EDITORIAL

EPISTEMOLOGY OF INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

Aldo Ocampo González[*]

Center for Latin American Studies on Inclusive Education (CELEI)[1]

Map the movements of a peculiar theory

Thinking about the construction of knowledge of inclusive education is undoubtedly a high point, thorny and hot.

To a certain extent, a product of the multiplicity of voices that participate in its structuring, as well as the diversity of heuristic convergences that occur in it. His epistemological understanding breaks with the conservative purism of the work of work in the intimacy of the disciplines and the normativity and objectivism of certain paradigmatic frameworks deconstructs the sanctioned forms of epistemic authority.

Although this singular heuristic territory has circulated through academic structures without blocks of reflexivity according to the singularity that defines the nature of its knowledge, it has also failed to consolidate a corpus of research methods and methodologies to address the multiaxial and multidimensional complexity of its phenomena, the truth is that it has consolidated a global political commitment that marks its political-theoretical trajectory in terms of a new materialist epistemology, a system of reflexivity committed to the interpretation of the signs of the present, a cognitive apparatus committed to becoming knowledge.

---

[*] Chilean. Theorist and educational essayist. Founding Director of the Center for Latin American Studies for Inclusive Education (CELEI), Chile. He is the Doctor in Educational Sciences, approved Outstanding mention "Cum Laude" unanimously by the University of Granada, Spain. He is the creator of the epistemology of inclusive education.

[1] It is the first research center created in Chile and in Latin America and the Caribbean (ALAC), dedicated to the theoretical and methodological study of inclusive education, articulates its work from an inter-, post-, and para-disciplinary perspective. This is the international institution recognized and with affiliative status by the Latin American Council of Social Sciences (CLACSO) and by the International Consortium of Critical Theory Programs (ICCTP), USA.

Inclusive education heuristically faces a defining dilemma: it cannot be defined in the paradigms of any special discipline, since the complexity of its field of phenomena overwhelms them.

This is what makes the corpus of phenomena that constitute it to be in permanent movement and becoming; particularity that requires understanding how the phenomenon has moved through time, concepts, knowledge projects, theories, political projects, ethical commitments, epistemic problems, and epistemic geographies, etc.

Inclusive education as a field and object of research involves the question about its scope, nature –translated as an index of singularity– and theoretical capacity, demonstrating the presence of multiple objects and theoretical languages that when meeting and joining forces at particular points produces something unknown.

Each of these objects and languages of inclusive education ratifies that the construction of their specialized knowledge is the consequence of a singular rhizomatic and multidirectional trajectory through which different objects and theoretical languages coexist that do not always have a direct relationship between them.

To a certain extent, this is what makes his structure of knowledge and object network something open and the property of an ambivalent openness; while, as thematic, focus and epistemological position, it crosses an infinity of topics, knowledge projects, and theoretical commitments.

The question about the genealogical conditions of the field can be answered through the notion of genealogical entanglements, an analytical-methodological instrument through which it is possible to map the emergency and formation itineraries of the territory, which operates through epistemological nomadism and **diasporism.,** giving an account of knowledge in permanent dispersion.

One of the functions of genealogical entanglements allows documenting how the set of theoretical, empirical, political, visual objects, among others, has moved, realizing a materialistic possibility in which certain things when meeting and interacting inaugurate something completely new and unknown.

It is the notion of **"figual"** that most fertilely describes the meaning of inclusive education and its post-disciplinary commitment, whose knowledge operates in a singular way beyond various concepts, theories, knowledge projects, methods, subjects, territories., ethical commitments, and political projects. It is a knowledge that is produced in the translation of various contributions from intellectual fields and **regionalizations** that, when meeting and interacting in a singular contact zone, the product of a **"diasporic"** effect, rearticulate, rotate, and dislocate, inaugurating singular epistemic units that assemble another heuristic **"rostricity".**

Genealogical entanglements are a category of analysis dedicated to explaining the formation of heuristic territories of the inclusive, accounting for different overlapping, overlapping, and even co-penetrated strands that form their **rostricity.** Through it, it accounts for a phenomenon eminently rooted in the inheritance of knowledge projects of a critical and post-critical nature and political projects, such as anti-, de-, and post-colonialism, the philosophy of difference., political philosophy, queer studies, anti-racist studies, women's studies, gender studies, black and contemporary feminism, critical race theory, intersectionality, among many other approaches and intellectual projects in resistance. As each of them converges, a constellation emerges that inaugurates a way of thinking about problems endemic to the constitution of the known world-system, as well as epochal tensions and conjunctures.

It becomes a device for configuring the sensitivity of an era, installing peculiar ways of ordering relational, intersubjective, and affective grammar, it produces new and unknown maps about the human being and a singular form of subjectivity, typical of an "alterative" cultural change. Inclusive education is a heuristic and analytical tool that assumes a strong micropolitical commitment in charge of questioning how the knowledge available in its dominant conception contributes to the silent reproduction of conditions of inequality. Because of this, it accounts for a set of tangled theoretical, political, and ethical debates, not always translated, and understood in their specificity. It is in the transposition that the power of its singularity index emerges.

The theory of inclusive education that I propose does not present a clear starting point, this is what led me to the statement that its knowledge emerges through a singular effect of **diasporization,** a reflection of a set of influences that roam without stopping a side to side, this condition of its heuristic capacity shows that it is a neo-materialist theory that cannot be exhausted in previous movements, but is something that is transformed and altered in its evolution. Indeed, "there is potentially always another set of concerns that theory can be directed to, other places that theory can be moved to, and other power structures that can be deployed to examine" (Carbardo et al., 2014).

Movement as a heuristic condition of the field makes explicit something in constant alteration, whose conjunctural network acquires a provisional character. The phrase 'inclusive education' ratifies a provisional intention, it is this, what it does when knowing the inclusive as something incomplete, unfinished, and in permanent transformation.

The provisional in methodological terms leads us to think about the possibilities of the phrase in terms of contained entity, what does this mean? Although it has its specific tasks that define its function in reality, it is necessary to ask **ourselves** about the various interests, perspectives, and areas of theming that participate in the assembly of its object network. What does inclusive education do in the world? What other things does it mobilize for the transformation of the known and experienced world? For this, it is necessary to characterize the work of the agents.

Another crucial aspect indicates that there is no a priori place, nor a discipline of origin to think about inclusion, rather, by constituting a transversal and common objective of struggle in various political and knowledge projects, it turns it into a concept suitcase and ambivalent, which can operate in different ways, in different contexts, theories, and practices, it is something that is refined through plasticity and a great constellation of themes, but which is not only aggregative but also alterative of substantivity of the purposes.

What I see as necessary to reveal are the agents of movement. Inclusive education is not limited to a single heuristic convergence but occurs at the confluence of multiple heuristic transpositions. It is necessary to bet on specific theorizing conditions based on each ontological collectivity to which it seeks to respond. All these arguments account for the difficulties to theorize and glimpse its contours.

The phrase works from a great constellation of problems, but it is not of disciplines, it is this particularity that defines the movement as a primordial heuristic condition in the construction of its knowledge. The great constellation of objects that make up the morphology of their territories moves not only about particular subjects and collectivities in permanent evolution, but also, one of the expressions of their movements as a constructive way illuminates their trajectories, connecting more broadly a variety of epistemic geographies and academic sub-fields, knowledge projects, research methodologies, political projects, ethical commitments, subjects, etc., all of them epistemological singularities that assemble a new knowledge.

Inclusion as a heuristic phenomenon is the result of a wide range of research interests, that is, new knowledge is manufactured "from data that are not initially framed through a prism" (Carbardo et al., 2014.) exclusively linked to its main themes of theming.

Inclusive education is not the import of the legacy of special education, an argument that often omits the question of the defining features of inclusive thinking. Both constitute **regionalizations** crossed by different cognitive practices and discursive traditions. By erroneously over imposing the face of the inclusive as an extension of the special, the understanding of the phenomenon is limited to the essentialist-individualist production matrix from which various kinds of **binarisms** proliferate. Inclusive education must be conceived as a "counter-hegemonic and transformative intervention in the production of knowledge" (Carbardo et al., 2014) that responsibly attends to contextual and emerging differences, accounting for alterative commitments in the development of its theory. This allows us to realize that the available conceptions are the result of limited elaborations about their object.

The truth is that inclusion moves beyond these discussions. None of the arguments that I have argued in various works explain that special education is a form of inclusion, while inclusion is not a form of the special, its function is to de-disable the argumentative consciousness of the

inclusive, but rather, overcome one of its most obvious reductions. Although inclusive education research involves a multiplicity of concerns linked to an infinite variety of collectivities, it seeks to overcome the ontological exceptionalism that subordinates certain groups that are the product of the western-centric matrix to last place in various indices of inequality.

Ontological exceptionalism allows us to understand how certain figures of otherness are inscribed in an inferior and unacceptable place in the intimacy of the multi-categorical effect that the essentialist and oppressive approaches on inclusive education erect. This condition of exceptionality is the property of singular mechanisms that produce ontological disdain typical of the area of being, which in Fanon (2009) inaugurates a zone composed of non-being or non-existent, that is, a **multipositional** spatiality in which they are sharpened forms of oppression and domination, treating them as, especially different groups.

The condition of ontological exceptionality is a theoretical-practical consequence of the ontological problem of social groups, part of an ideological monopoly that is systematically reproduced in inclusion policies worldwide.

As a general educational theory, inclusion "carries forward the often-hidden dynamics to transform them" (Carbardo et al., 2014). Inclusion is always imperative of transformation and alteration of the known, assuming the analytical need to create "interlocking forms in which social structures produce and consolidate power and marginalization and calling attention to how the existing paradigms that they produce knowledge and politics often work to normalize these dynamics" (Carbardo et al., 2014).

The complexity involved in tracing the origin of the term, the object, and the field reveals that there is no a priori place for inclusion in academic structures, nor in their genealogical entanglements, nor their communities of practice; Due to its ambivalence, it will be refined, rearticulated, translated and transformed in its interaction with various kinds of constructive resources that assemble its territories of work. The type of debates, conceptual instruments, methodological forms, and modalities of theorization express that inclusion as a project of knowledge in resistance goes beyond the humanities, social sciences, education, philosophy, gender studies, psychology, and political science, among others. It is not only a repository of (post) critical bodies of knowledge but also produces new angles of vision to intervene in our reality.

The theory of inclusive education becomes a heuristic device when it manages to capture a multiplicity of knowledge projects in resistances and methodological forms that make visible different threads of analysis to examine the imperceptible complicities with inequality. This theoretical form builds a counter-theory and an epistemological counter-space made up of intersections, translations, and rearticulations of various constructive resources, thus inaugurating

an **allectic** assembly, characterized by unique interconnection mechanisms between various classes of epistemological resources that together create through translation, topological examination, and re-articulation a new figural.

The construction of knowledge of inclusive education advances through various heuristic convergences.

What exactly is meant by inclusive education? As I have argued in various works, one of the permanent difficulties faced by this domain describes an index of singularity –the identity of the field– of low intensity, to be more precise, it adopts a status of ignorance. Although many researchers dedicated to gender believe they know or know inclusion, when they must explain it, they do not know how to define it or address it in depth.

The debate about how to conceptualize and use inclusion and inclusive education is not entirely clear; it is this ambiguity and unintelligibility that, to a certain extent, makes it attractive. However, it is necessary to advance in fully understanding its index of singularity, both are concepts that stimulate the imagination, the systematic struggle for the creation of other worlds, and modes of relationship and coordinates of otherness. Its methodological tensions, pressures, and obstructions are defined by its openness, permanent movement, and becoming, which is what inscribes its methodological developments in terms of increasing difficulty.

The open, as well as the intersectionality, makes it difficult for the contours of the field to be delimited in the centrality of a single methodological way. This faces another defining problem: it does not explain exactly how to study its field of heuristic, methodological, conceptual, visual, political-ethical, etc. phenomena.

Inclusion and inclusive education reaffirm a metaphor status, that is, it is an explanation created by various groups and used for various purposes and ends. Although its emergence is not clear, as well as it is heuristic and methodological uses, the truth is that these have emerged during a great variety of discursive spaces, knowledge projects, and debates, making explicit three major commitments: a) debates discursive and ethical-political on the scope and content of inclusion and inclusive education, both categories demonstrate a **hyponymous** state, as a theoretical and methodological project, b) political interventions with an inclusive lens and c) research practices with an imaginative framework to support the theoretical and ethical design of the future.

Inclusion becomes a form of theoretical navigation that encourages the exploration of creative ways to affirmatively engage with the present, recognizes that the notions of 'inclusion' and 'inclusive education' reveal a polyhedral, elastic, and nomadic nature. In its connection with the study of various inequalities and injustices conceived in terms of oppressions and dominations, it

provides an analytical framework that goes beyond the mere superposition of differential axes but consolidates an analytical and critical praxis of a multilevel and multilevel character. dynamic, designed to overcome existing social theories to deepen the analysis of inequalities.

Inclusion is a popular concept and signifier in various fields of study and movements, in its configuration diverse philosophical traditions converge, it harbors a wide variety of political issues and theoretical tensions. The domain of inclusive education is a field assembled by rearticulation of multiple heterogeneous theoretical-methodological practices that stress the liberal forms in which the functions of the said domain have been inscribed.

Crucial premises for understanding inclusive education epistemologically.

► Inclusive education does not have a clear starting point, but rather, it is traversed by a corpus of influences that travel and are mobilized by a wide diversity of academic geographies, political projects, ethical commitments, etc. None of these constructive resources has a special-order status.

► Inclusive education does not exactly belong to the regionalization designated as special education, this error in approaching its object is due to the inability of researchers to understand the depth and multidimensionality of the term itself. To some extent, the product of this comprehensive relationship is that the phrase becomes a euphemism and an elastic notion that can accommodate anything, giving way to a silent policy of anything goes. Without a doubt, it is a euphemistic term and with excess meaning. When we confuse special education with inclusive education, the superficiality of the misrepresentation sanctioned as a widely celebrated truth regime is assumed when presenting a more up-to-date version.

► Inclusive education does not have its theory consistent with its uniqueness index. What circulates in academic structures under the denomination of theory, is nothing more than a pastiche of ideas taken that reveal a paratactic operation, that is, simple placement of ideas and arguments next to each other without connections between them. Although, inclusive education is a provisional construct whose theoretical-methodological contours are not easy to define, a product that works beyond its inherited resources. The theory of inclusive education does not present a clear starting point, but rather a set of influences that have contributed to expanding its blocks of reflexivity towards other horizons of meaning. A possible theory of inclusive education emerges from a post-critical leap, inaugurating an unknown theoretical form. The phrase today is a space of high theoretical-methodological uncertainty resulting from the absence of more radical debates on its fundamental theoretical principles.

► Inclusive education as a heuristic territory, analytical strategy, critical praxis, and political project cannot precisely define its index of singularity –scientific identity– since it crosses multiaxially an infinity of knowledge projects and fields of work. The best way to explore its defining contours is through the principle of heterogenesis.

► The construction of knowledge of inclusive education begins by questioning the heuristic effect that resides between both sessions of the phrase, that is, the y-city or the logic of the multiple entries that come into contact and are activated at the time of assembling the action copulative of both terms.

► Inclusive education has no method. This statement must be understood within the framework of a singular double-bind: it does not have a method to explore the conformation of its object network, nor does it have a set of methodologies to deploy its investigative apparatus.

► Inclusive education expresses a marked traveler character, this condition not only illustrates the condition of knowledge production referred to incessant movement, but a criterion also that defines it as a neo-materialist epistemology. The traveler allows us to account for mutations, interpenetrations, and unexpected turns, through their interaction and landing by various **regionalizations,** their object network is altered, it is never trapped in the dogma of its main cognitive failures.

► The construction of their knowledge occurs in diasporic, nomadic, and transposing. These, in turn, delimit a substantive part of the laws of the internal operation of the field–its order of production. Among its main production conditions, the following stand out: a) diasporism, b) translation, c) the ecology of knowledge, d) topological examination, e) the micropolitical, f) its post-disciplinary nature, etc.

► Epistemological concepts of inclusive education emerge from the critical center of multiplicity, not from essentialism or binarism introduced by the classical humanist legacy.

► Inclusive education reveals a strong commitment to anti-humanism. In particular, it builds blocks of reflexivity and an epistemological position that undoes and erases essentialism in its various expressions–strategic, ontological, methodological, etc. -.

► The epistemological basis of inclusive education is post-disciplinary in nature. However, the configuration and assembly of the field are composed of multiple heuristic convergences. The epistemological field of inclusive education reaches the figure of an unknown assemblage, being traversed by rhizomatic trajectories in the production of its knowledge.

► Inclusive education works to decentralize known forms of inclusive education and produce other worlds, other modes of relationships, and subjectivities.

The question about the epistemological status of inclusive education

Another key aspect in the epistemological construction of inclusive education refers to the question of status. Although, this is a controversial and thorny question since the most subversive and critical debates in the field tend to omit reflections on the matter. As there are no clear schools and currents of thought in the privacy of the field, concepts, analysis topics, and objectives of struggle tend to be confused with great recurrence, demonstrating a high component of homogeneity in their approaches.

Another tension refers to the degree of banality and lightness with which the phrase 'inclusive education is constantly defined, for some it is a paradigm–something that I would put between question marks and emphasize the scant relevance of delimiting its scientific developments around to this notion–for others, it is about an approach or perspective. The truth that it is, epistemologically, inclusive education is neither one nor the other, a product of its characteristics, it can only be defined today in terms of metaphor, that is, an explanation created and used by different groups with multiple purposes, whose uniqueness is that it does not belong to any of them.

Ocampo's (2017) epistemology of inclusive education can be conceived through a triple link. On the one hand, it is the result of a critical elaboration to think about education, especially, it displays a cognitive function that alters vocabularies and ways of practicing and thinking about education to respond to the multiplicity of singularities–ontological disorders systematically disabled in politics and education. educational practices. On the other, she carries out an ecology of the intellectual, methodological, and categorical systems used to read the world. She shares the premise of Bal (2009) that concepts order the world, and it is through them that it is intervened.

Finally, the epistemology of inclusive education specifies in the study of the conditions of production of its knowledge, which reveal a strong commitment to the elaboration of a micropolitical and neo-materialist epistemological pragmatics. Micropolitics in the sense of constituting a project of knowledge in resistance that systematically evaluates how some of its arguments produce imperceptible alloys with inequality and other endemic pathologies to the constitution of the known world system. Neo-materialist in the most intrinsic nature of his knowledge, a phenomenon in permanent evolution, which creates historicity of the present to deal with a great constellation of emerging problems that work in the **entrity** of many things; it breaks with the cognitive craftsmanship bequeathed by the Hegelian dialectic.

The construction of its knowledge operates in the movement –in the dialect relationship of the given-giving-by-giving–, in the thought of the relationship, in the constellation, in the encounter, in the plasticity and translation of each of its main cognitive resources. It is not an exclusively speculative vision, it tries to elaborate a sophisticated message to responsibly stress

Aldo Ocampo González

a set of pressing problems that set the directions of the contemporary world of a complex and multifaceted nature, to look beyond the intimacy of these and collect broader questions that delimit the configuration and performativity of certain social practices in which it operates. Inclusive education epistemologically becomes a positioned praxis.

The epistemology of inclusive education lays the foundations of contemporary educational theory, it acts in the double impulse of revision and removal of what has been seen that we must codify to alter the world. Therefore, its terminal purpose is pragmatic, it works tirelessly to produce a body of knowledge that penetrates people's lives.

The Entrity conformed by the terms 'epistemology' and 'pragmatics' questions the type of structure of educational practice and its cognitive modalities in the key to a great constellation of problems that escape the conservative and normative purism of the disciplinary canon. Another pragmatic action is interested in understanding the discursive trajectories that it constructs and participates throughout its intellectual history, delimiting singular object networks in the production of its understandings. The problem is that many of the categories used for high efficiency by propaganda discourse or, as I usually call mainstream, is incapable of thinking about more sophisticated and profound questions linked to the structural production of the phenomenon, leading to the systematic imposition of assimilation practices to the same, it is a mechanism of inclusion through inequalities.

These categories fail to clearly explain the domains of what can be said and done, validating a singular policy of anything goes or an acrylic pastiche. To do this, it is proposed to review the explanations made available by inclusive education beyond the terms in which it is systematically projected. Its structure of knowledge shows that many of its systems of reasoning, blocks of reflexivity, concepts, and ideas do not belong to it in its specificity, since the inclusive qualifier without being named in this way has been present for many decades in various discourses. and contemporary critical movements, so that the constellation of ideas that it configures has operated within and outside its domain.

Starting from the caveat: the status of inclusive education is not clear, I will try to characterize, albeit partially, the level of scope of the domain. This statement requires a poignant question: What exactly is inclusive education? Is it a concept, a paradigm, a metaphor, a heuristic device, a methodology, or a theory? Framing inclusive education through the notion of 'theory' suggests cautiously determining what kind of theory it designates. Without the intention of offering a hasty answer as a hasty researcher would do, I will argue that the type of arguments that designate their territories transgresses, re-articulates, and goes beyond post-critical approaches, it is something that I do not know how to mean for this intervention.

If we examine each of the levels of involvement indicated in the question, I find it unfeasible to define their current developments in terms of paradigm, since it does not present their levels of scientific formalization–the ontological, the epistemological, and the methodological.

For some voices, inclusive education constitutes a linear mutation of special education, sometimes failed, giving way to a system of repositioning, and pairing of the special with the inclusive, legitimizing an ideal of diversity conceived in terms of assimilation, accommodation, and compensation. These paradoxes and confusing assertions give life and meaning to the different aspects of his intellectual history.

This block of reflexivity contributes to the legitimation and high-intensity circulation of the ontological problem of social groups, a long-standing problem in analytic philosophy in which people's identity assumes a negative attribute, permanently devaluing them. Some theoretical-practical consequences of this are the persistent multi-category effect of educational policies and their compensatory emphasis, the systems of differentiation and differentiation, and the matrix of essentialisms-individualisms that found the binary grammar with which inclusion problems are studied. and exclusion, reduced to a Eurocentric fiction.

For other voices, it is a perspective or approach to investigate educational problems linked to the material and subjective production of injustices, the brakes on self-development and self-determination, etc. These discussions contribute to moving the framework about the permanent reductionism of placing inclusion in the sign of disability. Inclusion becomes a singular connective link between the forces of structural and micro-practical development of reality, that is, an intermediary device between the institutional rules of operation of society and the network of relationships, passions, affectivities, and singularizing modes of subjectivation. in which we move.

Therefore, inclusive education alters the institutionalized modes of functioning of social and school structures, allows investigating a diversity of educational, political, ethical, cultural, social problems, etc., of a general nature, attending to the specificity of each one. According to this, it can study, re-articulate, and dislocate all the domains and subdomains that make up the Education Sciences. Therefore, its research development unit is variable, heterogeneous, and (**several dimensions**) multidiensional; This is what makes its object cannot be easily delimited in the paradigms of any of its disciplines and knowledge projects that contribute to assembling its cognitive apparatus.

Inclusion crosses and alters all fields of scientific and human development, while inclusive education, despite dialoguing through a unique hinge effect between various projects and theoretical-political commitments, restricts its scope of work to education. To unveil these tensions, it is necessary to rediscover their index of singularity –scientific identity–.

Returning to the warning that opens this section, I will argue that voices sometimes emerge that indicate that this is a perspective or approach to investigate general educational problems, however, in the initial portion of it, to observe a crucial defining dilemma unnoticed in the Intimacy of the community of practice: inclusive education cannot be defined in terms of perspective, method, methodology, it only reaches metaphor status today.

The inclusive in the contemporary world overflows the canonical signifiers on which the oedipal function of the qualifier is erected to the subordinating, dominating, and normative force of the special. Nothing shares in its genealogical basis, function, scope, and nature inclusive education with special education. If this error of object proximity has been established, it is due, in part, to the inability to understand the diversity of objects that participate in it, as well as the weaknesses of understanding the term. It is a heuristic field that updates the disciplines–, which explains a "new meta-discursive energy on the part of the disciplines" (Braidotti, 2018, p. 13).

The epistemology of inclusive education becomes a neo-materialist epistemology by assuming an ontological and ethical conception close to the notion of embodied materialism or nomadic materialism, for this, you must create your conception about the present. A critical-affirmative action with the present suggests that:

> (…) All human and non-human entities are nomadic subjects in the process, in perpetual movement, immanent to the vitality of self-ordered matter. Approaching the present thus produces a multifaceted effect: on the one hand, the acute awareness of what we are ceasing to be (the end of the current) and on the other the perception–in different degrees of clarity–of what we are in the process of becoming (the actualization of the virtual). Both phenomena occur at the same time, in a non-linear, time-continuous way. (Braidotti, 2018, pp. 6-7)

Production order? Inclusive education is the result of various intellectual, ethical, political, identity, and methodological diasporas. As inclusive education is a territory in permanent movement, its constructive laws operate in what Ocampo (2016) calls: epistemic diaspora, that is, a space for delocalization of multiple constructive resources inaugurating an alectic field. The theory of inclusive education is a theory of dislocation, a field of phenomena dispersed by various heuristic-methodological latitudes that do not show exclusive centrality in any of the disciplines and paradigms, due to its objectual complexity, overflows them. Its topics of analysis, concepts, and analytical-methodological tools form a singular figural, each of its forms in its way, are scattered by various intellectual spatialities, forging a singular connection mesh, which operates through the force of the performativity of what re-articulatory.

The epistemological production space of inclusive education, when conceived as a relational unit of relocation, inaugurates a singular unexplored territory crossed by unsuspected crossings and overflows between said constructive resources of a changing and contextual nature, which move between forms of relocation and dislocation. One of its main problems describes the

shortage of vocabulary available to deal with the problems of the countryside in migratory terms composed of "processes of arrival and settlement in a new place not only encompassing the present and the future" (Ang-Lygate, 2008, p. 295).

Offshoring policies play a relevant role in understanding the movements and turns experienced by each of the constructive resources that participate in the assembly of inclusive education as an object and field of research, they are not fixed in the paradigms of any discipline They also do not know for sure where each of their concepts, methodological forms, surrounding objects, theoretical forms, among others, belong; each of these constructive resources that many times are not fully understood and accepted by the dominant and objectivist ways of conceiving the field of inclusive phenomena. We are faced with delocalized character heuristic articulations.

The diaspora as an epistemic and analytical category allows exploring the movements of each of the constructive resources that participate in the assembly of the field called inclusive education, its complex understandings describe the modalities of displacement, migration, landing, dislocation of various kinds of epistemological singularities.

The diaspora makes it possible to understand the forms of unfinished movement, migration, reunion, and transmigration that are specifically established at the heuristic level, it provides tools to deepen the type of alloys, migrations, foreclosures, grafts, interfaces, among others, from each of Its elements converge, forming a new mobile reception diagram–hereinafter, production field and research field–called by Ocampo (2019) diasporic production space, it is a space inhabited by multiple resources, inaugurating a singular allectic field. One of the main characteristics of this epistemological production space allows us to understand the various forms of the interweaving of genealogical or genealogical entanglements that participate in the formation of the field. Inclusive education as a specific disposition reconfigures the force of the multiple.

By conceiving the field of production of inclusive education as a diaspora space–a point of confluence of various kinds of constructive resources–it confronts us with a territory made up of various kinds of assemblages, a singular point of confluence of various things, a point of mutation and agitation of thought. The diaspora space establishes that the heuristic global condition of inclusive education is a place of complex nomadic forms, of migrations and trips without fixed itineraries, it inaugurates a space inhabited by resources that have migrated and have been rearticulated together with their descendants or mutations, passing through various heuristic convergences that enunciate and listen to their field of phenomena in a singular and complex beyond.

Inclusive education develops a post-disciplinary object, a field of phenomena that listens and enunciates its phenomena beyond multiple kinds of problems, discourses, concepts, theories, methodologies, territories, political projects, knowledge projects, and ethical commitments,

among others.; configuring a territory crossed by singular heuristic assemblages, which despite inscribing its activity beyond each of these resources articulates specific questions about specific objects.

It is a field of openings, jumps, translations, and permanent doubling. The multidisciplinary convergence that participates in the assembly of the field becomes visible through the encounter, dialogue, and participation of various intellectual geographies that take advantage of certain disciplinary contributions that have become a superficial assembly and a low-intensity encounter. So far, their contributions are not embedded in the centrality of the territories but reside in partial planes and far away in their defining contours. The floating nature of each of its resources is what makes movement possible, it is it that enables the opening and doubling towards an interdisciplinary convergence in which various methods, concepts, and knowledge of different epistemic regionalizations arrive, including observing the presence of various political projects, such as feminism, anti-racism, etc.

The flow of transfer of various kinds of constructive resources enables the question of the mechanisms of understanding, readability, positioning, relation to, and translation of each of its resources, requiring going beyond a synthesis of each of its convergent approaches. Unveiling each of these forms of synthesis constitutes a critical nodal point to unveil the nature of assemblies by rearticulation. Interdisciplinary convergence in the inclusive field operates through "feedback loops, when people retrieve knowledge from other disciplines in their disciplinary research, or when they work together on a project that overlaps multiple disciplines. When that work crosses the fuzzy boundary between overlapping and meshing, you end up with new disciplines" (Biagioli, 2009, p. s / r).

INTEREST CONFLICT

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest with an institution or commercial association of any kind.

REFERENCES

Ang-Lygate, M. (2008). Trazar los espacios de deslocalización. De la teorización a la diáspora. En M. Fabardo (Ed.), *Feminismos negros. Una antología* (pp.291-314). Traficantes de Sueños.

Bal, M. (2009). *Conceptos viajeros en las humanidades. Una guía de viaje*. Cendeac.

Braidotti, R. (2018). A Theoretical Framework for the Critical Posthumanities. *Theory, Culture & Society*, *36*(6), 31-61. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276418771486

Biagioli, M. (2009). Postdisciplinary Liaisons: Science Studies and the Humanities. *Critical Inquiry, 35*(4), 816-833. https://doi.org/10.1086/599586

Cabardo, D., Crenshaw, K., Mays, V. M., & Tomlinsom, B. (2014). INTERSECTIONALITY: Mapping the Movements of a Theory. *Du Bois Rev., 10*(2), 303-312. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25285150/

Fanon, F. (2009). *Piel negra, máscaras blancas*. Akal.

Ocampo, A. (2016). Gramática de la educación inclusiva: ejes críticos para cartografiar sus condiciones de producción y funcionamiento epistémico. En A. Ocampo, (Comp.). *Ideología, discapacidad y dominación: los imaginarios constitutivos de la discapacidad en Latinoamérica* (pp. 73-159). Fondo Editorial CELEI.

Ocampo, A. (2017). *Epistemología de la educación inclusiva*. UGR.

Ocampo, A. (2019). Contornos teóricos de la educación inclusiva. *Revista Boletín Redipe, 8*(3), 66-95. https://revista.redipe.org/index.php/1/article/view/696