

Inclusive education as a heuristic device

Aldo Ocampo

Chilean Latin American Center for Inclusive Education Research

Abstract: This work analyzes the configuration of analytical methods that consider inclusive education as a heuristic device. Therefore, it establishes a theoretical and political model to solve various problems, thereby breaking the knowledge production logic left behind by the normative logic of Logos. The objective is to explore the defining contours and the heuristic intelligibility grid to think about its field of problems of a neo-materialist nature. The method used was the critical documentary review. The work concludes that, to a certain extent, the dominant onto-semiotic conceptions of the field possess the ability to impose a signic rostricity based on caricature aspects and impose universal conceptions of difference. This particularly inaugurates acute political and ethical implications.

Key words: education; heuristic device; method; epistemology; signs

1 Introduction

Heuristically speaking, inclusive education disrupts the stability of Logos, interrupts the legitimate logic of knowledge production in various research fields, and goes beyond the fixed and normative aspects related to knowledge production in the past.

As a heuristic device, it establishes a theoretical and political model to solve various problems, thus undertaking the task of shaping "updated conceptual creativity and a current map unrelated to politics" (Braidotti 2002:21).

Sintagma goes beyond the established disciplinary framework and violates the methodological forms infiltrated by the cognitive political normative system, resulting in a category that decenters its traditionally legitimized semiological devices, as well as an object that cannot be defined from any current disciplinary paradigm (Ocampo, 2020), not to mention being considered a new form of special education - heuristic monolingualism or the standardization process in the field. Through this process, their roles are summarized and edited, or attempts are made to incorporate their phenomenological domains into institutionalized disciplinary frameworks. In embarking on this enterprise, it runs the risk of failure.

These and other arguments make it difficult to define the positions within, related to, and beyond the multiple cognitive geographies involved in their combination. In its relationship with the educational sciences, it experiences a stance, a dialogue and an acceptance itself.

The fact is that inclusive education has overturned every presupposition formulated by contemporary educational theory. This can be understood as a part of the protocol for an accepted place within the research field.

By transgressing and crossing multiple disciplinary boundaries, it presents distinct challenges to many established positions in and around what counts as educational science and each of its fields of confluence and adherence.

Inclusive education becomes an intermediary device that combines various interrelated issues with other fields far from the center of its heuristic activities (which can be referred to as convergence and disciplinary actions). These fields need to generate their own units of meaning in accordance with their receptive fields when in contact, and translation is crucial for this (Ocampo, 2019b).

Each influence, stream of thought, knowledge project, moral commitment, methodological form, concept, etc. record the interrelated issues of "class, feminism, race, history, translation, comparative work, post structuralist theory, popular culture, literature, film, and technology in any cultural study" (Bowman 2010:231).

In addition to policies that have ethical nature and regulate the operation of the contemporary world, the epistemological understanding of inclusive education is also conveyed through accidental root trajectories and scattered genealogical entanglements, making it a highly politicized knowledge space.

"(...) sensitive and responsive to awareness of the intertwined genealogies and lines of force that have constituted and structured these fields, and the often subterranean pressures, movements that condition and overdetermine such academic fields and other distances, relationships, encounters, hybridizations, ruptures of cultural discourses and their consolidations. (Bowman 2010:231)."

The diversity of knowledge sources involved in their territorial gatherings helps to open up and disrupt objective networks of imitation and forgery that arise within the framework of the imposition of special education awareness and teaching models. The role of these models is due to numerous errors in approaching inclusive objects, such as the comprehensibility grid in rural areas.

This fact opens up part of what Ocampo (2021) said: "prejudice against special things". This is nothing more than a "pretense of pure representation of the structure of thought or reality" (Peretti, 1989). The bias towards special things can be interpreted from the perspective of the ideological self defense possessed by the essentialization project. This is a key tension area between special things and inclusive adjective forms, a multi location space in which both heuristic boundaries are permanently irritated and strained. Although they demonstrate a parasyonymous status, their analytical and methodological capacity is different (Ocampo, 2019a).

The bias towards special things becomes a primitive and marginalized argument for other complex identities and the possibility of approaching the known world. It also established a signifier whose analytical and visual power successfully overshadowed the true singularity index in the field of inclusivity, constraining it to an easily propagated argument that has nothing to do with the true function of the field. It becomes a substitute for arbitrary symbols, which are translated into an illusion system that is uneasy about the issue of inclusive voices and faces, and consolidates a status of inferiority owned by the special-centric regime.

The relationship between the inclusive field and special education can be described by another continuous equation in its theory, which has visual, heuristic, and methodological significance as well as different tasks. Although there are many relationships and discontinuities, there is a significant gap in their ability to intervene. These two heuristic territories both report completely different purposes, content, and language, with the characteristic of inclusivity being the promotion of another rationality and other established goals, as well as ancillary interests, which go beyond the conservative purism inherited by the production centered normative system and later transformed ontological names. In the readability standards of images and existence introduced through classical humanism (Bredoti, 2018) and essentialism matrices, individualism becomes a despicable object of world production policies and knowledge, rather than the subject of knowledge. Here, we are facing the problem of redefining its epistemological pragmatics.

From an epistemological perspective, inclusive education proposes a post-disciplinary work to think about its problem domain and interact with each phenomenon. The characteristic of its cognitive practice is to listen and clarify its problem network in the intimate relationship of research practice elucidated by educational science, beyond the usual knowledge and legal categories.

The combination of its analytical methods and practices is not limited to or simplified as exercises formed on a common or parallel basis, but rather accommodates its diverse and constructive resources through unique separation and transposition effects, in which dispersed academic geography, concepts, knowledge projects, methods, moral commitments, political projects, knowledge objects, etc. occur and interact with each other.

Each has an unpredictable force, and it is precisely because of this characteristic that it is possible to recognize that in interactions, different epistemological resources open up unknown points and new perspectives.

Incommensurability becomes a mechanism that can be used to unlock the conceptual, heuristic, and methodological attributes of meaning, which obscure the knowledge-based issues of inclusivity or the possible relationships, dialogue, and semantization between the adjective power of specificity and inclusivity, and refer to its opaque space.

In addition, questioning the power of excessive identification or loyalty assigned to heuristic gaps is arbitrarily imposed and filled, turning into a false strictness and consciousness of the power of inclusive theory.

The inclusion we are most familiar with refers to an arbitrary over-identification or excessive fidelity to the special things. It can also be described under a certain fundamentalism that is not so, whose genesis lies in the absence of a radical debate about its methodological configurations, which is a product of an ambivalent openness.

In terms of its epistemological authenticity, the grid that defines the comprehensibility system of inclusive education must break free from its multiple capture and editing systems of uniqueness, voice, and face indices, while the power of specificity is achieved through its heuristic plot. The proximity between these two adjective forms often leads to an analytical object, which often triggers a normative imitation effect that easily covers up and fills the gaps in terms of its theoretical-methodological conditions, whose signifiers trigger something completely opposite, assuming the challenge of rejecting the imperative of the naturalization of its objects, questioning how they are constituted.

Undoubtedly, the non objectification of determiners is the hottest topic in the construction/understanding of inclusive education epistemology. There, the latter becomes a space without authentication or definition, but a place full of strong creativity and unsettling ways.

The objects of inclusive education need to assume the sliding of these, triggering a key cognitive puzzle: if it is possible to continue discussing objects due to the crisis of the disciplinary framework, and more importantly, if its epistemological foundation is combined from multiple heuristic convergence, then it is urged to reveal the multi-directional trajectory of its mobilization, variation, and regeneration, record which other possible territories can be used to find the cause. Here, we face the deterritorialization of objects beyond their predictable rotation. All of these hinder the identification of a different theme and specific approach in this regard.

The premise recorded above illustrates a unique imbalanced relationship, despite the fact that qualifiers and syntagm are widely known and used in practice, we have little knowledge of their composition and heuristic forms.

We find ourselves in a widely circulated, vague, and inaccurate concept that is permeated by excessive meaning, indicating its weakness around the absence of blocks of reflexivity that allow recovering its index of singularity. This indicates that we do not know what the uniqueness of inclusive education is, whether in the field of research or training. It arises through various constructive themes that do not always seek to restore questions about its epistemological nature.

2 Methodology

This review article establishes a framework for its work around the critical literature review method (Flick, 1998; Valencia, 2019), which is one of the main methods of expression on a qualitative basis, dedicated to reviewing various viewpoints related to professional research fields, especially theoretical viewpoints, and documenting positions, trends and schools from different research fields, aiming to enrich the understanding of their theories and analytical objects. This method emphasizes the value of analyzing content as a multi stance strategy across multiple contingent research themes (Matus, 2017; Ahmed, 2019; Richard, 2020), just like each theme that constitutes this article.

The consolidation of the work is based on two dimensions:

- The former emphasizes the external aspect of methodological work on the nature of literature, also known as formal analysis.

- At this stage, the main axis of themization has been identified, which will serve as the route and coordinates for action-reflection, related to the delineation of various voices and positions, many of which are intertwined. These voices and positions help to construct the theoretical outline of critical inclusive education.

Formal analysis can identify a document within a large thematic constellation related to various research topics. The boundary of the second stage is to provide a comprehensive explanation of the content defined in each part of the work. This stage is usually designated as the internal part of the content analysis or document process in professional literature. The work introduced strictly combines these two stages together.

The level of external literature work revolves around international bibliometric review, with the first step being to identify databases observed based on the relevance and scientific significance standards in the research community's privacy. The databases selected to determine the age of the submitted theoretical vertebrate research papers are: Scielo, Scopus, Open Science, Sage Journal, Proquest, Redalyc, and EBSCO.

Among the selection criteria used to determine each database, it is worth noting that:

1. (a) Latin American geopolitical space researchers are highly consulted on key inclusive education.
2. (b) In terms of conceptual research, emerging methodological forms, and epistemological configurations, it forms a space for periodical publication of innovative theoretical works that challenge traditional knowledge production methods in open and constantly developing fields through diverse heuristic convergences such as inclusive education, and
3. (c) to be databases that connect diverse theoretical affiliations linked to the critical and transformative study of inclusive education.

- On the other hand, dimensions related to internal or specific content analysis made it possible to orchestrate the selection and configuration of the corpus of works that form the basis of this article, as defined below:

1. (a) Key papers published in Spanish and English, dedicated to reviewing and questioning the methodological work and configuration since the instability of the Logo inheritance matrix.
2. (b) Scientific publications that analyze the theoretical, pragmatic and political effects of inclusive education from a decolonial, post-structural, feminist and post-colonial point of view; and
3. (c) Research aimed at exploring the residence of its territory when its function deviates from the special central government. In this work, detailed research was conducted on each topic.

In terms of bibliometrics, a total of 72 papers were reported, of which 43 were published in Spanish and 29 were published in English. This opportunity only selected 22 according to the selection criteria:

1. (a) Work written by authorities around the world dedicated to each thematic area that constitutes the main theoretical faction of key inclusive education, such as feminism, cultural studies, key studies on race and disability, philosophy, intersectionality, etc.; and

2. (b) Its methodological matrix allows works that articulate arguments beyond the disciplinary limitations set by Logos, determining the possibility of breaking into its knowledge production logic.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that every decision related to the selection of manuscripts and works is in line with the theoretical work externalities required by the theoretical methodology outline of inclusive education with a post disciplinary nature.

3 Results and discussion

3.1 Key tasks of inclusive education heuristic mechanism

Inclusive education becomes a territory crossed by multiple arguments and problems not easily identifiable in its thematic areas. That is why it is understood as something material and not metaphorical, assuming that the "ethics of incommensurability allow for the recognition of different things, sovereign things" (Tucker and Yang 2012:28).

The epistemology of inclusive education not only engages in dialogue with multiple knowledge items and records the subordinate relationships of various classes, but also penetrates, interrupts, and disrupts the stability of its knowledge production logic. This is the key to establishing a knowledge space that goes beyond iconic classic names (Braidotti, 2018).

As a territory, it has undergone various heuristic convergence in terms of continuous openness, flexibility, rearticulation, and processing of its assembly units, and its auditory and auditory conditions are influenced by the power of accidental events between its adhesion, fusion, and reception domains.

The concepts of incommensurability, root trajectory, genealogical entanglement, combination, accelerated development, and heterogeneity recognize that inclusive education is a heuristic territory that is the result of multiple conflicts, intersections, transformations, travels, dislocations, and unexpected transitions, as well as the result of multi-directional roots that assemble territories from heterogeneous units of the heterogeneous (BAL, 2018b; Castillo, 2019). Through various types of translations, a new thing is gradually becoming aware of itself. Although its roots and heritage play an important role, it is impossible to easily identify the original text or its genealogical entanglements.

This complex process can be referred to as the "creolization" of inclusive education. Its capacity can accommodate what we call infinite assembling and disassembling, using an infinite number of influences and objective capabilities affected, as well as external relationships that allow components to separate and reintegrate into another assembly.

"(Escobar and Osterwell 2009:120) and permanent mutations, although at different speeds, are irreducible on a common scale - in this sense, they operate as cosmic gaps, leading to various mutual infiltration and infections" (Lee and Fisher 2009:13).

Creoleization makes it possible to document a corpus of mutations, interpenetrations, translations and rephrasing, giving way to something completely unknown. Undoubtedly, this expression is one of those that does greater justice to the multiple operations that give life to the contours of the field, as its reason arises from the contact and interaction by diasporization and translation of unknown and heterogeneous elements among themselves."

"Power and meaning are intertwined, revealing that meaning and meaning are composed of power, which makes sense without natural meaning". (Bowman 2010:236).

Inclusive education can be understood as a new theoretical, political and cultural field, which emerges from constant rearticulations and translations, each of its elements inscribed in diverse degrees and levels follow the analytical and metaphorical structuring proposed by Bal (2009), which analyzes multiple objects and phenomena from different cross

perspectives and levels. They occupy different but shared time and space, which are recorded in different root or root trajectories. These root or root trajectories do not always share a theoretical language or a common object, and they incessantly invoke the task of translation.

Heuristic translation is a key component in the turbulent or highly asymmetric field, consisting of multiple epistemological singularities, whose configuration coordinates are inevitably affected by pollution and freezing systems. Translation clarifies and purifies meaning units, making way for the emergence of new meaning entities.

When this situation occurs, we face the emergence of a new constellation and critical configuration of its knowledge. In any case, the epistemological translation of inclusive education positions its object of work beyond its classic premises and maintains a close relationship with each field of integration.

Inclusive education, as a post disciplinary knowledge project, provides reading about various objects without being restricted by strict and standardized division, which enables immeasurable knowledge objects to interact with each other. Its operation involves "complex discourse relationships, rephrasing, implicit and explicit interconnections, as well as gaps, hiatuses, aporias and barriers across supposedly separate realms" (Bowman 2010:234) or fields that seem to have no commonality in their structure, rationality, and language.

Inclusive education is a heuristic device that emerges from cross domain, cross knowledge projects, cross regional, and cross influence interactions, organizing its thinking around relevant ethical tensions and political problematics, which does not mean that "we must abandon theorizing, strenuous and rigorous analysis, or even the regrettable process of placing ideas and arguments in irrefutable and endless testing" (Bauman 2010:234).

What does it mean to contradict the dominant argument of inclusive education? The first thing we must consider is that the envisioned inclusive education lacks rigorous devices, which means capturing and understanding a field that is not entirely our own, but it may interrupt and change contemporary educational theory internally.

When an argument is edited into a special force, it gives rise to a pseudo-effect of epistemic alterity that disrupts its stability without changing its analysis method and classification conditions. This effect is not abolished simply by the incorporation of other perspectives, fields and epistemic geographies that act as devices to expand its frontiers, but also by destroying and decentering the placeholders of its global power through humanism and the matrix of essentialism-individualism. To this end, it is necessary to weave a network of countless interrelationships through rephrasing and translation.

As we imagine, this is the result of the development of a homogeneous corpus to a universal level, where an object is violently imitated, opening up a production space for pseudo inclusive knowledge, or internalizing a unique desire for imitation. For this reason, it is necessary to suspend and possibly delegitimize its own premises of enunciation.

True inclusive education is an education that resists and avoids the foundation provided by special things, from a decisive construction provided by the Eden signifier to a permanent construction network - the new materialist heuristic. Inclusive education "represents the other, different, heterogeneous, unknown, and indescribable" (FROW 2010:267).

The inclusive education arguments that are currently circulating around the world and approved by almost all countries of different latitudes are inherently apocalyptic. The various inference systems I proposed in this section explain this contradiction.

Finally, inclusive education cannot be seen as a discipline because it does not have a clearly defined object based on previously established assumptions and axioms, the complexity of which goes beyond the disciplinary frameworks of current paradigms. It does not have a standardized research object, let alone a well-defined field to define this object. In terms of its heuristic properties, it does not have clearly defined goals, working hypotheses, and research methods.

Another tense situation suggests that it is impossible to identify a group of professionals and researchers who are practitioners of this territory, since the political-theoretical force of the qualifier inclusive in its deep structure has been used for several decades by various critical social movements and knowledge projects in resistance, without necessarily being signified with that denomination. In addition, there is also a disciplinary excess that exists at the deepest level of its epistemological foundation, in which the objects come into contact with domains with vastly different properties, reflecting a variety of voices, interests, geography, as well as conceptual and micro political plots.

Inclusive education has a post-disciplinary epistemological nature, which does not mean that it does not have an object or an understandable network of objects, but rather that its configuration occurs through multiple heuristic convergence, which makes the composition of the domain multifaceted, determining different degrees of approximation to its object -multiple layers- and its reference framework.

By understanding the configuration of its territory through rotation, replication, and translation, which combines various incommensurable locations and knowledge objects, it opens up a processing system that changes its analytical methods and units. Inclusive education has become an intervention strategy for contemporary cultural policies.

3.2 The theoretical origins of inclusive education

If the scope of inclusive education goes beyond the special power of the Garden of Eden, then its definition and outline operate within the externalities of theoretical work, that is, they listen, elucidate, and showcase their phenomenal domains in a special and unknown way outside of constructive resources, research fields, and dispersed academic geography. They have expanded their knowledge structure through the epistemological principles of heterogeneity, connecting, dialogue, interaction, mediation, negotiation, and translation of countless resources, concepts, methods, knowledge items, etc., revealing the heterogeneous nature of the heterogeneity and creating an unknown cognitive production image, which is the result of the fusion of multiple heuristics. Diversity has created a new field of epistemological production, and its activities are carried out through openness, that is, connection. This composition can be described as:

(...) the question of determination, the core of Deleuzian's contribution does not lie in his supposed option for the uncertain choices but in his reformulation of the conditions under which it is related to determination and the determined: what is uncertain is not the opposite of the determined but its condition, that logical or ontological sphere (which makes any determination possible and allows the determined to exist alongside each other even when they are unable to compose themselves). (Mengue 2008:13).

Many of the critical concerns and influences that encourage the rediscovery of the index of singularity-scientific identity- randomness and voice of the territories of inclusive education, do not always seem initially to be linked to each other. This is the result of signifier dictatorship that acts in sovereign terms trapping the question for its heuristic singularity.

The vast majority of dispersed influences, key concerns, knowledge projects, and cognitive geography are best characterized by a deep affinity for epistemology, ontology, and methodology when assembling, creating, and ensuring the assembly of new fields. Such an enterprise has challenged our most comfortable assumptions, deconstructed them, and helped redefine an imaginative political culture project that reveals unexpected connections between different work geographies and heterogeneous phenomena.

This capacity indicates that its operation is carried out through root like, multi-layer, and multi-directional operations, revealing a mechanism close to meta-analogue, as Ocampo (2018) puts it, a morpho-dynamic assembly, a space that monitors the boundaries of multiple academic fields.

The arguments put forward in this paper aim to highlight the verb "to include" and the qualifier "inclusive" rather than its traditional analytical approach. All this calls for a paradigm shift, and it is no longer possible to continue studying its phenomenal space in the same way, or even to document how the categories traditionally used to mark the functioning of their objects have been eliminated in the face of the complex tensions that they embody.

This requires rethinking its comprehensibility grid, taking into account not only the intellectual and ontological concerns related to the production dynamics inherited by classical humanism and Logos, but also the misalignment of its symbolic units, methodological conditions, and visual plots supported by spaces of reception.

This is a space that draws on multiple broader domains, which decentralize the traditional perspective of inclusion and are closely integrated with absorption and inclusion mechanisms. All of these are manifestations of suppressed heuristic explanations.

Thinking about the theoretical affiliations of inclusive education is not a simple task, since, as has been argued, a diversity of areas, knowledge projects, subjects, ethical commitments, political projects, methods, regions, subjects, disciplines, interdisciplines, etc., participate in its understanding being defined as an enterprise owned by "movement of the senses, fluctuation of the subjects, provisional places of conjunction and dispersion, unity and diversity, ambiguity, uncertainty, trajectory, anchoring, and traces. (Orlandi 2012:18)."

The issue of heuristic connections in inclusive education is key to rediscovering the authenticity and nature of this phenomenon, especially as it records the existence of multiple lineages that intertwine through the dispersed effects registered in various cognitive regions, forming a multifaceted and multi-level entanglement of lineages.

The presence of multiple genealogical entanglements enables us to insist that there are many ways to study inclusive education: to focus our attention on their cognitive and visual abilities, or to use them as knowledge project for resistance, critical practice, and analytical strategies; or to use it as a set of method rules to approach an understanding of the incommensurability of its object network.

In addition, various potential issues that constitute this field can be analyzed from the perspective of critical research on phenomena, intersection, postcolonialism, non-colonialism, philosophy of difference, cultural studies, women's studies, gender studies, queer studies, and post structuralism. In short, a large group of territories can access their objective network from these territories, providing information on various ways and methods for their development. In epistemology, inclusive education has multiple meanings.

Inclusive education, as its name suggests, does not deal with special education, disability, special educational needs, exclusion, domination and oppression conceived as brakes to self-development/self-constitution, problems of social contractualism, the rules of functioning of society, the destabilization of Logos and the irruption of legitimized logics of knowledge production, problems of subalternity, democracy, the struggles and resistances of women and of sexual identities of women and of sexual identities of women, the destabilization of Logos and the irruption in the legitimized logics of knowledge production, low-level issues, democracy, the struggles and resistances of women and non-normative sexual identities, the ontological disorders produced by the essentialist-individualist matrix of constitution of the world-system, the political redefinitions of the present world, etc. Nevertheless, all these things are of interest to him.

Inclusive education situates its point of emergence in many of the struggles and perspectives of analysis provided by the post-critical movement. However, the emergence, imagination, and listening of its inspiring conditions go beyond these contributions, inaugurating a meta-field of receptivity and a new paradigm in the understanding of educational phenomena. So far, I have not known how to name the complex products experienced by educational phenomena. Politics is the foundation of its production conditions.

Taking these premises into consideration, it (re)articulates in a particular way bodies of knowledge bequeathed by diverse fields and sub-fields coming from the social sciences, philosophy, critical pedagogy, feminism, intersectionality, analytical philosophy, philosophy of difference and politics, visual and cultural analysis, de- and post-coloniality, anti-colonialism, anti-racism, cultural studies, Anglo-Saxon, Asian and Latin American critical disability studies, critical race studies, deconstruction of evolutionary psychology, anti-colonialism, anti-racism, cultural studies, critical studies of Anglo-Saxon, Asian and Latin American disability, critical race studies, deconstruction of evolutionary psychology, women's studies, queer studies, among many other spaces that converge producing an altering effect on its rostricity.

The production of its knowledge is based on a deep reflection about the epistemological work, seeking the practical transformation of inclusive education research as described by Ocampo (2018), which brings together a series of unknown ontological and methodological redefinitions.

His knowledge becomes a form of interpellation to the bases of contemporary educational theory, decentering the normative notion of inclusion understood as a regenerative extension of the special-centric regime and overcoming the relativization of its objects with sovereign and special signifiers.

In this confluence of analytical, political, ethical, categorical and methodological contributions, nothing reaches a status of harmony, only complex entropic mobilizations that permanently destroy their heritage and stable systems related to such a work area, and even everyone systematically feels angry and hostile. All of this is not easy to identify or map, it requires continuous practices of rearticulation and translation of its construction units, making way for its own legitimate version, a unique "transformation" pattern generated from the contact, mutual penetration, distortion, discontinuity, and heuristic topology transformation of absolutely heterogeneous elements.

I like to see this practice as a progress in epistemological consciousness in the field, or as creating and inheriting something different. Undoubtedly, this is the most intense point in his theoretical understanding: creating an object that does not belong to anyone. Inclusive education is a field composed of multiple heuristic institutions, "a series of ideas, concerns, positions, interventions, and theories that make up a thought" (Hernandez 2018:7).

Inclusive education is a way to break free from direct discipline training, forming a space that opens to the parts. In all forms, all parties basically participate together, and their continuity and cohesion are guaranteed as a whole. James said that in "each form," there is true discontinuity and separation, so "there is always something that escapes. What escapes is what makes the movement, what creates, what innovates (Lazzarato 2006:23), unveiling a field whose organic facet follows the logic of a "mosaic-universe, a patchwork-universe, an archipelago universe", that is, an "incompletely systematized universe", a "partially logical or irrational" world where there is a possible and contingent multiplicity of junctions and disjunctions, of unifications and separations" (Lazzarato 2006:27). Let's now examine some of the most significant theoretical affiliations in the production of his territories.

Inclusive education is committed to the interactive integration of each of these fields, transcending boundaries, interrupting the logic of knowledge production, and making unknown reductions in the analysis, methods, and category resources that make up its territory, constituting an object that will affect all these forms of knowledge: this is the object of the inclusive education.

It should be noted that the object of inclusive education cannot be delimited from the paradigms of any particular and current discipline, since it overflows and alters its dynamics of operation. It also does not belong to the epistemic regionalization designated as special education.

If this strange and problematic relationship has been established, it is to some extent due to researchers being unable to access the terminology and its designated object network. If this kind of discussion remains silent, it is because its

delimitation cannot clarify and solve its object, as well as the creation and collection mechanism due to the signifier established by the special-subjugation and edipization of signs-. Making inclusive education a special education will condemn it to repeat the same failure.

Inclusive education redefines the dialectical relationship between self and others from an expanded perspective, assuming that it constitutes a new production device and social relationship model of subjectivity.

In this regard, the argument presented is inherited from feminism, as advocated by Braidotti (2006), which aims to provide a series of positive meanings and attributes about differences.

This ontological semiotic transformation has the nature of a new materialism, focusing on the evolution of a manifestation, which directs its efforts towards "a shift in values, which may lead to a reaffirmation of the positive content of differences, and will allow the collective to adapt to the uniqueness of each subject while not neglecting its complexity" (Braidotti 2006:21).

Feminism contributes to the construction of inclusive education, specifically, through the overcoming and eradication of metaphysical cannibalism. Therefore, the despicable other subject that is crossed by the value framework of abnormal ideology and essentialism constitutes a special sovereign subject, while the inclusive subject is not crossed by each of the above manifestations, but rather establishes its alterative force through the redefinition of the ontological signs provided by the multiplicity of singularities, an ontological materiality, a procedural ontology and minimal ontology.

The multiple singularities construct a pedagogy of the minor (Ocampo, 2018), an educational practice in which minorities construct a pedagogical space, challenging and destabilizing the attributions and designations of the majority - the instituted, the normative regulation-.

The multiple singularities inaugurate a form of de-essentialization of the subject, in which the subject traverses through multiple forms of expression during the process of permanence. Its foundation is the principle of human variability, which clarifies that "an embodied, complex, and multi-level subject maintains a distance from institutions" (Braidotti 2006:22), and the subject opposes abstract development maps and its powerless desire for universality.

Therefore, we are talking about a mutated subject, an incarnated subject. This ontology has generated other readability standards, through which educational themes have emerged. In this sense, inclusive education has established a commitment to anti humanism and a new policy of subject localization, which is a way to give meaning to the diversity of existing complex identities traversed by (...) a shared and collectively constructed, jointly occupied spatio-temporal territory. In other words, this position itself largely goes beyond the scope of self examination, as it is so familiar and close that it has not even been repaired. Therefore, "politics of location" implies an awareness-raising process that requires political awakening, and therefore requires the intervention of others (Braidotti 2006:26-27)".

Post structuralism endows inclusive epistemological construction with analytical tools to overcome normative concepts that influence/regulate human rationality and its moral values. This is linked to the power of anti humanistic commitments, running counter to the ideals inherited by classical humanism, which is responsible for generating a binary system to understand the multiple differences in education and political space. It also shares issues related to others, race, gender, ethnicity, class, and identity with cultural studies, while engaging in dialogue with postcolonial studies through concerns intertwined with various global hegemonic systems and social injustice globalization.

From intersectionality it inherits "the critical insight that race, class, gender, sexuality, ethnicity, nation, ability, and age operate not as unitary and mutually exclusive entities, but rather as reciprocally constructed phenomena" (Hill 2015:i). Inclusive education is informed by multiple projects linked to social justice. The link of this to intersectionality lies in its

attention to power relations and social inequalities. Each of these legacies enables us to overcome the reductionism centered around special regime that has become a broader neo-colonizing project.

4 Methodological issues

Inclusive education does not radically reject the presence of methods, however, it works against their rationalities and systems of normativities that they impose. It is especially interested in destabilizing the inherited logics of methodological educationism; it even argues that, despite the existence of multiple methodologies and methods to investigate the large field of problems designated by the syntagm, none manages to capture the specificity of its heuristic demands. Even many of the conventionally employed methods reabsorb each other, being unable to disrupt and interrogate the very conditions of sanctioned academic discourse.

Inclusive education has opened up an ex-centric methodological repertoire, articulating the face-to-face confrontations between many things, which may unlock the configuration knots, in order to study multiple ethical behaviors-incommensurability- that is, any research practice that emerges from difference becomes an ethical act, conceived as an "episode of horizontal co-presence that needs the spatial metaphor and its imagination" (Rufer 2020:298).

Anyway, the research on the conditions of inclusive education methods challenges and undermines the stability of the scientific authority standards inherited by Logos, many of which are considered as epistemic violence that contributes to marginalizing multiple ways of thinking about a subject.

At this point, we face the consequences of knowledge and power colonialism, which means that in terms of reflective research matrices, the only effective form is the legacy left by the European Center's social science classics, which are limited to imposing specific research institutions that cannot capture the uniqueness or multidimensional nature of phenomena.

Inclusive education as a methodological practice is expressed as a terrain of deep unevenness, cultivated in unequal ways; symptoms of dissatisfaction with methodological forms, a desire to redraw the attributions and meanings of methods. All of these will affect how we think and relate to knowledge.

In terms of the areas discussed here, they are closely related to politics. The fact is that methodology is not simply a utilitarian effect, but rather an attempt to reflect a question: how to study a field of post disciplinary phenomena?

Here, the concept of methods means how to do it and how to think about a series of emerging and intersecting phenomena that are not easily interactive, let alone reading. I like to understand the concept of methods as a multipositional space where various problems come together. This re symbolization turns this notion into an analytical strategy for thinking a multiplicity of unknown and emergent problems that challenge, destabilize and disrupt conventional modes of analysis, which can never reduce its function and field of signifiers to a mere set of steps and resources. The creation of a new methodological assemblage depends on the capacity to deeply understand an object never strictly delineated.

The problem is that the objects or objective networks of inclusive education are not easily defined, which means it is not possible to clearly define a large number of things called inclusive education. However, it is also possible to ask oneself, perhaps this Sintagma has no objects.

The fact is that when it appears on the basis of a post-disciplinary nature, it does not force its practitioners to resort to its symbolic or real nature, but rather challenges the normative production method of knowledge and opens the door to imagination. Especially, it opposes the exclusivity strategy of the discipline and the reduction of its methodology.

Objects are events, not a mere collection of things thematized by simple identification codes. This argument allows for a wide variety of intellectual concerns.

If the domain of an object is not obvious - like the territory discussed here - if it must later be created on the basis of questioning its established vision, then we face a grid of comprehensibility that transcends, intersects, and rearticulates by shifting multiple disciplinary constraints.

When this situation occurs, an unknown transcendence arises, acting in a heuristic metaphorical methodology, which constructs an object and method belonging to no one, despite its clear genealogical strands. The part that does not belong to anyone is one of its main methodological challenges. As Barr (2018a) said, in terms of his methodological practice, this is a difficult thing to maintain.

5 Conclusion

The research on the image of inclusive education reveals a complex interactive and performative nature, which has the ability to act as a subject and ways through which we understand reality and its phenomena.

Undoubtedly, images become heuristic devices, namely thinking patterns that utilize categories to enhance their fertility with the ability to intervene ontological signs of certain themes appearing in social education and cultural experiences, and on the other hand, they possess the practical ability to decentralize certain images and visuals.

Although vision is the core of ontological practice, the type of meaning given to the social world and cultural background of a specific era, and its viewing behavior conforms to the boundaries of society and history, requires a conscious audience to have the possibility of interaction.

Acuña Bal (2018a) said that these images always conformed to the reference framework established for them by specific eras and societies. (II)

In short, linking images to the concerns of today's world is a more open and conscious projection behavior (Bal 2018a: 22).

How to approach a visual understanding of inclusive education images? What are the ways to bring value to what we see? How are their visibility and meaning production conditions established? All of these issues play a crucial role in shaping and urgently establishing a new ontological regime that is close to subjective materialism as well as procedural and minimalist ontology.

The image of inclusive education is related to current issues, surpassing the social and political significance constructed by its audience, and even having the ability to eliminate the significance given by the false knowledge structure inherited by the special central regime.

What we know and most of the content we recognize in specific ontological semiotic codes correspond to many of the ways we view others, which are pre-programmed at the cultural level rather than naturally. What are the social conditions that are articulated behind each image signified as part of the regime of signs of inclusive education?

One of its critical tasks in epistemological terms will be to offer a framework for understanding the visuality of its object and its ontological codes and, in so doing, to offer a meaning coherent with the tensions of the world we inhabit. However, each of these objects is delimited by its senses, which in the mainstream argument reveals a subtle combination with essentialism-individualism, dedicating a limited ontological code to legitimize the potesta -negative attributions -of being, instead of its conditions of potentia -attributions related to the force of differentiability of being-.

This indicates that there are obstacles in developing their visual code, especially in their ontology symbol systems, previously contained in a visualization device of the daily behavior of what counts as inclusion.

The visual conditions of inclusive education are largely trapped in the referential dictatorship provided by the normative central regime, which is reflected in the reductive analysis pragmatics that restricts the development of subjectivity. Barr (2018a) believes that the analytical potential of vision "implies meaningful exposure to issues related to subjectivity in this new relational structure" (page 28).

Inclusion has a mutuality effect, it is something that sees us and challenges us and at the same time, we see it and challenge it. The images that we often legitimize and signify as part of the theoretical and political field of inclusive education demonstrate a unique system of semiotic subjection. Consequently, special education is never the other ascendant of inclusive education.

The first task will be to free both from the oppressive burden of their meanings and the essentialism that conditions their images and symbolic articulations of the visual and linguistic order, which is a consequence of a generalized semiological structure.

When their semiotic codes are placed relative to the tentacles of the normative central regime, they record a homogeneous structural matrix. These should vary depending on the different components of various symbols, which gather a large number of unique expressions of existence. By the way, these expressions have destructive and transformative effects on their cultural significance and the units of inscriptions, thus breaking the universal decoding system of reading their main phenomena at the social or individual level.

In a system centered around norms, the ontological grid and its semiotic components only operate under the conditions of constraint machines conspiring with certain power relationships - the inauguration ceremony of ontological disorders- which makes them a universal image, touching the most sensitive parts of their referential materials. For this reason, I have noticed the need to remove the regionalization of its significance in elucidating the effects of ontological forgery, silently reproducing some of the purposes of Logos centrism.

All these are symptoms of the semiotic imperialism embodied through classical humanism and the matrix of essentialisms - individualisms constitutive of the Western-centric world system, an enterprise characterized by "the lack of something. It is as if they were condemned to wait for the chains of linguistic signifiers to come to take charge of them in order to control, interpret and signal the authorized paths, the forbidden senses, the tolerated gaps" (Guattari 2013:24).

Inclusive education has established various semi typified models, which shift elements to avoid obvious obedience and persistent desires towards subjective personalization, leading to a closed image that inherits the essentialist individualistic thinking model.

The critical understanding of the sign regime that elaborates the visual field of authentic inclusive education builds a worldview from which the relationship between image and subjectivity devices emerges. The task remains to discover the semiotic conditions of what we mean by inclusive education.

The visual symbols and practices established in mainstream inclusive non critical discourse record the semiotic exposition of the other, which operates in proximity to an automated regime with power and discourse saturated, where the other, whether appearing in unfamiliar forms, on the other hand, is marginalized, overlooked in the past, drowned, humble, unheard of, invisible, ignored, suppressed, strange, despicable, exotic, mysterious, unknown, or not yet established. (Bauman 2013:34)

Opening the post structuralist lineage chain in the intimate relationship of inclusive education in Sintagma clarifies the broad expression, interest, and significance surrounding differences and their semi typification forces, reducing the potential for understanding the existence of subjective singularization devices prior to their existence.

The dominant conceptions have the capacity to impose a signic rostricity based on caricatural aspects giving continuity to universal conceptions of difference. This special situation has brought strong political and ethical impacts.

Conflicts of interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

References

- [1] Ahmed, S. (2019). Esperanza, inquietud y promesa de felicidad. Recuperado el 06 de junio de 2021 de: <https://nuso.org/articulo/esperanza-inquietud-y-promesa-de-felicidad/>
- [2] Bal, M. (2009). *Conceptos viajeros en las humanidades. Una guía de viaje*. Murcia, España: Cendeac.
- [3] Bal, M. (2018). *Tiempos trastornados. Análisis, historias y políticas de la mirada*. Madrid, España: Akal.
- [4] Bal, M. (2018). Y-cidad: los múltiples sentidos de "y". *Versants*, 3(65), 187-207.
doi: <https://doi.org/10.22015/V.RSLR/65.3.11>
- [5] Bowman, P. (2010). Reading Rey Chow. *Postcolonial Studies*, 13(3), 239-253.
doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13688790.2010.508814>
- [6] Bowman, P. (2013). *Reading Rey Chow. Visuality, postcoloniality, ethnicity, sexuality*. New York, EE.UU.: Peter Lang.
- [7] Braidotti, R. (2002). *Metamorfosis. Hacia una teoría materialista del devenir*. Madrid, España: Akal .
- [8] Braidotti, R. (2006). *Transposiciones*. Barcelona, España: Gedisa Editorial.
- [9] Braidotti, R. (2018). A Theoretical Framework for the Critical Posthumanities. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 0(0) 1-31. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276418771486>
- [10] Castillo, K. (2019). Claves teóricas en Manuel de Landa. *Andamio*, 17(40), 229-250.
doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.29092/uacm.v16i40.705>
- [11] De Peretti, C. (1989). *Jacques Derrida. Texto y Deconstrucción*. Barcelona: Anthropos. Recuperado de: <https://redaprenderycambiar.com.ar/derrida/comentarios/peretti.htm>
- [12] Escobar, A. y Osterwell, M. (2009). Movimientos sociales y la política de lo virtual. Estrategias deleuzianas. En K. Castillo. (2019). *Claves teóricas en Manuel de Landa. Andamio*, 40(17), 229-250.
- [13] Flick, U. (1998). *Introducción a la Investigación Cualitativa*. Madrid, España: Morata.
- [14] Frow, J. (2010). Hybrid Disciplinarity: Rey Chow and Comparative Studies. *Postcolonial Studies*, 13(3), 265-274.
doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13688790.2010.508831>
- [15] Guattari, F. (2013). *Líneas de fuga. Por otro mundo de posibles*. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Ed. Cactus.
- [16] Hernández, M. A. (2018). Introducción. Mover la frontera: actuar aquí y ahora. En M Bal. *Tiempos trastornados*, (pp.5-13). Madrid, España: Akal.
- [17] Hill, P. (2015). Intersectionality's Definitional Dilemmas. *Annu. Rev. Sociol.*, 41, 1-20. Recuperado de: <https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/pdf/10.1146/annurev-soc-073014-112142>
- [18] Lazzarato, M. (2006). *Por una política menor. Acontecimiento y política en las sociedades de control*. Madrid, España: Traficantes de Sueños.
- [19] Lee, M. y Fisher, M. (2009). *Deleuze y la brujería*. Buenos Aires, Argentina: La cuarentena.
- [20] Matus, T. (2017). *Punto de Fuga. Imágenes dialécticas de la crítica en el Trabajo Social Contemporáneo*. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Editorial Espacio.
- [21] Mengue, P. (2008). *Deleuze o el Sistema de lo múltiple*. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Los cuarenta libros.

- [22] Ocampo, A. (2018). *La formación del profesorado y la comprensión epistemológica de la educación inclusiva*. Santiago Chile, Chile: Ediciones CELEI.
- [23] Ocampo, A. (2019). Contornos teóricos de la educación inclusiva. *Boletín Redipe*, 8(3), 66-96. doi: <https://doi.org/10.36260/rbr.v8i3.696>
- [24] Ocampo, A. (2019). Condiciones de producción de la educación inclusiva. *Boletín Redipe*, 8(8), 66-96. doi: <https://doi.org/10.36260/rbr.v8i8.800>
- [25] Ocampo, A. (2020). En torno al verbo incluir: performatividades heurísticas de la educación inclusiva. *Revista Quaestiones Disputatae: Temas en Debate*, 27(13), 18-54.
- [26] Ocampo, A. (2021). Epistemología de la educación inclusiva: tensiones neo-materialistas para un mundo desconocido. *Revista Psicología Em Fase*, 2(2), 1-23.
- [27] Orlandi, E. (2012). *Análisis del discurso. Principios y procedimientos*. Santiago de Chile, Chile: LOM/UMCE.
- [28] Richard, N. (2020). *De la revuelta social a la nueva constitución en Chile*. Conferencia leída el 16 de diciembre de 2020 en el Centro Cultural Kirchner. Recuperado el día 28 de diciembre de 2020. de: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pI18SJEW9Hw>
- [29] Rufer, M. (2020). No vamos a traducir. Instalar un secreto, negar la dádiva, redefinir el juego. En I. Cornejo y M. Rufer, (Comp.). *Horizontalidad: hacia unacríticade lametodología*. (pp. 227-302). Buenos Aires, Argentina: CLACSO.
- [30] Tuck, E. & Yang, K.W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 1(1), 1-40.
- [31] Valencia, V. (2019). *Revisión documental en el proceso de investigación*. Pereira, Colombia: Ediciones UTP.