start to deepen their implications with food for thought from the little reading list below.
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1 *Interculture* exists in French and English versions.
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