

INCLUSION AS A KNOWLEDGE PROJECT IN RESISTANCE¹

—

Aldo Ocampo González
aldo.ocampo.gonzalez@gmail.com
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6654-8269>

CENTER FOR LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES ON INCLUSIVE EDUCATION
(CELEI), CHILE

- 1 Text presenting an excerpt from the second section of the inaugural lecture given at the Interdisciplinary Congress on Education, held in 2020 at the Universidad de Azuay, Ecuador.



To quote this article:

Ocampo González, A. (2021). La inclusión como proyecto de conocimiento en resistencia. *ESPACIO I+D, INNOVACIÓN MÁS DESARROLLO*, 10(26). <https://doi.org/10.31644/IMASD.26.2021.a02>

— Abstract —

This article analyzes the forms of knowledge production, which are always forms of intervention-creation-alteration, closely linked to the heuristic and the political. They carry out an open, restless, and affirmative operation of a non-dialectical nature, which has become a counter-epistemological space that builds knowledge that alters reality, embodies a heuristic-political force that subverts the conventional established in the institutional and alternative. The main objective of this work is to examine the central characteristics that define the contours of inclusive education as a knowledge project in resistance. The work uses a critical document review methodology for its development, using various databases such as Scielo, Wos, Scopus, etc. By conceiving inclusion as an alterative movement of the multiple constitutive structures of world-systems, it is possible to recognize its strength as a knowledge project that articulates a set of profound transformations that alter the intellectual, ethical and political structures that regulate education and the democratic and citizen frame. The understanding of oppression, domination, injustice, and inequality is one of its core points, along with the ideal of transformation. Another singularity of its intellectual project leaves space for a wide number of collectivities and communities of adherence and interpretations, linking a variety of specific knowledge projects. Its heuristics provide new viewing angles..

Keywords

Inclusive epistemology of education; nomadism; exteriority of theoretical work; challenging imaginations; heuristic transpositions.

INCLUSION AS AN EPISTEMOLOGICAL COUNTER-SPACE

One of the most relevant epistemological characteristics of inclusive education is its micro-political character –not in its traditional sense but in terms of a counter-epistemological and counter-enunciative analytical space–, it describes a project of knowledge in resistance, a counter-epistemological space that articulates knowledge that alters reality. It embodies a heuristic-political force that subverts established conventions in the institutional and the coordinates of the alternative – in my opinion, today, movements meant as an alternative possess qualities very similar to those of hegemonic proposals, especially those that proliferate in education. For this reason, inclusion can be conceived as an alternative movement of the structures of regulation of world-systems, an open challenge, a performative commentary, and a vector of heuristic dissipation.

Another singularity that involves the construction of a project of knowledge in resistance becomes the emergence of a new style of relationship, subjectivity, and affectivity. Inclusion –founded on Feuerbach's eleventh thesis– is a singular sign of mobilization of heuristic frontiers, penetrating new logics of thought that have become the configuration of a powerful threshold of transformations from which complex understandings and challenging imaginations proliferate to think about the construction and/or understanding of the contemporary world.

Inclusion is not a practice of assimilation, it generates differential situations of (micro)exclusion, (micro)oppression, and (micro)domination –breaks to self-development and self-determination–, but it is a powerful mechanism of reconfiguration of world-systems, a transpositional heuristic of knowledge, an epistemology of agency, a form of differential political-ethical intervention and a multi-referential, multifunctional and multi expressive domain. Its epistemological form operates outside of the absolute ontological code –a substantialist configuration–, strategically becoming "an as if, whose articulation is not in reproducing or interpreting, but in creating from the available elements in a specific position that, in turn, constitutes us" (Ávila, 2014, p.170). The epistemology of inclusive education is a constructive form closely linked to the political. The political aspect of it assumes the desire for transformation, while the epistemological aspect itself is, to a certain extent, the configuration of creative changes and alterative architectures of thought –the principle of positivity. It is an epistemic-political enterprise that goes beyond the critical and post-critical. Although the contribution of the post-critical is what regulates a large part of its constitutional matrix, the truth is that it rearticulates this threshold of production, giving way to something completely new. The epistemology of inclusive education emerges from a set of genealogical entanglements, many of them coming

from the post-critical legacy. Its heuristic field is enunciated and heard in the exteriority of these contributions.

The epistemology of inclusive education is not an eminently speculative construction; it is intimately interwoven with the political aspects of it. Its purpose is not only the recognition of its field of knowledge but rather, the transposition, mutation, and alteration of the foundations of contemporary educational theory –it is a device for the recognition of all fields and sub-fields of Educational Science. Analytically, the theory of inclusive education is synonymous with educational theory; it demonstrates an alter-epistemic effect. It provides new fields of vision and new conceptual instruments and assumes the insistence on the creation of concepts that allow us to read the present, fostering a multidimensional-complex examination of the social and educational practices and problems that restrict the emergence of an ethical and politically committed praxis with a broader project of subjective and social change.

Heuristically, inclusive education is a complex threshold of knowledge transformation. One of its *raison d'être* lies, to a certain extent, in fighting against the various forms of injustices that affect large groups of society in a relational and multilevel manner by paying attention, methodologically, to how each one of these singular forms of curbing human development generates singular regenerative and performative repercussions in the school setting. Conceiving inclusive education as an intellectual project in resistance suggests recognizing that we are in the presence of a broad-based knowledge device that configures a dynamic and unfinished assembly, in no way enjoying a stable and definitive definition, but rather intensely unstable, open, restless, and unpredictable. Its analytical nucleus is configured by a set of interdependent concerns and interests, resulting in the formation of a terrain crossed in a multi-axial way by diverse knowledge projects and informed by critical social movements, whose discussions and concerns reside in the depths of the field. When inclusion is employed as a form of social and educational justice, we are faced with the crystallization of its critical praxis.

Inclusion constitutes a new category of analysis applied to a set of diverse practices, analysis strategies, decisions and forms of political intervention, methodological exploration modes, conceptual formations, etc. We study a body of knowledge in permanent movement –the main condition for the production of the field–, an operation that follows the logic exposed by Zemelman (1989), "given-giving-to-give". However, its general contours have never been well defined. One of its definitive aspects consists in affirming that it is a theory without discipline, a post-disciplinary operation, and a heuristic device of post-critical re-articulation. While one of its most far-reaching definitive problems is reduced to the low intensity of its index

of uniqueness, that is, academics, researchers, cultural and public policy workers, and education professionals believe they know what inclusion is, while at the same time they are unable to explain it in-depth, or, many believe they know it, but encounter obstacles in defining it. Besides, their conceptualization reflects a drastically different signifier than the one that demands its authenticity, recognizing that different groups have different explanations for approaching the phenomenon. We speak then of inclusion as a metaphor.

Another definite problem of the field lies in the absence of clear analytical-methodological rules resulting from the concealment of its substance and modes of existence. Attention to its modes of legitimation is crucial since it fosters zigzag interconnections between what counts as part of its authentic epistemic center and the mechanisms of transformation of its definitive and conditional forms of the field and of the concept itself –heuristic syntax-. Inclusive education faces complex definitional dilemmas. The interest in definitions should not be understood as iterative practices whose objective is that they fix the politics of intellectuality. In the case of inclusion, it is something that is in permanent movement, it inaugurates a restless and unfinished field of the field, it is a point of departure in the analysis, never of closure, it inaugurates new points of analytical focus.

The question of the conditions that define the nature and modes of existence of inclusion as a project of knowledge in resistance is key to situating ourselves like its epistemological domain. It thus becomes an intensifier of thought, a singular political praxis, and a device for turning social and school life around. As the threshold of the world's transformation, it can create devices of singularizing subjectivity –a main axis in the ontological politics of inclusion. This affirmation leads us to the recognition that its ontological policy reaffirms a character of the minor, breaks with the substantial implications of the field, and legitimizes the halo of heterogeneity that resides in each singularity which, in turn, is multiple.

By signifying inclusive education as a project of knowledge in resistance, it becomes an epistemological counter-space, becoming the configuration of a plan to imagine education and social becoming in a completely alterative and different way than what is known. Inclusion is always synonymous with disruptive heuristics and complex understandings; it is also a deliberate political commitment and a set of ethical and aesthetic passions, a cartography of the present. What does this unique mode of mapping suggest? Inclusion is the effect of a system of a total transformation.

Is inclusion outside of education, is it education, or does it operate on top of it? Although it is essentially educational, it is not limited to this regionalization, since it is not reduced exclusively to the work of the educator –it is substantive to its work, allowing the intrinsic sense of it to be recovered – inclusion is found everywhere. It is even deployed in fields

not directly related to education because of the extra-disciplinary relationship. It is something that is not limited to what one can find in books or institutional training structures. It plays a crucial role in the organization of the world and the construction of other worlds, of culture and political life; it is a space of complex tensions and transits of a nomadic and diasporic character. It is a mechanism for reading the present, an effort to think of a new subjectivity capable of coexisting with the continuous transformations. It is a strategy to challenge global education and to imagine educational thought and its practice in a different way, committed to a broader project of subjective and social change.

Although many of the programs for change have exhausted their historical function, the desire for social justice and progressive transformation is one of the main manifestations of their ethical conscience. It is a territory that operates through the transposition of different objects, methods, concepts, theories, political projects, ethical commitments, discourses, disciplines, inter-disciplines, territories, knowledge projects, etc. It assumes a new form to imagine differently its forms of knowledge production. It is a subversive epistemological force, an itinerary that favors heterogenesis, nomadism, complexity, and multiplicity.

2. NOMADIC KNOWLEDGE, A SYNTAGMATIC FIELD

Epistemological nomadism? The forms of production of knowledge constitute complex mechanisms of intervention-creation-alteration, they are not reduced to mere speculative questions and converging legacies in this singular heuristic context. It forges a novel way of conceiving the production of knowledge, its object does not proceed by normative means, it is a device that overflows and interrogates knowledge and legitimate interpretative forms, its epistemological plot operates outside the absolute ontological code, strategically it becomes itself, whose articulation "is not in reproducing or interpreting, but in creating from the available elements in a specific position that, in turn, constitutes us. Neither subject/object nor signifier/meaning" (Ávila, 2014, p170).

It articulates a set of deep transformations that alter the intellectual, ethical, and political structures that regulate education, the democratic plot, and the citizen architectures. Heuristically, it is a field of deep theoretical, political, and ethical interests. It rescues the notion of multiple singularities –a category that impacts the theoretical and the political; it redefines the cultural, social, and educational space. So far, the subjects of mainstream and liberal inclusion are the others of modernity; they reproduce the presence of a set of classical binarisms –substantiated in the grammar of essentialism-individualism. While being conceived as a counter-discursive

space of counter-subjectivities, it takes the subject –regardless of its categorical forms – to a higher stage of realization, consistent with the forms of post-humanism proposed by Braidotti (2009). His epistemological domain is permanently armed and disarmed.

In this way, he proposes "to moderate the theoretical voice within us and to try to deal with our historical situation in a different way" (Braidotti, 2004, p.113). This emphasis on creativity "causes a shift from theoretical language to the production of cartography and political figurations or fictions" (Ávila, 2014, p.174). Inclusion, being present everywhere, must be rooted in real-life events and, by extension, assume the critical desire for social justice and progressive transformation, reinventing the manifestations of our ethical consciousness.

In affirming that inclusive education possesses a complex alterative nature, I refer to a set of affirmative representations of a creative and dislocated type, a non-reproductive form of the same (Braidotti, 2004), opposed to the figurations of the alternatives that work under the logic of reiteration. It is in this that part of the epistemological nature of inclusive education is inscribed, conceived as a system of heuristic-political relocation of a strategic nature, a displacement that gives way to creation, an operation that implies the transformation and emergence of new spaces, inclusion is never a mere system of projective imagination. Its domain can be read in terms of a multi-layered space inscribed in a dynamic exterior.

Inclusive education as an area or regionalization of study provides a set of radical prototypes, it is an epistemological form that acts by complex mechanisms of re-articulation of fields crossed by the post –this prefix, in the interiority of the domain, does not follow a linear logic-, specifically, it reveals an operation close to the overturning of each one of the post-critical theories that converge in it. Although the post-critical constitutes part of its genealogical structure, its nature and authenticity crystallize beyond this. Its object, field, and method operate in the re-articulation of each of these contributions.

It is very common to think that inclusive education is a post-critical sign. Although to a certain extent it is, certainly its theoretical, empirical, and analytical object is informed by cognitive constructivism, and regulation is built beyond these. Once again, the constructive insistence of the exteriority of the theoretical works returns. The epistemological construction that I propose about inclusive education resorts to a wide corpus of knowledge located, for the most part, in the legacies of subaltern epistemologies –it shares with them a set of meta-methodological premises-; it transcends their approaches, it redoubles them by creating something completely new. Inclusive education is not a post-critical theory, it is something that is beyond its presuppositions. By confusing the special with the inclusive, we

are facing a singular form of mental monoculture whose heuristic morphology is regulated by a set of inner relationships which is what traps the phenomenon in mimesis and an extension of the special. Special education is a form of the inclusive, the inclusive is not necessarily a form of the special, it is a phenomenon of greater scope. It breaks with internal relationships that anchor it to the normative epistemological models. Let us stop for a few moments to analyze this singular interweaving.

Inclusive education, as epistemic regionalization, takes distance from traditional academic methods and disciplines, acts by diasporic, nomadism, and (de)linkage, the production of its knowledge is interwoven in the struggle to capture the present –philosophy from abroad. It constructs a new modality of codification, a new affirmative composition of subjectivities, whose relational capacity is not confined within the classical epistemic and ontological dictatorships and/or dependencies. As a product of the exodus that fosters its emergence, its constructive forces are permanently de-territorialized and re-territorialized, whose heuristic procedure takes place through singular affirmative modes, but not through reactivity in the production of knowledge –mainstream formula-. It is a field of irremediable and permanent openings, a device of dynamic multilayer nature, a knowledge that acts on incarnate subjects, on its relational and affectivities, it builds an ethical fabric coherent with Braidotti's (200) approaches, regarding the differential ethics that traces a double link between the forces of transformation and the construction of a new ethical praxis.

3. INCLUSION: AN INTENSELY SENSITIVE AREA

What do you hear when you hear the word inclusion? If we look strictly at the differentiation offered by Bal (2009), it is possible to say that inclusion is today a word, not a concept as such. As a word, it fills us with hope, with strength and vigor, with intense relativity, it imposes a figuration that opens up to that which allows us to continue to struggle, it takes distance from any signifier in favor of naivety. Up to this point, its function inscribes a singular way of living life, a modality of behavior, of understanding the world that surrounds us, a way of using our mind and conscience. By affirming that inclusion fulfills the same functions of a philosophy, I sustain that is something we find everywhere, we make flesh this adjective, noun, and verb when we relate to others, we are not only inclusive in school –this is an inherent condition of the educational endeavor-, we are inclusive when interacting, walking, relating, etc., this creates permanent learning.

Although the term inclusion and the syntagm inclusive education are used in different ways by different groups, they can be described in terms of metaphor, that is, explanations developed by different groups and used

for particular purposes. It is a discourse that is not owned by anyone. So far, inclusive education can be described in terms of movement, especially when used as a slogan and, sometimes, to identify around a strange ideal of diversity that borders on the ontological enterprise that conceives this category in terms of assimilation. In what kind of manifestations is the ideal of inclusion used? Although there are no specific protests about groups and spaces that claim inclusion as such, or rather, under this denomination. It is certainly an object of permanent struggle in various critical contemporary knowledge projects and social movements, whose articulations, concepts, and developments inhabit the deepest part of their domain. Although people increasingly want to know about inclusion, the lessons and uses that surround various latitudes of the world continue to work in a negative tropism, that is, they employ a repertoire of concepts that distort the authentic object of it. It is a field that awakens people's interest. Inclusive education is a field shaped by multiple interests and complex influences. One of its many singularities lies in its capacity to be enunciated with different words, objects of struggle, and purposes of work.

Inclusion is a concept that challenges us, speaks to us about ourselves, about our existence, and, uniquely, about our life. For it to have an effect on our lives –biographies- we must dislodge ourselves from them; it suggests becoming part of something close to a global and situated political commitment. This is a domain that supposedly travels and happens in terms of a great structure that makes us part of something, but this fiction of regulation, to such an extent, tells us its history in its way. To become a weapon of a transformation of the world, it needs to take on other problems, tell other stories, legitimize other voices, etc. How does inclusion teach us to speak out for and against violence and injustice? This question invites us to reflect on the semiological devices with which we interact, as well as the spaces and people who transmit this message to us. In terms of movement, what is not clear about this approach is precisely the awareness of inclusiveness. It is the movement that seeks to end exclusion, silenced discrimination, structural violence, sexism, collective indifference, racism, and, above all, puts in tension the discourses meant in critically democratic terms, those that cover up a wide variety of forms of inequality. Above all, it is a commitment to make visible all forms of (micro)oppression and (micro)domination.

Not because we talk about inclusion, or that the policies and training programs revolve around their purposes –they are mainstream- means that this happens. Not everyone recognizes that what one wants to end or inaugurate. This approach faces the challenge of learning to recognize and act on the structure and fundamental pieces of injustice that are inherent in today's capitalism. Inclusive education reinforces their approach by continuing to emphasize these phenomena. Up to this point, in my opinion, the inclusion

of which we speak most about configures an insufficient understanding of the world fails to explain how a wide variety of chronic social pathologies, constitutive of the world-systems that we experience, are produced or continue to be reproduced at various levels of social life. It is precisely this repetition that constitutes its source of difficulty, one of the multiple limits of thought.

Inclusion is learned in micropraxis, it is described, through the metaphor of "housework" –I take this expression from Ahmed's work (2005), as it brilliantly exemplifies the configurations of the micro praxis to which I refer in various sections of this work-, it is a task that one assigns to oneself, an awareness, a deformation of our self-awareness. It invites us, as Ahmed (2005) points out, to learn about our discomfort in the world, about our intentions for change, desire production, and life experiences. Housework is an analogy around the idea of critical intimacy or reflective intimacy, in projection with the archive of images of our biography, suggests to turn to deeper areas of our life, our interactions, our relationships, etc., becomes a unique process of intimacy, which involves the reconstruction of our biographical plot, our affections, passions, and feelings. All of them are key axes in the construction of the theory of inclusive education. Theoretically, the understandings of inclusive education describe it as a great movement of social and political transformation. By going through the experience of exclusion, it helps us to discover an infinite number of forms of possible worlds. To learn about inclusion is to learn about the world.

4. ONTOLOGICAL TENSIONS: THE LEAP FROM SUBSTANTIALISM TO MATERIALISM

Inclusive education configures an intellectual program articulated in the exteriority of the theoretical work, amalgamating diverse trajectories of knowledge –degenerative genealogical networks-. It constructs an ontological policy of the minor that takes distance from the differentialism that emerges through identical thought –an angular piece that, in part, bases and legitimates a corpus of essentialisms-individualisms in the organicity of the field. An ontology of the minor is coherent with the principle of differentiability, it ratifies that each singularity is heterogeneous in itself, it is an expression of multiple and infinite variations. I agree with De Landa (2016), observing that the dominant ontological forms, Eurocentric, colonial, and Western-hegemonic, are the same ones that have regulated the mainstream and liberal discourse of inclusion. In it, identity becomes a restrictive factor of difference itself, even the politics of identity and otherness reproduce this failure of the analytical approach.

The epistemological field of inclusive education constructs an infinitely greater ontological figuration, property of its open character, which allows

the construction of broader, unfinished things and inaugurates new perspectives of analysis. The ontology of inclusion is something open –openness allows us to reach higher states of thought. The open is in perpetual becoming, nothing is fixed in it. These properties are key in the understanding of the structure of knowledge of inclusive education, its configuration elements reach their functioning through complex forces of deterritorialization and reterritorialization, revealing a field that is configured in diverse planes. The structure and the field of knowledge of inclusive education are configured through a corpus of "hybrids of forces folding and disseminating singularities through a multi-combinatory in constant updating" (Castillo, 2019, p.236), in permanent evolution. On this point, I agree with Braidotti (2006), since he establishes a materialistic ontology that works to destroy the faces of enunciation of a dominant human being. Let us stop for a few moments at this point- Braidotti (2009) consolidates his academic work through a positive notion of difference. This assertion is sustained by a network of individualism-essentialism that founds the ontological problem of groups –an operation also conceived as a substantialist ontology- that undermines and objectifies a large social group of people, thus justifying a corpus of public policies that do nothing more than reproduce an assimilation effect and a multi categorical problem to justify their task around the passive signifiers of inclusion,

where a very specific idea of the human being has been imposed on others, functioning as an ideal or regulative canon to be contrasted and aspired to. In such a framework, difference loses much of the richness of its significance, being delivered to a structure of thought in which the unity or homogenization of subjectivities takes precedence, since those who do not respond or who are different from the hegemonic one, are either segregated or placed on the margins, when they are not repressed and persecuted or are awarded a position of subordination concerning that one, forming a markedly hierarchical and stratified social system (González, 2018, p.174).

The principle of identity is organized around a criterion of unity, in it, the matter of the human is one; it produces a sameness and unity that foster diverse classificatory forms of the same. The subject of inclusion -mainstream, falsified, or mimesis of the special, liberal, and capitalist- is classified around a principle of individual nature. The principle of identity acts in terms of a principle of restriction, the power of differentiability, and human variability, it is this that allows us to affirm that the subject of inclusion is the property of the multiple and the lesser, a subject with a great ontological richness. The strange articulations that define the policy of inclusive education - I mean specifically, in terms of intellectual assemblages - impercepti-

bly assume what Lacan (1970) calls the impasse of difference or in Young (2002), the ontological problem of social groups. Indeed,

[...] the difference comes from the different, bringing to flote the differences that hide the sameness in its eagerness to mold the entities from the principle of concealment that promotes identity. For this reason, difference emerges as a great accumulation of intensities that are captured neither by the general, nor by the particular, since the differential relations of each energetic vibration bloom in varying degrees of intensity, and different temporal-spatial scales (Castillo, 2019, p.235).

The study of the conditions of epistemological production of inclusive education, not only focuses on understanding the mechanisms that create and guarantee the emergence of its knowledge but also focuses on the forces of appropriation of its elements, imprinting a particular meaning on each of them. Coinciding with Castillo (2019), such forces are conceived in terms of wills, this is what allows the field to be in constant alloy with intensely different elements - the epistemological principle of heterogenesis -, thus avoiding falling into repetition. It is a domain composed by variable intensities, by multiple assemblages that mutate towards other folds, whose structure follows the logic of:

[...] swarms of diverse materials, scattered and folded by the multiple spaces of energetic possibilities, mutating all the time towards diverse folds. In such a way, that all interconnected dynamism are in an infinite proliferation in a game of adjustments and maladjustments in which the multiple flows live a constant metamorphosis from one to another, without stopping for a single instant (Castillo, 2019, p.237).

Inclusive education does not possess status as a preformed heuristic figuration, the same is true for education. In it, each of its elements is in permanent mutation, affected at disparate rhythms, accounting for a constellation that can be signified in terms of "cosmic hiatuses, thus propitiating all kinds of interpenetrations and contagions" (Castillo, 2019, p.237). Inclusive education as a structure, object, field, and knowledge, is loaded with constant dynamism, regulated by principles of variability, mobility, and continuity, through them, a field of great strength of analytical-methodological infinity is unveiled. It is a terrain inhabited by multiple resources and constructive singularities of different nature that can be signified in terms of "container of multiplicities in constant configuration" (Castillo, 2019, p.238).

Inclusion leads us to a materialistic onto-logic, it inaugurates a debate around the presence and recognition of singularities of a heterogeneous

nature -the founding axiom of its ontological politics and the main heuristic key to the construction of its knowledge-, whose principle of articulation is structured around the logic of integration/disintegration thanks to its differentiation. If we start from the statement: inclusion is the effect of a total transformation, what triggers such a phenomenon? While the systems of reasoning employed in the operation by falsification -effect of simulacrum, transvestisation, and mimesis with the special- impose a signifier that does not correspond to the nature of the field, giving way to a set of erroneous ideas to support its heuristic task as a result of the absence of opportune foundations.

The performative and alterative nature of inclusion reflects a singular mode of irruption in the world, similar to a political-imaginative unleashing that acts on its own. Its analytical power performs reality through a "given-giving-to-give" movement, which is something that takes place in praxis -understanding this last category, from the point of view of the philosophy of praxis posed by Marxism-. The dismemberment of the signifier of the inclusion of the special - epistemic palimpsest of the inclusion that imposes a new face of the special. However, it leads to a repetitive substantialization of entrapment, a false oedipization- merits a finished reading in the interiority of the process of falsification and of the theoretical tradition that grounds its legacy in it. While the special may be a form of inclusion, inclusion is not necessarily a form of the special. It is a device of defiant imagination in the face of the times in which we live. Inclusion is a patent and legible need in all fields of human development, it is not exclusive to education -that is, it is what makes its object ambivalent and functioning in different ways-.

In what kind of manifestations is the ideal of inclusion used? Although there are no specific protests about groups and spaces that claim inclusion as such or rather, with this denomination; it is certainly an object of permanent struggle in diverse knowledge projects and critical contemporary social movements, whose articulations, concepts, and developments inhabit the deepest part of their domain. Although people want to know more and more about inclusion, the lessons and uses that abound in various latitudes of the world continue to work in a negative tropism, that is, they employ a repertoire of concepts that distort the authentic object of inclusion. It is a field that arouses people's interest. It will be necessary, then, to distinguish its various axes of analysis around the constitutive forms of its theoretical, methodological and political interests and contours. Inclusive education is a field shaped by multiple interests and complex influences. One of its many singularities lies in its capacity to enunciate itself with different words, objects of struggle, and purposes of work. Inclusion is everywhere, it is a micro-practical event, why does it need to be everywhere, where do we find it, where does it find us?

Inclusion is a concept that questions us, it speaks to us about ourselves, about our existence, and, singularly, about our lives. For inclusion to affect our lives - biographical plots - we must dislodge ourselves from them, it suggests becoming part of something close to a global and situated political commitment. Inclusion supposedly travels and happens in terms of a grand structure that makes us part of something, but this fiction of regulation, to such an extent, tells its story in its way. For inclusion to become a weapon of a transformation of the world needs to take on other problems, tell other stories, legitimize other voices, and so on.

Inclusive education, as a theory, reaffirms Deleuze and Guattari's (1968) concept of assemblage. What is the heuristic benefit of this notion? Inclusion as assemblage brings us closer to the context of a constellation. Constellations suggest the creation of something without copying the previous. It is a philosophical task of a materialistic and dialectical order, states Buck-Morrs (1997). Constellations are a large group of ideas that assemble a certain phenomenon or figuration of it, which are intensely unstable. They are fragments of ideas, concepts, methods, theories, subjects, territories, etc., that, when juxtaposed, configure a certain constellation that analyzes and illuminates reality and its diverse systems-worlds. The great majority of these constructive singularities remain in a state of isolation, whose imbrications and connections are not always well understood in the intimacy of the systems of alloys that configure the domain of inclusive education. Their organicity is obtained "by transforming traditional concepts, dialectically inverting their relationships, and challenging the slogans of 'second nature'" (Buck-Morrs, 1997, p.199).

The epistemological field of inclusive education can be conceived under the concept of constellations since it builds, assembles, and models a singular analytical-methodological figuration from isolated elements, not always well understood or distant in their function to its object, whose imbrications and alloys reveal creative and intensely unstable links. What constellations do is to heuristically re-functionalize a given domain; they are also phenomena that have the power to unravel various problems and effects.

Inclusive education is a specific constellation from the constitutive elements of its phenomenon, encouraging its axes of the constitution to become visible in its interiority. Its domain understood in terms of constellation does not operate exclusively under the signifier of the simple regrouping of constructive resources. Although they all operate under the principle of heterogenesis, their modalities occur under the performativity of the re-articulatory. The constellations operate in terms of alterations in the forms of construction of meaning, each of them erected within the intellectual history of the latter, as well as in its genealogical trajectories and entanglements.

5. HEURISTIC ASSEMBLIES?

Taking the approaches of De Landa (2016), we will argue that the assemblages encourage the formulation of other types of non-causal explanations, it also encourages complex understandings about diverse styles of the agency that occur in the configuration of the field, accounting for the diverse heuristic dynamics of the domain, those occurring at multiple scales, according to De Landa (2016), constitute historically contingent forms whose nature describes a structure that operates at different scales, emancipating its constructive forms from the classical hierarchical dependencies imposed, preferably, by normative epistemologies. Consequently, I will argue that inclusive education is a historical, intensely contingent, multi-axial, and multi-scalar field. The operations of assemblages are constructed through singular interactions with other assemblages; this heuristic mechanism is what sustains the diasporic and nomadic construction of the domain. In it, diverse diasporas converge and interact, similar to the functioning of the constellation, a space assembled by elements naturally heterogeneous among themselves, which do not coexist harmoniously, but rather intensely chaotic through alloys in determined points.

The principles of regulation and constitution of the epistemological space of inclusive education are those of diasporism - dispersion, incessant and undulating movement - and heterogenesis. Inclusive education is an assemblage since it is configured by heterogeneous elements, it is a domain whose architecture occurs in the encounter and interaction with countless different elements that denote a set of larger components through the performativity of the articulatory and singular analytical, political, ethical, cultural, economic and methodological coalitions. Field configurations "can accommodate that infinite, assembling and disassembling of which you speak by using the indefinite number of objective capacities to affect and be affected, and the relations of exteriority that allow the separation of components and their reintegration into another assemblage" (Escobar and Osterwell, 2009; cited in Castillo, 2019, p.240), regulated by a self-generating movement by itself. The buoyant is what makes a change, transformation, and the new happen.

The nature of configuration of the field of knowledge of inclusive education is a constant opening to the new, shares the statement of De Landa (2016), as an intellectual space that models a "multiverse, where the parts are assembled and disassembled, and in which it is possible to point out all pluridisciplinary, multi-scalar, trans-local, non-reductionist, heterogeneous, materialistic and processual (De Landa, 2016; cited in: Castillo, 2019, p.241). This quote confirms what Ocampo (2018 and 2019) argues, regarding that inclusive education, as a phenomenon, cannot be delimited

in the paradigms of any particular discipline, since its object overflows such heuristic forms. De Landa (2016), inspired by Morin (2008), adds that currently, no discipline stands on its own. In it, each of the knowledge projects, theories, disciplines, methods, discourses, concepts, subjects, territories, etc., interact, dialogue and adopt complex forms of mediation and negotiation, whose products are subjected to processes of epistemic translation and re-articulation to achieve the heuristic purposes designated by the exteriority of theoretical work, typical of post-disciplines. It configures a wide-ranging framework of knowledge through the rearticulating exchange of diverse contemporary (post)critical intellectual projects.

Another epistemological property of inclusive education is multiscalar, a key concept in the work of French scholars Deleuze and Guattari and the context of the Americas, De Landa. The structuring coordinates of the field agglutinate elements of a singularly heterogeneous nature, grouping entities of different scales. This is what, in various works, I have tried to show through the need to apply the topological examination to understand the place, position and degrees of proximity and relationship in scales of different types, "in which all and parts coexist as interconnected hybrids in a continuous coupling and decoupling" (Castillo, 2019, p.242). Is the structure, object, and field of knowledge of inclusive education a materialistic operation? The first aspect to relieve a character of continuous interweaving that generates its own forms.

The assemblages, as theoretical apparatuses, allow us to understand that none of their configuring elements are stable, normative, fixed, but are intensely contingent; pieces that are not always found in comfort and harmony, their organic happens in proximity to constellations and systems of external relations -a key epistemological principle of inclusive education-. Accordingly, they also denote a figuration close to the logic of displaced, replaced, and rearticulated within and among other bodies. The knowledge project signified under the denomination of inclusive education denotes an organic dynamic in which diverse dimensions of analysis are included. Its analytical terrain is articulated by a set of singularly contingent and imaginatively heterogeneous elements. Its forms of ordering are called codifications, they adopt a particular form; that is, they select, compose and complete a territory giving life to a singular heuristic figuration.

The assemblages as forms of knowledge production, like the constellations - a notion I will discuss in later paragraphs - carry out a complex process of selection of the epistemological resources that make up the field of inclusive education, thus avoiding the imposition of an anything-goes policy, a product of the elasticity of the concept. Its elasticity is materialized through a mimesis effect. Inclusive education is a space of reterritorialization of the bases of contemporary educational theory, specifically, it establishes new articula-

tions that become an intellectual network. Inclusion and inclusive education are intensely fluid and historically contingent psychic, heuristic, political, and ethical terrains.

What does it imply to think about the heuristic functioning of inclusive education through the notion of assemblage? A preliminary caveat will consist in evidencing that its field of research and heuristic domain organizes its function based on an order of production - internal laws of the domain that determine its organic - of a diasporic and nomadic character. Through these articulations, it observes the convergence and confluence of diverse territories and geographies of knowledge that, in turn, are (micro) diasporas and the result of other more complex (micro)configurations. The domain of inclusive education is the result of multiple more complex configurations, moving away from the metaphor of the simple gathering of different things, which, to a certain extent, becomes a paratactic - static - and parasitic articulation. Inclusive education as a heuristic phenomenon is the composition of many other things under the performativity of re-articulation, avoiding the passivity of simple amalgamation.

The first major characteristic of its field and object is signified through the notion of 'transient configuration', whose pattern of articulation operates in indeterminacy. It is a highly contingent and interactive constellation between each of its parts, in which each of its heterogeneous elements - the principle of heterogenesis - are related to each other, by extraordinary forms of alloy structured through the principle of exteriority. The component of heterogenesis offers an appeal to a wide diversity of elements, none of which is of the same matter. Thus, a wide infinity of elements, objects, events, sensations, expressions, signs, etc., is observed. The assemblage it forms is described under a figuration proximal to a rearticulating combination of inextricably interconnected parts. Each of its elements is contingent, not necessarily connected to each other. Their forms of connection function outside of any established series. Thus, for De Landa (2016), many of its elements

[...] can be extracted from one whole and inserted into another. "These relations imply, first of all, that a part of a whole can be detached from it and connected to a different whole in which its interactions are different. In other words, the exteriority of relations implies a certain autonomy for the terms to be related (p.10-11).

It is an assemblage that, although regulated by complex external relations, observes, to a certain extent, the participation of the philosophy of internal relations, especially in the mimetic effect that leads to the cross-dressing of the inclusive with the special, resulting in the establishment of a false descent. In the interiority of the structure of epistemological configura-

tion of inclusive education, no element, no system, no articulation is above another, it distances itself from the dependencies and anchorages that sustain the configurations of normative epistemology. In contrast, its analytical-methodological figuration is close to the field of multiple scaling; it evidences a multi-axial crossing of diverse dynamics, expressions, and plateaus. The analytical specificity of the concept of heuristic assemblage refers us to the Guattarian notion of 'agency'. Let us now see how this notion plays a fundamental role in this examination.

Inclusive education works on multiple cutting-edge problems, not disciplines. It is a space configured from a set of sets connected at some point. De Landa (2016) will offer a preliminary precision that we cannot omit: assemblage as an agency is not fetishized to the mere act of joining or adjusting a corpus of elements of diverse nature -passive activity-, neither is it a set of well-combined parts, but they describe a multiplicity -if we attend to Rajchman's (2004) approaches, we will observe that multiplicity is synonymous of complexity product that leads us to multiple articulations-, in it, very different elements among themselves establish relationships, links, and twists to produce something completely new.

The construction of the epistemological field of inclusive education, although it explicitly states a wide variety of affiliations, many of them act through the figure of epistemic memories; the emergence of its object occurs through rearticulating alloys. Its epistemic architecture is composed of irregular and non-uniform parts; it plays various forms of alloys. In contrast, the internal relations - links by descent - are connected by function and nature of the terms, that is, if the terms are linear and intimately connected, they validate a corpus of extension systems, applicationism, and aggregate particle. This figuration is restrictive to think the field of problematization of inclusive education, especially if we attend to the forms of construction of this knowledge since none of its singularities comes into contact by its direct descent and nature -multiple-, forges an alliance of strategic-heuristic character. The internal relations -mono-centered analytical system- according to De Landa (2016), do not respect the heterogeneous nature of its components, they occur in the articulation of an analytical network of homogeneous character. In other words, they are patterns of behaviors that perform the same function, generating the entrapment of objects and their authenticity. When these are applied to the construction of knowledge, their operations become the technique of epistemic applicationism and the aggregate particle. The opening of new problems and phenomena occur in exteriority -a key epistemological principle of inclusive education-, yes, "their "role" within a larger whole is not what defines them (this would be a relation of interiority). This means that a component is self-subsistent

and can be "disconnected" from one assemblage and "connected" to another without losing its identity" (De Landa, 2016, p.11).

The epistemic architecture of inclusive education and its object follows the logic of pollination described by Deleuze (2005), an operation in which elements of different nature interact establishing contingent alloys. In it, none of the elements has an identical relationship by function or nature. It is a space assembled through a broad corpus of oppositional elements that are united through a singular alliance. In other words, each of these elements is opposed to each other as they transform each other. The forms of linkage or analytical-methodological relationships occur through coordinates that assume particular political problems and social obligations -a connection point that reaffirms its performative character-, it is a link that is created between diverse problems of regulation of the contemporary world. "Cognitive tools do not merge into a totality, but coexist and interact in exteriority" (De Landa, 2016, p.11).

The unfinished sense of inclusive education itself and its epistemological property of movement makes the diversity of heterogeneous elements that constitute it form a structure that is permanently re-territorialized and de-territorialized. Inclusion must be consolidated around a heuristic base of a critical realist character that is key to the inauguration of programs of change. It attends to the modes of the irruption of the phenomenon, alters and transforms the formations of thought. It recognizes that the ontological politics of inclusive education is consistent with the molecular revolution. Inclusion is a heterodox sign, a vector of mobilization of the frontier, a force of alteration of the structures of multiple world-systems.

In itself, a singular form of becoming is also, "an affirmative desire for transformative flows" (Cardenal, 2012, p.20); it is a vector of dislocation. Also, its signifier can be housed under the imaginary figuration of reinvention, its mechanisms of production of desire are founded and pursue the transformation of the world -Feuerbach's thesis number eleven-. Inclusion "has to do with the desire for change and flows, as well as the dynamism of multiple desires" (Cardenal, 2012, p.20).

6. INCLUSION AS CREATIVE RECOGNITIVE FIGURATION IN RESISTANCE

The mainstream program of change called 'inclusion' demonstrates exhaustion of its function of change and intervention in the world, unable to remove the chronic social pathologies that articulate a wide variety of forms of social misery. This program of change or slogan must be analyzed within the impacts that this has for the contemporary world: a) subjectivity, b) the general construction of knowledge, c) political interventions and d) the

academic and research practice of education. Another step is to understand what is said about it. According to Braidotti (2009), at present, all programs of change have exhausted their function.

The human has always been a category linked to privilege and power -substantialist ethics-. However, the mainstream program of inclusion - ratified by all governments worldwide - defines its ontological articulations on a wide range of dualities, the question of the racialized, marginalized, and excluded others that this program of change does not address or strategically removes from its ontological policy returns here. Inclusion as a knowledge project is not exclusively an alternative appeal, but a critical-political task that configures a multi-layered and multidirectional project that displaces anthropocentrism while pursuing the analysis of the discriminatory and violent aspects of human activity and interaction wherever they occur (Braidotti, 2009).

Inclusive education is a unique strategy of analytical resistance. Its epistemological and political terrain is expressed in terms of a nodal point in permanent mutation; it is a place of encounter and re-articulation, despite its marked zigzag traveler character, it never stops. It does not pursue the paratactic activation of any theory and methodological debate visited and traversed in each of its travels. It is more interested in its transformation; its operations take place in the performativity of the re-articulatory. What defines inclusion as a resistance project? A core aspect to be rescued is the analytical power of intersectionality in each of the confluent epistemological resources, an operation that goes against the expectations of a grand theory that has become a heuristic space out of place from which we do not understand the use of theory.

The configuration of the constructive forms of this field suggests an examination of its historical and political contingencies -both notions constantly interpenetrate in the study of its conditions of production-. Inclusion as a project of resistance faces a fundamental defining dilemma, that is, it analyzes the structural power relations and cultural representations it interrogates. Another dilemma analyzes how particular bodies of knowledge establish imperceptible alliances in the service of inequality, domination, and oppression. Likewise, how knowledge influences the configuration of power relations confirms the alloy of its statements with one of its epistemic memories: critical intersectionality.

Inclusion as a knowledge project significantly addresses the power relations and social inequalities that affect and permeate the institutional rules of operation of society and the educational system as a whole. When conceived as an analytical strategy, it provides new angles of vision on the heterotopicality of phenomena housed in its interiority. It constructs a critical praxis that informs diverse projects of educational justice. Although

interest in the field has grown rapidly, its efforts remain in an imperceptible and dramatic reproduction.

The question that imposes the statement: inclusive education as a project of knowledge in resistance, analyzes the spaces and forms of interpenetration and re-articulation through which this approach has been configured 'through', 'beyond', 'outside', and even, against singular political spaces and heuristic regionalizations. Such an undertaking suggests a preliminary caveat, that is, to strengthen the levels of theoretical, political, and methodological literacy required by the domain. The constructive singularity of the domain encourages that none of its convergent fields act rigidly separated; rather, the configuration of its knowledge structure describes a centrifugal process, which travels and mobilizes through diverse places, passing through disciplinary, interdisciplinary, and post-disciplinary fields -a territory of multiple intertwined epistemological convergences-, adapts to diverse discursive and research fields, ratifying the flexible character of its heuristic operative. Interrogating the question, inclusion becomes a desire and, in turn, a critical perception that fosters new readings on the singular forms of regeneration and performative action of power; it is a phenomenon in reciprocal construction that operates by critical intimacy, that is, it establishes planes of closeness between languages and theoretical-methodological forms that participate in its construction. Despite this consensus, the definitions of what counts as 'inclusion' and 'inclusive education' are far from clear.

Currently, there is an adjustment of the mainstream signifier of inclusion to various research formats, that is, to a set of standard methodologies that, in the case of the Educational Sciences, refer to the general methods and methodologies provided by the Social Sciences. Here, another critical knot emerges: The Educational Sciences do not have their research method, with duly formalized levels and degrees. This enterprise or such degrees of decisions seek to promote the formalization and adaptation by abduction - not re-articulation - of the foundations of inclusive education - intrinsically linked to the imposition and transvestism of special education - a persistent epistemic scandal - within certain fields and regions of study and research. Such an operation works through an extensive or aggregative particle modality, extends its scope within certain fields, then we observe the presence of research that, previously uninformed of the heuristic and methodological basis of inclusive education. The qualifier operates in terms of something that walks and travels around diverse fields of study. The confluence of its structuring fields is also not so evident within the understanding of its cognitive apparatus. How is this knowledge project synthesized in diverse fields of study and research?

Inclusion as a knowledge project in resistance, despite constructing an analytical-methodological spatiality that operates and inscribes its heuristic task at the margin, is skeptical of the application of methodologies proper to disciplinary fields and is not given to the integration of conventional theories and methods applied by diverse epistemic geographies. In such a case, any methodological form may be rearticulated, rather, it seeks the integration of innovative and critically transformative ideas that allow to examine-in-another-way the reality and the diversity of problems of the world-systems. Its methodological and analytical action is close to the notion of 'over readability, that is, a position of reading and interpretation based on a multiplicity of meanings, levels, subjects, and lines of argument.

Inclusion as a knowledge project synthesizes analytical-political navigation tools to think about its nature and role in the contemporary world. This point is key since it tensions the meaning of the educational function. By constituting a broad-based knowledge project, it denotes a dynamic assemblage that provides new angles of vision on determined practices and problems that not only border the order of injustices but rather, that of challenging imaginations that erect and sustain a world-of-possibilities, evaluating whether or not its objectual network constitutes a (un)fortunate performative. It is, in turn, a singular project that informs and nourishes its analytical network through diverse frameworks provided by justice, feminist theories, Anglo-Saxon, Latin American and Asian cultural studies, post- and decolonial studies, women's studies, subaltern studies, critical race studies, political and structural intersectionality, critical interculturality, critical pedagogy, queer studies, gender studies, philosophy of difference, etc.

The question about the corpus of elements that define inclusion as a knowledge project in resistance, attends to the axes of production of new knowledge, thus, we speak of an intertwined and interpenetrated relationship between knowledge project and analytical strategy. A knowledge project in resistance is built in the analytical intimacy of the relations between knowledge and power, providing languages, concepts and theories to interpret inclusion as a counterpoint reflecting singular performative power relations. Inclusion is something that is socially and politically constructed, legitimized in micro-practice.

What knowledge and methodological forms are linked to an epistemic project of resistance? The same question could be asked in the political dimension of the project. It is the knowledge that is informed and influenced by particular power relations - hence the need to carry out a relational analysis of the problems of the field, which can be applied to the construction of public policies in the field. The object of analysis of inclusion focuses its analytical focus on the variables that condition the recursive relationship between social structures and cultural representations. It is interested in

analyzing the set of interconnected meanings situated by oppression, domination, injustice, and inequality, paying attention to what this does with the subjectivity of each citizen-subject, all of them, expressions of regenerative and performative nature, articulate specific patterns of location of diverse groups of citizens. The struggle against each of these chronic forms of social and educational regulation is at the very heart of the resistance project.

The understanding of oppression, domination, injustices, and inequality are central points, together with the ideal of transformation, in the construction of the theory of inclusive education. Another uniqueness of this project leaves room for a wide number of collectivities and communities of adherence and interpretation, linking a variety of specific knowledge projects. One of the main analytical obstructions assumes a monocentric and monocategorical analysis to study injustices and inequality, etc., neglects an analysis around the social formations and knowledge projects that reproduce such forms of inequality. Inclusion as a knowledge project operates far beyond a mono-analytical system. Indeed,

[...]can also be profitably conceptualized as a constellation of knowledge projects that change in relation to one another in tandem with changes in the interpretive communities that advance them. The broader knowledge project provides a set of ideas that provide moments of definitional consensus. (Hill Collins, 2015, p.9).

Inclusion as an analytical strategy has a dual function. First, it constructs a particular way of analyzing problems; it manufactures an epistemological tactic for addressing a wide variety of complex educational problems. Also, it can be conceived as a matrix of "analytical inquiry, rather than a specific alignment or prescription for particular methodological approaches or techniques" (Burman, 2017, p.12). Whereas, its second function, places it in relation to the production of new knowledge about the educational, social, and political world, allowing to employ the notion in different ways.

Drawing from Hill Collins (2015), the notion 'analytical sensibility', I will argue that what makes the analysis that proliferates by way of inclusion inclusive escapes the use of the term itself, but rather creates forms of creative non-dialectal figuration that offer outlets for "thinking about the problem of sameness and difference and its relation to power" (Cho, 2013, p. 795). The analytical dimension of inclusion as a new heuristic praxis works when we see it. Undoubtedly, an examination of the patterns of production of new knowledge can be far more productive in understanding inclusion, specifically, it confronts the question of the corpus of issues that characterize inclusion -certain consensus exists that these are inscribed beyond disability and the struggle for justice-, or what concerns and interests do this

work share with other knowledge projects? The theoretical and constructive work of inclusive education has many significant nuances in the transformation of the contemporary world. For this reason, by conceiving its analytical force in terms of a 'nodal point' and a 'heuristic transposition mechanism' for contemporary educational theory, it is key to the realization of a relational approach that cuts across theoretical formats and methodological corpora. Inclusion produces other epistemological ideas, it understands that the new knowledge and methodological forms it produces are neither neutral nor outside of power relations, rather they are deeply imbricated in it.

Among the main epistemological challenges it faces, the following stand out: a) its knowledge is not politically neutral, b) its empirical work must consider the guiding presuppositions of its praxis, otherwise what the mainstream of its discourse has so far done happens, "unwittingly uphold the same complex social inequalities that it aims to understand" (Hill Collins, 2015, p.14). This has been my research objective for some years, specifically, when I refer to the need to understand how school and social structures operate, as well as the mechanisms of functioning of each of the formats of power, that is, diverse expressions of a regenerative and performative nature. Under this concept, injustice, oppression, domination, collective indifference, structural and micro-scale inequality, structured and silenced violence, etc., are agglutinated. All of them are deeply interrelated and interpenetrated. Thus,

[...] individuals and groups differentially placed within intersecting systems of power have different points of view on their own and others' experiences with complex social inequalities, typically advancing knowledge projects that reflect their social locations within power relations (Hill Collins, 2015, p.13).

Finally, I note the coexistence of a politics of inequality about how researchers and practitioners in the field use the syntagma inclusive education, reflecting different degrees of emphasis on specific analyses, ratifying a functional use. Faced with this, the need arises to explore to what extent these analytical and working forms contribute to clarify the theoretical contours of the field and to unveil its underlying heuristic assumptions. Agreeing with Hill Collins (2015, p.16), it is highly necessary to situate the epistemological understanding of inclusive education, through

[...] Stuart Hall's construction of articulation can be very useful in examining the dynamic patterns of how scholars use intersectionality as an analytical strategy. Hall posits that a theory of articulation is "both a way of understanding how ideological elements come, under certain conditions, to cohere

together within a discourse and a way of asking how they do or do not become articulated, at specific conjunctures, to certain political subjects.” (Grossberg, 1996, p. 141-42).

6.1. Main characteristics of inclusive education as a knowledge project in resistance

The epistemological problems and challenges of inclusive education in which I am interested in try to understand the mechanisms that affect not only the use of the term but also explore its interventionist function in the contemporary world. I am interested in exploring the alternative figurations that occur outside the canonical demands of research. Inclusion as a project of knowledge in resistance pursues the desire for social justice and progressive transformation by introducing other systems of reasoning resulting from the interpenetration of the legacies of feminism, intersectionality, the philosophy of difference, Asian cultural studies, women's studies, queer and gender studies, post- and decolonial studies, etc. In the face of the exhaustion of change programs, inclusion emerges as a creative and alternative figuration of reality, a device of renewed hope, a strategy of social reform of a relational nature that operates at the zigzag intersections of the macro and microstructural. If the desire for inclusion pursues the production of the new, then it becomes a figuration that activates a spiral of profound changes. It is a sign of an open challenge and a vector of heuristic dissipation that works in the creation of a different notion of ethical responsibility that reconfigures the being, not only limited to the encounter with it. It constructs new figurations or ways of imagining different frameworks of thought about the political, the social, and the educational.

The epistemology of inclusive education executes a corpus of alterative changes in the way of reading and approaching a network of phenomena; it denotes an open, restless, affirmative operation of a non-dialectal and intensely creative character. It can also be conceived as a dynamic heuristic morphology assembled by intense flows, a network of openness, creation, and the relation of diverse heterogeneous singularities -the principle of heterogenesis-. It is something that works on the epistemic-ethical question of 'coming-to-be', a movement that leads us to a higher stage of realization is a domain in permanent construction. It rescues epistemological plurality, imputes a corpus of vanishing points that affect ways of thinking and their heuristic-political uses. Among the main characteristics that define inclusion as a resistance project, the following stand out:

- Inclusion as a category of analysis participates in the power relations and cultural and political representations it interrogates. It significantly

attends to the forms that make its knowledge comprehensible and applicable to the problems of today's world.

- Inclusion, as a political strategy, constructs unique mechanisms to decolonize the unconscious. It not only tries to put into practice different kinds of rights, but its rationality permeates people's lives and their ways of relating and subjectivity, beyond the antithetical problem of the right to redistribution and difference.
- Inclusion at the structural level claims a performative action, it is inextricably linked to the analysis of the logic of the functioning of power, whose emphasis goes beyond the study of the structures of inequality.
- Inclusion is a deconstructive-transformational-creative movement. It proposes to recognize the forms of resistance, making us see what critical work in this field has been omitted. To this end, it is essential to challenge the uncritical acceptations of the term, highlighting the set of practices in which the discourse and its argumentative plot lead to colonial and capitalist fantasies about difference and singularity.
- The epistemology of inclusive education is a performative commentary, as such, it is interested in recomposing its scope in the academic and political world. It constructs a new form of practical intervention and a device for the production of singularizing subjectivity.
- The politics of theoretical content for the most part advances through nomadic and diasporic efforts among diverse knowledge projects, methodological forms, theories, political and ethical commitments, concepts, (inter)disciplines, territories, etc. In no way does it attempt to place itself in proximity to the obscene metaphor of open fields. Inclusive education is a knowledge project that works on the margins and from the margins with each of its convergent contributions.
- Inclusion as a knowledge project in resistance undoes and transcends systems of otrification, that is,

[...] by centering and reaffirming identity in the categories of race, language, and nation, it continues to this day, sometimes in the willingness to celebrate diversity and hybridity; and others, in the 'organic' accentuation of that same difference to legitimize exclusionary and -on its darker side- racist speeches (Cho, Crenshaw & McCall, 2013, p. 789),

imposing a set of essentialisms-individualisms that obstruct access to its epistemological understanding and contextual and political singularity in today's world.

As inclusive education reaffirms a field assembled by silent forms of individualism-essentialisms, it faces the challenge of advancing in the subversion of

[...] a type of differentiation that is ultimately additive or cumulative method, requiring others to be named as other while retaining the generic term as the general intelligence grid, the morphology that has the power to account for additional, including divergent or deviant (Cho, Crenshaw & McCall, 2013, p. 792).

6.2. Specificities in the construction of a knowledge project in resistance

The post-disciplinary nature of inclusive education describes a phenomenon that cannot be delimited in the paradigms of any of the disciplines and knowledge projects that collaborate in its configuration. Its object, field, and domain emerge in the exteriority of theoretical work, that is, it listens and manufactures its corpus of knowledge 'beyond' and 'outside' its convergent contributions. The constructive exteriority of the territory makes many people located within the educational field as well as some outside these analytical and methodological languages and confines misunderstand its claims and contours. The same happens when it is affirmed that inclusion has no method; to infer this action completely can lead to certain errors. Its halo of unintelligibility in this regard is clear. When I affirm that the intellectual developments of inclusive education do not demonstrate a clear method, I argue that it lacks an analytical form of its own that traces the norms of research and the training of its educators, as well as the treatment of each of its phenomena. I am interested in being aware of the wide variety of confluences and epistemic-methodological conventions that intertwine, interconnect in zigzag, and disfigure -understood as an action that produces something else- the educational field as a system of transformation of experience. This multiplicity of elements does not necessarily impose a sign of erasure on the most burning issues to which inclusion draws attention in the contemporary world; it intensifies the sophistication of its forms of analysis and constructiveness.

Its multiple forms of linkage are not always apparent. Efforts to produce new knowledge cannot dispense with the apparatuses through which information is produced, classified, and interpreted. Inclusion as a knowledge project is not located within any specific framework. It is interested in opening new ways of thinking - a sign of mobilization of the frontier. Its heuristics do not work exclusively by questioning the institutional logics of knowledge and research, or against the norm. Certainly, it attends to the set of imperceptible imbrications in which its object interacts with knowledge projects inherent to inequality. As an epistemological form,

it works in the creation of its methodology of analysis. What does this mean? It creates an analytical, political, and discursive space in another way, which operates outside the usual -heterological-, avoiding the hindering of an insurgent field such as the one analyzed here. Another critical point is its lack of methodological and epistemic literacy; it is a field of radiality whose heuristic operation does not occur through each of its confluent constructive resources, but in a singular non-Hegelian, complex, and restless dialectal action. It is a field that informs other fields and is informed by many divergent territories -assemblage-.

In keeping with the uniqueness of the nature of inclusive education knowledge, it is possible to define its methodological contours in terms of 'analytic sensibility'-a concept I borrow from Cho, Crenshaw & McCall (2013) and Hill Collins (2015). What are the implications of analytic sensitivity in this constructive terrain? Fundamentally, it fosters an understanding of the phenomenon as a disposition of thought; it is a vector of imagination and alterative intervention in world-systems, relations, forms and coordinates of equality, and equity with the problem of difference. It can also be described in terms of a permeable and restless analytical form, constantly searching.

The epistemology of inclusive education is an effort to think and specify educational relations, their passions, and affectivities in a different way. A sensibility that clashes with the legitimized forms of theoretical-methodological educationism. It is also conceived as a theoretical-political effort to think critically about certain conditions that often imply an active engagement with analytical conventions and their categories, many of them embedded in language, their methodological formations, relationships, passions, etc.

One of its methodological concerns is to dissociate epistemic reductionism from its weakly established approaches. It also proposes to construct a methodological form capable of capturing the complexity and multidimensionality of the expressions of power and its mark on the subjective fabric of people. Its political commitments go beyond the implementation of rights; it inaugurates unique rationality to understand the performances of equality, justice, equity, etc. It advocates for an alternative vision of subjectivity, ethics, and emancipation while opposing the principles of liberal individualism.

The potential of inclusion in the contemporary world lies in its brilliant and rigorous application on each of its topics of analysis, rather than in theoretical rejection, replacement, reduction, and remediation, all of which are canonical analytical forms. The construction of the epistemological field of inclusive education does not focus on any particular theoretical and methodological form, nor does it inscribe its workforce in an antithetical action. Rather, it rescues its legacies and traditions conceived as powerful forms of the alterative intervention of the world and its structures. My research

interest devoted to the theoretical and methodological study of inclusive education can be conceived as an attempt to de-habituate and delineate the figurations and their signifiers that situate its task in terms of a general affirmation and a simplified political conception extremely rooted in the contemporary world.

Inclusion, despite traveling through diverse spaces and discourses demonstrating that its politics of knowledge production is far from being considered an insurgent and transformative project, faces the challenge of clarifying "the way such projects are received, historicized, and engaged. Both the ideas at issue and the responses that insurgent ideas engender reflect structural relations that are dynamically constituted by the very forces being interrogated" (Cho, Crenshaw & McCall, 2013, p. 798).

Undoubtedly, the question of the conditions of production -imbrications between the political, the historical, and the social- foster an understanding of its multiple critical points of inter-referentiality established within and outside its institutional formations that impact the production of meanings about what is meant by inclusion, as well as, by its fixers of discursive conventions and recognizable methods.

It also encourages an examination of the intellectual forms adopted in the field in its evolution, understanding how it has been used to think about different issues in its passage and linkage with various epistemic regionalizations. Inclusion is a highly productive concept applied to an infinite number of contexts and fields of work. As a knowledge project, it operates in an expansive way establishing diverse forms-of-what-is-possible; it becomes a device of challenging imaginations that interfere and break into diverse intellectual commitments. It is a territory composed of diverse theoretical segments, shaped by diverse political questions. How is inclusion put into practice? Inclusion raises a myriad of questions about various critical issues that touch and stress our present.

7. "TRANSPPOSITION" AND "MOVEMENT" AS CONDITIONS OF KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTION IN INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

The theoretical force that resides in 'transposition' as a heuristic tool denotes a singular constructive operation of analytical-methodological transference of a cross-border nature. For Braidotti (2002) transpositions foster a leap of code, language, field, and methodological apparatus to another place or direction. From my theoretical position, it is not a leap that gives rise to a plurality of things, but rather it is an operation founded on heterogenesis, which trans-codes, moves elements, decenters them, superimposes them, and translates them to configure a new form. Heterogenesis in this regionalization operates in terms of complex multiplicities of convergent resources,

distancing itself from the mere palette of colors imposed by the sign of the diverse -artificiality and analytical instrumentalism-.

Transpositions as epistemological tools applied to the recognition of the domain are not reduced to the mere matter of weaving different threads, variations on a theme, but, rather, suggest a scale of variations and changes in a discontinuous and harmonious pattern. The domain of inclusive education becomes the creation of "an intermediate space of zigzagging and crossing; non-linear, no, but chaotic; nomadic, but responsible and committed; creative, but also cognitively valid; discursive and also materially embedded, it is coherent without falling into instrumental rationality" (Braidotti, 2002, p.13).

Transpositions in heuristic terms allude to a singular process of mutation, transformation, and alteration of the everyday order of things. The object and domain of the inclusive is a transpositional phenomenon, a space regulated and constructed by diverse forms of information transfer that do not occur in a linear, random or arbitrary manner, but "in opposition to the dominant scientific vision that tends to define the gene as a stable entity that transmits fixed units of inheritance in an autonomous and self-sufficient manner" (Braidotti, 2002, p.14).

The power of transpositions in knowledge construction occurs in terms of multiplicity and complexity; they articulate a spiral of levels of constructiveness, their strength expands a repertoire of ideas, actions, and constructive resources, decentering and trans-coding each one of them. Its marked transpositional character does not deny the multiplicity of convergent epistemological forms, rather, it keeps them interconnected in reticular planes and multiple layers, attending to their singularity.

7.1. Inclusion as theory and nomadic epistemology: becoming as a constructive and emergent point

Inclusion as a nomadic theory suggests the configuration of an epistemological counterpoint. It is a singular theoretical form in becoming; its transformation depends on processes of subjectivation that go through its mechanisms of enunciation of knowledge. The constructive force of the nomadic according to Braidotti (2004)

[...] refers to a type of critical consciousness that refuses to situate itself in codified social modes and practices" (p.216). For the famous Italian-Australian philosopher, Rosi Braidotti, such mechanisms can be conceived "as a figuration of contemporary subjectivity, the nomad is thus a post-metaphysical, intensive, multiple entities that unfolds in a network of interconnections [...]. One of its historical tasks is to discover how to recover a sense of intersubjectivity

that allows the recognition of differences to create a new type of bond in an inclusive (i.e., non-exclusive) way (Braidotti, 2000, p.78).

Its heuristic is based on the interweaving and interconnection of diverse theories and knowledge projects; it gives life to a sign of permanent becoming. What defines inclusion as a knowledge project in resistance is the set of counter-knowledge that it agglutinates in its passage through diverse regionalizations.

The epistemology of inclusive education crosses a wide variety of knowledge projects, contributes to the affirmation of a new mode of subjectivation that involves the interweaving of the epistemological and the political -a key aspect in this heuristic understanding-. Nomadic thought generates new interpretative practices that become new subjects and cartographies of knowledge. Although it goes through different critical knowledge projects, it does not stop there; its cognitive operation takes place in the turn and the re-articulation. One of its ontological options consists in conceiving the subject of the inclusive as part of the anti-essentialist and post-humanist. Nomadic theories conjugate a series of political elements and a set of becomings and other places for the construction of knowledge. They inaugurate an intellectual space in permanent contradiction. The heuristic horizon of the nomadic inscribes its creative power beyond the established, centralizes its force in dispersion, the multiple, the interconnected, etc., that operates in constant flux between each of its diverse constructive elements.

The domain of the inclusive is a space in which diverse worlds are incardinated, each of which is superimposed between various plateaus of reality. It is a sign whose unfolding takes place in exteriority; it is a mobile entity that endures through diverse sets of discontinuous variations. Educational thought is always nomadic; it is in permanent becoming. What interests this type of theoretical construction is the process of becoming a theory. For Braidotti (2006), nomadic theories establish a non-hierarchical analytical network, basing their activity on the construction of counter-senses and counter-knowledge. The section of the syntagma 'against' does not suggest a negative operation, rather, it proposes to create new social practices and a new cartography of knowledge. In this understanding, the subject and knowledge are actions of power. All this suggests new modalities of heuristic construction that force us to draw new cartography, it leads us not only to the clarification of its knowledge body but also to a new politics of epistemic imagination, to a form of appropriation of the being and to an affectivity that deforms the world.

The production of knowledge of inclusive education is closely linked to the intersubjective fabric; it is a knowledge and a comprehensive framework towards the creation of a singular process of creation of the possible.

Nomadic theories are the result of a set of analytical, methodological, political, ethical, and discursive practices, which, in trying to find their index of singularity, do so through re-articulation. The knowledge of education is always situated, dynamic, intersubjective, and complex. The devices of singularizing subjectivation include history. In it, the challenge for inclusion is to turn its critical spatiality into different kinds of disruptive hegemonies that follow the logic of the point-of-fugue. Movement as an epistemological property of inclusive education is conceived in terms of an unstable determination, it is not exclusively delimited to the changing, but rather, it institutes a process of construction of powers that adapt to the context of subjectivation.

The field of production of inclusive education can be described in terms of crack, that is, a set of displacements in various directions, whose transitivity is analogous to Braidotti's (2006) operation, in respect to the journey "from anticolonial theories and movements towards a postcolonial critique; then, from heterosexual and colonial hegemonic feminism towards a critique of the transversal construction of race, sex, gender and sexuality" (Cabrera and Vargas, 2014, p.28). Its heuristic architecture is signified as a space of deep contextual specificities, fostering according to Braidotti (2006).

[...] recognizing the partiality of scientific enunciations, their necessary contingency, their dependence on concrete mechanisms that are very much determined by historical and socioeconomic factors, has nothing to do with relativism. On the contrary, it is an attitude that marks a significant change in the ethics of discursive and intellectual style. The repudiation of old-fashioned universalism to pay greater attention to the complexity of "situated knowledge" augurs greater flexibility in research, especially in the humanities, as well as new sensitivity to differences (Braidotti, 2000, p.209).

By conceiving inclusion as a nomadic theory, its analytical force imposes a project of critical and creative intensities; it places people in positions of discursive-political subjectivity. Its epistemological nomadism suggests a substantial transformation of four of its core characteristics of its territory: a) replacing the idea of difference with multiple singularities, b) recognizing the intrinsic sense of inclusion as a category of analysis and contingent political apparatus that outlines the structures of the configuration of world-systems, c) its epistemic architecture is composed of mutant, unstable and constantly evolving knowledge. Inclusion as a nomadic theory "moves in the interstices, the intervals, at the frontier between all structured spaces. It is a bridge capable of creating analogies, bridges between several different plateaus. It rejects the idea of all that is established, fixed, immutable and coming from a uniformizing power" (Palaisi, 2018, p.66).

7.2. Inclusion as a theory in permanent journey and transposition

To which metaphor of the journey does inclusive education ascribe? The metaphor of the journey does not only concern the singularity of the movements that define part of its migratory space, but rather, its heuristic potential is played in the creation of critical categories that foster the emergence of new practices, ideas, senses, and feelings. Understanding the domain of inclusive education requires attending to how theories and ideas travel within it. In this incessant movement, each one of them mutates, transforms, dislocates, and resignifies its constitutive and alloying elements. The basis of the traveling theories is housed in a set of alterative micro-movements, orchestrated trans-relationally. The convergence of each of these in their surface structure appears to be interconnected, mediated, informed, and affected by singular historical circumstances. Within the interiority of the field, I observe the circulation of epistemic palimpsests, that is, elements that can never be erased, residues, and mutating forms of originality. None of the strategic forms of the field, in transforming itself it replaces its originality, it does not become docile but bursts with greater force destabilizing a falsified or mimetic apparatus.

The domain of inclusion does not domesticate any theory, but rather translates and redoubles them creating an effect of multiple and trans-relational co-production. It is difficult to reach a consensus about the theories that converge in the structuring of its domain, especially as it is regulated by the principle of heterogenesis. It is a dynamic and a-centered domain, whose theoretical forms are used to subvert and disrupt the language of cognitive patriarchy, especially in its oppressive and essentialist forms. The heuristic work takes place in a clearly defined place 'in relation', 'beyond' and 'outside' diverse fields of study that converge in the configuration of its domain. It is conceived as an agreement that inaugurates an accepted place, offers distinct challenges to many established positions in and around inclusive education studies. It assumes a complex, intimate, and highly sensitive epistemic awareness to a variety of complexities to diverse interconnected problems of class, feminism, ethnicity, history, injustice, politics, ethical relations, traversed by a web of imbricated genealogical entanglements and the lines of force that have constituted and structured its relationship to each of these fields.

The transfer from one theory to another can cause unique forms of contamination and even distortion of its meaning. Indeed, as Said (2000, p.12) points out, "the critical recognition that there is no theory capable of covering, closing, predicting all the situations in which it could be useful." At this point, it seems opportune to me to turn to the forms of translation. How to understand this mechanism? The epistemological field of the inclusive is

made up of elements that travel of their own free will and others that do not. It is not only these elements that allow us to develop a situated understanding of the constructive regulatory function of the field. A large part of each of the resources that draw its authentic domain are the object of a complex action of epistemic violence. Security in displacement is always given by complex and singular forms of translation, mediation, negotiation, among others, that operate in terms of a complex system of intermediation and a zone of contact. Displaced or travelers? The epistemological resources of inclusive education cannot be strictly conceived in terms of displaced since they possess a marked sense of identities, movement is not meant in terms of flight, but of a journey, of something that is driven to see other forms of visibility, understanding of the phenomenon and its regulation strategies.

The premises of the journey is what lead me to the affirmation of the order production in terms of a diasporic field. Here the diaspora is not lost in the kaleidoscope of the multiple, nor does it allude to a mere system of gathering and accumulation, but rather, to an incessant movement, regulated by diverse forms of work. A space of diaspora is that which allows for permanent construction, an unfinished sign, a set of disturbing questions that are always open and unfinished. It is a territory of complex genealogical entanglements of dispersion. Inclusion and its intellectual domain are not something elusive but rather, something that emerges from the contact, interaction, imbrication and translation, and twist of diverse epistemological forms. It is the result of a collision of critical and post-critical knowledge projects in resistance scattered across diverse regionalizations of study. The identity of inclusion is restless, unfinished, and fluctuating. Its field does not proceed systems of framing, delimiting what can be or not, inside or outside -it works in de-limitation. This binomial seems to me frankly reductionist and instrumental. The epistemological field of inclusive education is an 'extopia', that is, it is an operation based on exteriority as an epistemic principle and exteriority of the theoretical work; it is something that is not discovered in the object but in the construction of the project.

8. INTERRUPTING LIMITS, CONFIGURING TRANSFORMATION THRESHOLDS

As inclusive education constitutes a singular critical disposition, it becomes a powerful threshold of knowledge transformation and a meaningful political intervention strategy for diverse world-systems. Also, it can be considered as a mechanism of audibility, an activating force of consciousness, a creative figuration in constant becoming. The uniqueness of the heuristic-political force of the threshold it builds has, among other functions, transcoding a series of highly significant contributions to educational transformation. At

the same time, it fosters the emergence of new codes that show us fundamental positions through which its intellectuality and conceptual forms are transformed. The notions of 'threshold' and its 'transformative ways of thinking' operate through a (trans)relational nature; that is, they work by zigzagging, interconnecting, and opening up new ways of thinking and imagining each of their world-systems.

The heuristic power of the threshold acts in terms of a vanishing point, opens perspectives, creates new categories, and so on. It is an operation that proceeds by the logic of de-foundation, it accepts the challenge of constructing new theoretical frameworks, in it, the socio-political is part of knowing, it is an operation of turning the usual ways of thinking and producing knowledge. Thresholds are key in epistemological work since they allow us to rediscover the strength of its task, they become a vanishing point, in distinctive forms of thought. Their critical center agglutinates the dislocating force of the event, of performativity, and of challenging imaginations.

The knowledge of inclusive education is not exclusively cognitive, but also deeply imaginative, affective, and volitional. Its epistemological work coincides with Chen's (2010) approaches by pursuing the construction of a heuristic plot that dislocates the subjectivity production devices, it creates new categories that emerge by way of such injection. Its concepts should help to deeply read the present. These are, undoubtedly, some of the most far-reaching implications that arise from the task of knowing through the epistemological lens of inclusive education. It is an operation that proceeds by way of incorporating novel scopes. Its constructive forms work to make apprehensible the openness, the new, the emergence of a knowledge that disrupts forms and functions, which according to Zemelman (1989, p.89), "is the content of reality is an articulation between the limit of the given and the possibility to be given", it is a sign of construction of the possible, it is a knowledge that works in the dialectic opening/breaking of reality and its phenomena, enhancing the unknown and activating the networks of the transformation of the world.

Inclusion is, in itself, the elaboration of a method, what does this imply? Fundamentally, the assumption of an inventive task and a platform in the interiority of the field. Sharing the assertion of Bal (2009), in his brilliant work published in Spanish by Cendeac, entitled: "Conceptos viajeros en las humanidades: una guía de viaje", he argues the need to replace methods by concepts in emerging fields such as the one analyzed here, especially when the analyst has nothing to rely on. Concepts are forms of heuristic and political regulation, singular forms of linking with reality. For Zemelman (1992, p.45), "the productivity of posing the methodological question on the categorical plane lies in rereading the conceptualizations of reality, starting from the incidence of social and political forces, considering possible latent

directions in the present." Working with concepts is always problematic. As an open theoretical figuration, it works from multiple levels of analysis, fostering a more complex illustration of reality by capturing in its complexity the totality of its phenomena.

The field of knowledge of inclusive education can be understood in terms of a dispersed, nomadic, non-unitary, and dynamic totality structure, in which not only diverse singularities converge, but also complex practices driven by its actors. The construction of its knowledge follows the logic "given-giving-to-be-given" which allows us to conceive its heuristic task in terms of incompleteness. Inclusion, as an open field of alterations, is signified in terms of a heuristic and political force that creates out-of-the-ordinary realities, a challenging imaginative device in the intervention of the contemporary world. Its constructive forms operate in 'structure' and 'action'; it is a knowledge traversed by a set of practices that crosses, transgresses, and transforms the social, the political, and the ethical, multiaxially.

The structure concept adopted in this singular regionalization assumes a mechanism of adaptation to the needs of movement of the social reality and its problems in permanent becoming. For Zemelman (1992, p.93-94), it constitutes "a process of condensation of a determined tempo-spatial dynamic." It becomes a mode of concretion in zigzag, in permanent overturning and turning, never something closed, but construction and constellation that allows in its dynamics the inclusion of new levels and processes of analysis and constructiveness -thus, the field is assembled by diverse epistemological convergences-, harboring multiple modes of concretion. In this sense, Zemelman (1992, p.67) proposes "to consider reality as historical, an open field of alternative actions and social forces capable of creating realities, as possible directions of the movement of reality." It is a sign of "reinvention of a critical utopia, against resignation and conformism, it must overcome two key problems within a modern knowledge, in itself colonialist, for its realization: "silencing and difference" (De Sousa, 2006, p.46).

The task of knowing in this field is defined from the (re)articulation of problematic, figurative, and imaginative categories of production. Its epistemological function "assumes a dialogue between diverse theoretical schemes, in order to capture the multidimensionality of the problems to be known and in coherence with the complex form of social reality" (Zemelman, 1996, p.119). The study of movement as a condition of production assumes that the understanding of reality is always unfinished. Indeed, as Paredes (2014, p.127) indicates.

[...] the epistemological function assumes a logic of inclusion, consistent with a vision of openness to the complexity of social reality, while the theoretical function works exclusivity. That is to say, a logic based on an articulating movement, which

includes different times, spaces, processes, towards a moment of condensation called "present". For Zemelman, "since reality is conceived as an articulated movement of heterogeneous processes, the first structure of possible relations must be based on the logic of inclusion, which allows us to link concepts without necessarily resorting to a theoretical hypothesis" (Zemelman 1987, 41). In other words, the epistemological function of knowledge appeals to problematic openness, and the theoretical function to its closure (Zemelman 2005, 70-71).

As inclusive education inscribes its work of intellectual production in exteriority, it becomes a peculiar predicative and attributive form, a way of thinking in terms of possibilities.

The epistemological field of inclusive education proceeds along multiple paths that disrupt the usual order of things, multiple paths that lead to a series of alterative confrontations, affected and unexpectedly realigned by multiple trajectories that inscribe its heuristic force beyond its confluent denominations. It is a field that not only possesses the theoretical possibility of deterritorialization and movement but rather, continually submits to this process.

The configuration of its domain does not proceed through a single synthesis, but, through a restless dialectical action, it assumes the critical impossibility of a fusion since we are forced to think beyond theory due to the characteristics of the field. I am mostly attracted to think 'beyond' the prevailing critical forms of education, an action that becomes an enterprise aimed at extending our languages of understanding, affecting their networks of objectualization, systems of reasoning, and degrees of intelligibility.

9. CONCLUSIONS: CHALLENGING AND UPLIFTING IMAGINATIONS

In the interiority of the field of inclusive education, the special acts in terms of a placeholder for the global domain - mental monoculture - while, in heuristic terms, it assumes a position of palimpsest, that is, that which cannot be erased. This idea confirms the presence of a rather normative movement. However, its domain becomes a network of innumerable interrelationships that foster multi-axial understandings about its web of intelligibility, this operation traces a web of analysis that has clouded the question of authenticity. It is necessary to destabilize and dislocate to find other kinds of intellectual, ethical, political alloys.

Another aspect to highlight is the epistemic, methodological, and lexical non-equivalence between each of its constructive parts. While the special may be a form of the inclusive, the inclusive is not necessarily a form of the special, it is a much broader operation. The pairing of the theoretical-methodological forms of the special as part of the inclusive unveils an analytical operation that proceeds by way of *precarious directionality*.

In part it justifies the search for forms of analytical precarization sustained in instrumental forms of approximation to each other, revealing a non-transformative crossing. This transference of the special as rostricity of the inclusive constitutes a homogeneous set that acts in terms of a parodic identity. The special becomes the grounded place of the aesthetics of the pseudo-inclusive. For this, it is necessary to institute a process of suspension and delegitimization of its premises of enunciation.

The transvestization of the special as the face of the inclusive acts in terms of a 'turn inward', that is, a kind of turn in the same language, what would one call this strategy? This theorization ratifies an ontological politics of the subject that is trapped through the signifier of sub-alternity, unveiling a tortuous linguistic relationship. This regionalization advances through systems of mutation, convergence, and other forms of analysis through an infinity of knowledge projects, situated within area studies and the subjects of inclusion. A strategy of de-subjugation of the special in the inclusive must be promoted since they are two different heuristic forms. Although the special is recast through the epistemology of the inclusive, the special does not have the power to redefine all the domains of education and the world-system.

Inclusion inaugurates a new way of thinking, assumes a device of recognizing the educational task and all the fields of educational sciences, assumes a transforming enterprise of understanding and representing reality and its corpus of problems, articulates a new vision of the world, a complex interactive system. The question of the place of inscription and residence of inclusion confronts us with the dilemmas of socio-spatial pedagogy, opening up to the discussion of new contemporary relations; at this point, it connects with the critical tasks of inclusive education. It inaugurates a network of new ethical commitments.

Imagination plays a fundamental role in the constitution of an ontology of the lesser - molecular revolution. The affective and imaginative force imposed by the sign of inclusion fosters the construction of an intensive becoming. It inaugurates a counter-space of creation in the diverse world-systems. It is a process of permanent reinvention. Its intensely creative figurative force possesses the capacity, differs, and alters the course of things. Inclusion does not adapt to the figurations of the established world, whose desire does not pursue the preservation of things, but tends to change, to deep transformation. The domain meant as inclusive education when conceived as a challenging imagination harbors a plurality of desires builds a new affective and language politics. Inclusion is not a mere system of projective imagination, rather it recombines contents, languages, and ways of thinking, attuned to the complexities of the field.

The nomadic sense that entails the knowledge project in resistance of inclusive education reflects a powerful political sign; it is a "commitment to a critical and political praxis in terms of counter-memory, resistance, responsibility, situated knowledge and a politics of localization" (Braidotti, 2004, p.66). The heterotopic space of which I speak in my texts is precisely a counter-space, which

[...] needs to build and preserve utopian and uchronic spaces that serve to define and consolidate all the other spaces in which individuals live and socialize. Places, he says, that oppose all others that have as their destination the erasure of all others, their neutralization or purification. They are like counter-spaces, localized utopias that children know perfectly well (for example, the parents' bed when they are absent or the basement). They are transgressive and harbor a space of free expression where everything that is against the established order, the rules, everything that does not follow the laws, finds a possibility of existence (Gonzalez, 2018, p.181).

REFERENCES

- Ávila, I. (2014). El nomadismo filosófico de Rosi Braidotti: una alternativa materialista a la metafísica de la presencia. *Tabula Rasa*, 21, 167-184.
- Bal, M. (2009). *Conceptos viajeros en las humanidades. Una guía de viaje*. Murcia: Cendeac.
- Braidotti, R. (2000). *Sujetos nómades*. Buenos Aires: Paidós.
- Braidotti, R. (2002). *Metamorfosis. Hacia una teoría materialista del devenir*. Madrid: Akal.
- Braidotti, R. (2004). *Feminismo, diferencia sexual y subjetividad nómada*. Barcelona: Gedisa.
- Braidotti, R. (2009). *Transposiciones*. Barcelona: Gedisa.
- Buck- Morss, S. (1997). *Origen de la dialéctica negativa*. México: Siglo XXI.
- Burman, E. (2017). Child as method: implications for decolonising educational research. *International Studies in the Sociology of Education*, 28(3), 1-23. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09620214.2017.1412266>
- Cabrera, M. & Vargas Monroy, L. (2014). Transfeminismo, decolonialidad y el asunto del conocimiento: Algunas inflexiones de los feminismos disidentes contemporáneos. *Universitas Humanística*, 78, 19-37.
- Cardenal, T. (2012). La extraña dentro: el feminismo nómada de Rosi Braidotti. <https://zaguan.unizar.es/record/9242/files/TAZ-TFG-2012-695.pdf>
- Castillo, K. (2019). Claves teóricas en Manuel de Landa. *Andamio*, 40(17), 229-250.
- Chen, K. (2010). *Asia as method: towards deimperialization*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Cho, S., Crenshaw, K. & McCall, L. (2013). Toward a field of intersectionality studies: theory, applications, and praxis. *Signs* 38, 785–810.
- Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1968). *Mil mesetas*. México: FCE.
- Deleuze, G. (2005). *La isla desierta y otros textos*. Madrid: Pretextos.
- De Landa, M. (2016). *Assemblage Theory*. Edimburgo: Edinburgh University Press.
- De Sousa, B. (2006). *Una epistemología del sur: la reinención del conocimiento y la emancipación social*. México: Siglo XXI/CLACSO.
- Escobar, A. & Osterwell, M. (2009). Movimientos sociales y la política de lo virtual. Estrategias deleuzianas”, en: Castillo, K. (2019). *Claves teóricas en Manuel de Landa*. *Andamio*, 40(17), 229-250.
- González, B. (2018). La ética diferencial de Rosi Braidotti. *Agora. Papeles de filosofía*, 37(2), 173-191.
- Grossberg, L. (1996). “On postmodernism and articulation: an interview with Stuart Hall”, en: *Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*, ed. D Morley, K-H Chen. (131–50). New York: Routledge.
- Hill Collins, P. (2015). *Intersectionality. As critical social theory*. Duke University Press.

- Hill Collins, P.** (2015). *Intersectionality's Definitional Dilemmas*. <https://edspace.american.edu/culturallysustainingclassrooms/wp-content/uploads/sites/1030/2017/09/annurev-soc-073014-112142.pdf>
- Ocampo, A.** (2018). Las políticas de la mirada y la comprensión epistemológica de la Educación Inclusiva: ¿en qué sentido la Educación Inclusiva es para todo el mundo?, *Polyphōnía. Revista de Educación Inclusiva*, Santiago, 1(2) 15-51
- Ocampo, A.** (2019). Contornos teóricos de la educación inclusiva. *Revista Boletín Redipe*, 8 (3), 66-95.
- Palaisi, M.A.** (2018). Saberes nómades. El sujeto nómade como contra-espacio epistemológico. *Enraonar. An International Journal of Theoretical and Practical Reason*, 60, 57-73.
- Paredes, J. P.** (2014). Pensamiento epistémico y conocimiento social: emergencias y potencialidades en la investigación social. *Revista de Estudios Sociales*, 48, 125-138.
- Rajchman, J.** (2004). *Constructions*. New York: The MIT Pres.
- Said, E.W.** (2000). "Traveling Theory." *The Edward Said Reader*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Young, I.M.** (2002). *Justicia y Política de la Diferencia*. Valencia: Cátedra.
- Zemelman, H.** (1989). *Uso crítico de la teoría. En torno a las funciones analíticas de la totalidad*. México: El Colegio de México.
- Zemelman, H.** (1992). *Los horizontes de la razón. I. Dialéctica y apropiación del presente*. México: Antrophos.
- Zemelman, H.** (1996). *Problemas antropológicos y utópicos del conocimiento*. México: Colegio de México.