

Anticolonial theory of reading and ontology of the lesser: analytical-methodological assumptionsⁱ

Aldo Ocampo González

*Centro de Estudios Latinoamericanos de Educación Inclusiva (CELEI)ⁱⁱ,
Santiago, Chile*

Genoveva Ponce Naranjo

Universidad Nacional de Chimborazo, Riobamba, Ecuador

Abstract

Discovering the voice of the inclusive can only be heard outside their usual understandings and audibilities sanctioned by their structures of thought and conventional academic wisdom. Inclusion requires knowing the world in a different way. This paper inscribes its activity in the intersectional-ontological-relational contingency 'reading and inclusion'. The intention of thinking anticolonially the blocks of rationality of alphabetic mechanisms, finds a point of connection with the methodology of the oppressed. Its analytical intention consisted in tracing diverse kinds of arguments that would allow thinking the Western alphabetic reason crossed by diverse tensions linked to the political-cultural movement and the historical event called: 'anticolonialism', which has contributed to reinforce a monolingual and universalist conception of cultural action. In order to understand multifactorially the configurations of literate practices through coloniality, it is necessary to recognize the imposition of a world pattern of cultural power that has the capacity to sanction the type of cultural action and linguistic-literary structures that are legitimate and for which collectivities, submerging multiple

linguistic-political and existential structures in the opacity of the act, thus reinforcing a monolingual understanding and a literacy system based fundamentally on a monolingualism that is sometimes inappropriate according to the structures of participation of diverse cultural groups.

Keywords: *reading, anticolonial action, logos, anticolonial literate practices; subversive literacies.*

Introduction

The main intellectual task of the last few years has consisted in tracking down different kinds of arguments that make it possible to destabilize the dominant conception of inclusive education widely disseminated worldwide. The domination of the special becomes a device that prevents the emergence of the defining signs of the index of singularity of the inclusive. This peculiar process of heuristic subjugation is called oedipalization of the object of the inclusive, a metaphor that is much more complex. Our interest in the epistemological developments of inclusive education assumes the re-ordering task of its desires, a question which, to some extent, takes part of Gramsci's influence. Activity that highlights the contradictions and ambivalences of social, political and educational processes. Returning to the question of the theoretical reason for the territory under discussion: 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 the type of theory it designates. Inclusion' as a category of analysis faces a particular defining problem: it participates in the structural power relations and cultural representations it interrogates.

The paper presented here should be understood as a ‘critique’ insofar as it examines the structures of knowledge production and the rationale of inclusiveness. The problem is that this framework that lacks any kind of theoretical imagination capable of challenging the diversity of problems that structure the gears of the world-system and, on the other hand, the inability to recognize that the most widespread argument is, in itself, infertile to produce educational transformation. This is an argument that moves between mimesis and masquerade, between copycatting and imitation and resistance to change, in terms of the fluctuation of its ideas. The intention lies in infringing the rules of the falsified structure of knowledge about inclusion that today is legitimized with great force by conventional academic wisdom. This is one of the forms of sabotage found to interfere with its rules.

Inclusive education as a heuristic device faces four fundamental problems, which oscillate between the ontological, the epistemic, the methodological and the morphological. In addition to this, it can be identified that this is a space configured from multiple influences, each one of which moves incessantly without a fixed direction, forming a figurative unknown and a space of heuristic meta-receptivity. This effect of incessant movement -a becoming of acceleration- resides in the deepest part of its order of production: the diasporic.

The question about the nature of their theoretical reason focuses strictly on the function of their object, a notion that, by the way, does not act according to the epistemic-normative presuppositions sanctioned by the canonical ones. Rather, this constitutes an involuntarily unknown object, misunderstood and lost in the discussions of the field, as a result of the absence of more radical debates as to its methodological and heuristic forms; therefore, they face the complex task of

inscribing themselves in a more general framework of thinkability of their defining dilemmas.

The understanding of inclusive education when it is centered exclusively around the onto-semiological figuration inherited by the special (special-centric regime) runs the risk of becoming a neo-colonial argument, which has been elaborated by the Global North and arbitrarily transferred to various phenomenological-structural-relational realities constitutive of the Global South. These are, undoubtedly, manifestations of the co-optation effected by the binarist imagination that is a consequence of classical humanism, as a form of production of the Western being. When misrepresenting the special as inclusive, or assume that the latter is a more advanced mutation of special education, an apparently crystalline argument begins to become intensely muddied when questioning ourselves about the true contours of this field of research, as a self-righteous reason. Indeed, “the fact is that clear waters have never flowed through the mainstream and may never be able to do so. Part of mainstream education involves learning to ignore this circumstance completely, with a sanctioned ignorance” (Spivak, 2010, p.14).

The epistemology of inclusive education is not intended to discard the theoretical-conceptual ordering of the special -rather, it becomes a *heuristic palimpsest*ⁱⁱⁱ, something that can never be erased and that which will never be rid of; therefore, this expression is used in reverse of ordinary rhetoric. Its effect works to explain that it will be something that will return again and again. Therefore, there is total disagreement that for the sake of inclusiveness, as part of the liberal argument of the field, special education disappears, but to criticize it in order to destabilize its regulations and cognitive references, to disrupt its

logics of production, which work in close tune with the articulations of the *logos*. Inclusion is never the displacement of the signifiers of the special.

At this point, it is necessary to inquire about the mechanisms of negative and constructive complicity that may emerge from this operation. It is of interest to find the change of 'alteration' of signs, not of displacement. To take the special as the inclusive is to bring to light a singular internal and external heuristic repression in terms of its intelligibility grid, which it conditions by means of a withdrawal of its signifier. A repudiation that operates at the symbolic level and the real-formal of its structure, an operation that implicitly carries two complementary operations: the introduction of a false argument and the expulsion of this, through a peculiar movement of senses by disedimentation.

In such an argumentative plot, the voice of the inclusive as an expression of its index of singularity is oedipalized, whereas, heuristic understanding is constituted through a highly generative blank space. The discovery of the voice of the inclusive can only be heard outside its usual understandings and audibilities sanctioned by its structures of thought. This problem is not a simple one, especially, when the contexts of reception and the grammars of pedagogical educationalism have unthinkingly familiarized with this kind of cognitive elaboration which is nothing more than trivial talk, with no apparent cognition -absence of heuristic awareness-. Apologies are made for the crudeness of the expression, but the simplifications that are made over and over again of the syntagma are tiring. The rules of intelligibility and the manifestations of its objectual network outside such arguments are exposed. Once again, the force of the expression “exteriority of theoretical work”, quoted from Chambers, returns. It is necessary to “modify the presuppositions according to the text under study” (Spivak, 2010, p.21).

The problem of the reason of inclusive education inhabits a register in which its reason is neither understood nor known. An obstruction in the reason that knows its theoretical nature. In such a case, a reason is constructed, without a cognition of itself, an object apparently without any objective reference –it is necessary to find the modalities of cognitive control over its objectual grid– it legitimizes a grid of intelligibility that “represents an object of cognition without the necessary reference for true cognition” (Spivak, 2010, p.22). It is the realm of its theoretical reason that should be carefully encountered, “by involuntarily commemorating a lost object” (Spivak, 2010, p.14). In addition to this, there are the objects that serve to delineate the cognition of the inclusive. But how to make the object or, rather, its objectual network fall prey to a sublime moment and access its rational will? The study of the theoretical reason of the territory, imposes a feeling of inadequacy on its imagination by trying to overcome the effect of subreption, that is, a cognitive structure that acts by supplementation –a mode of concealment of the true essence of the field–. The problem is that the argument that allows to understand inclusive education in its true theoretical immensity lacks an understanding of its heuristic desirability adequate to its index of singularity. Indeed, inclusive education is an educational phenomenon, which is not epistemologically produced by education, but rather, as documented in previous works, is informed by knowledge projects that escape the intellectual logic sanctioned by education.

Finally, the reflection revolves around the following question: oedipalization of the inclusive? In Ocampo Gonzalez's intellectual work, this term is used for the first time to examine the forms of dictatorship of the signifier and the heuristic force of the psycho- as a form of regulation of the psycho-pedagogical domain, establishing mechanisms of domination. Oedipalization is always a form of castration, restriction or control of something, it is also a feeling of inadequacy,

of being misunderstood, or the possession of a maladjusted, negative or contradictory image. To unveil the forms of Oedipalization of the inclusive to the over-imposition of the legacy of the special requires a conceptual insurrection against the genealogical matrices that establish this singular linkage. Even the attempt to liberate such a web of linkage chains elicits a mechanism of disobedience to systems of reasoning restrictive of its supposed genealogical authority figure. Is it possible to argue that the special marks a certain kind of Oedipal respect for the inclusive, and if so, what does it depend on? I am interested in exploring ways that make possible the de-Oedipalization of the inclusive as the core substrate of the special. The epistemology of inclusive education proposed by Ocampo (2017), assumes this enterprise; that is, the consolidation of a practice of de-oedipalize of its genealogical forms in order to find its authenticity and its multiple modes of existence. It is observed that both the forms of deconstruction and de-oedipalization consolidate alternative strategies to remove the rigid patterns of imitation imposed by the rationality of the special-centered regime, also known as the process of oedipalization.

The anti-colonial in the literacy process suggests fighting for other epistemological performances

This section aims at examining the fundamental gears of the heuristic-political operation called 'anticolonial theory of reading'. Such a chain of words saw, for the first time, the light of day, on the occasion of the work presented for the book: "Intercultural studies. A window for the dialogue of knowledge from Abya Yala", edited by UABC, Mexico and UdeA, Colombia. In that opportunity, the analytical intention consisted in tracing different kinds of arguments that would allow thinking the western alphabetic reason crossed by diverse tensions linked to the political-cultural movement and to the historical

event called: 'anticolonialism'. An anticolonial theory of reading can be signified as a corpus of “considerations, constructions, productions, creations, practices and action-reflection based on existence and resistance, insurgent, epistemic politics” (Walsh & Mignolo, 2018, p.29). This position takes distance from the argument that “enunciates that the Indian and the black are the only ones who can fight for their liberation against colonial power relations, without using the identitarian strategy of class” (Ávila-Rojas, 2021, s.p.).

Although such an undertaking cannot reduce its analytical force exclusively to the mere act of counterposing theoretical-methodological premises undertaken by those who have engraved on their bodies the deep imprint of colonialism in all its expressions. This fact becomes a fundamental piece of their conscience and argumentative project, their analytic works beyond and outside the classic interpretative frameworks linked to the production of the literacy process, which, by the way, have contributed to reinforce a monolingual and universalist conception of cultural action. Accordingly, some uses and meanings of the syntagma 'anticolonialism' are examined below, albeit briefly.

Anticolonialism as a historical event is not easy to categorize, let alone describe its analytical and political power. According to the latter, Lee (2018) will argue that, its most widespread interpretation in academic structures and citizen struggles has reduced its signifier to a simple act of opposition to foreign domination. If we transfer such an argument to the epistemic contextualism in which this work is inscribed, we will argue that, our interest goes far beyond a simple dichotomous rationality incapable of unlocking the configurations that obstruct the encounter with the presence of multiple forms of literacies excluded, devalued and marginalized by the modernist alphabetic reason imputed in Abya Yala. The present work offers a reevaluation of the syntagma

to critically question the gears through which the western-centric written culture has permeated the educational structures in the region. This purpose is, in itself, a struggle against the logos, that is, the reason that knows in the imaginary zone marked as the West. At this point, it finds an intersection with decoloniality, by referring to

[...] those processes and possibilities of collective analysis, collective theorizing and collective practice, all intertwined, that help engender relational being, thinking, feeling, doing and living in a place marked by the extremes of violence, racism and patriarchy in the current matrix of global capitalism/modernity/coloniality (Walsh & Mignolo, 2018, p.37).

Its analytics

[...] studies the process of ideological and political liberation of the resistances, organizations, movements and multiple expressions of struggle that indigenous and black peoples have as their own subjects in the face of the dispossession, exploitation, oppression and racism imposed since the European conquest (Ávila-Rojas, 2021).

Anticolonial theory of reading is an operation of unlearning and interruption in the logics of production of literate knowledge. Its central purpose is to produce other epistemological performances that make it possible to overcome the traditional systems of intellectual castration imposed through the monological effect of the most widely used literacy event in this region of the world. A theory of the act of reading in an anticolonial key supposes the recognition of a political and cultural history that works against the gears of multiple world-systems. An 'anticolonial theory of reading' does not claim to create a stable meaning to explore its rationality, rather, it situates itself in a nebulous terrain that breaks with all known forms of rationality. Nor is it a theory of the indigenous conceived as a restrictive and specular otherness, one of the best-known expressions of what Ocampo (2021) calls: the ontological problem of

social groups. This construct takes ‘critical distance’ from any system of instability related to the historical context or from an analytic that refers to

[...] It is only the present time that is problematic for those who place in the indigenous the desire for a radical otherness with respect to Western culture, for as ethnohistorians and historians of the colonial period have found, the Indians of the conquest are not the same as those of pre-Hispanic times (where, strictly speaking, they did not exist), just as the Indian of the colony is not the same as that of the conquest, and so on and so forth and only using a temporal perspective. From this we conclude that it is impossible to sustain the existence of a unique indigenous subject and much less to suppose the authenticity of such or such descriptions, since plurality is imposed in all the periods of American history (Zapata, 2011, p.24).

Another mechanism of critical distance that the proposal undertakes, recognizes that this

[...] is not to turn indigenous politics into a Western doctrine of liberation; it is not a philanthropic process of "helping" those at risk and alleviating their suffering; it is not a generic term for fighting oppressive conditions and outcomes. Under the broad umbrella of social justice there may be room for all of these efforts, but none of this is decolonization (Tuck & Yang, 2012, p.21).

It is an imaginative form that meets a moving text that is, in itself, an alternative and unknown otherness. It is fighting to produce a mental change, other epistemological performances to set in motion the sublime act of affirmatively sabotaging the configurations of the literate matrix. Its purpose is to turn around any kind of onto-political and epistemic essentialism that, to a greater or lesser extent, supports research on decoloniality and literacy. We are interested in promoting an understanding that leads to the recognition of reading

[...] as a political category around which a relation of power/subordination is articulated, where the cultural factor (the undeniable diversity in the past and in the present, although with different forms and contents) is one of its elements, fundamental by the way, but not the only one, which has been used ideologically in the construction of a hegemony from the European conquest onwards, hegemony that, despite not having lasted forever and having given rise to others, created the place of inferiority and low prestige in which these groups have been placed, as can be seen in the maintenance of the category of "Indian" and "indigenous" to name this type of cultural particularity (Zapata, 2011, p.25).

The ‘anticolonial’ of reading assumes the cultural incompatibility that exists between the Western cultural world and the multiple forms of literacy and literacies that transit without recognition and cultural pertinence in the multiple structures of the educational system. Its function is to decenter a corpus of images of thought that assume such a conception of literacy in terms of “a radical cultural difference, which associates it almost exclusively with rurality, orality, nature and rituality” (Zapata, 2011, p.25). The Chilean scholar insists, pointing out that, “what is surprising, however, is that many of these premises that guided the study of the "others" are still in force” (Zapata, 2011, p.25). The anticolonial designates a field of deep contingent-structural-ontological-political dissidence, whose starting point is the ideological liberation of peoples, a kind of erasure or dislocation of the dominant alphabetic matrix, responsible for the configurations of written culture. It assumes the critical task of turning around the universalist formulation of such gears through ethnic and cultural particularity, a complex and intersectional process in favor of the ideological and political liberation of multiple collectivities, imposed through colonization, as Avila-Rojas (2021) will argue, those who by being co-opted by the Western-centric literate matrix have registered “an obstacle to define their own political and social subjectivity” (s.p.). One of their intellectual strands emerges through

[...] the contributions of the aforementioned academics and intellectuals are framed within the wide range of currents and positions of anticolonial and decolonial thinkers that have not lost their relevance in Latin American thought, especially in the face of contemporary discussions with Marxism in the region (Ávila-Rojas, 2021, s.p.).

This is a theory that must be conceived “as praxis, as walking, questioning, reflecting, analyzing, theorizing and acting-in continuous movement, contention, relationship and formation” (Mignolo & Walsh, 2018, p.19), whose task is oriented to the “discovery of new paradigms, which challenge existing theoretical theory concepts and categories that break mental constructs...as the discovery of other cosmologies...other knowledge that has been hidden, submerged, silenced” (Mignolo & Walsh, 2018, p.18). It not only fights against the onto-political regime espoused by the logos, but, assumes “the need to take seriously the epistemic force of local histories and to think theory from the political praxis of subaltern groups” (Mignolo & Walsh, 2018, p.27). Confronting the Western-centric reason of reading suggests assuming that the signifier of

[...] theory - as knowledge - derives and is derived, shaped, molded and formed in and by actors, histories, territories, and place that, whether recognized or not, are marked by the colonial horizon of modernity, and by the racialized, classified, generic, heteronormativized, and Western-Euro-American systems of power, knowledge, being, civilization, and life that this horizon has constructed and perpetuated. The production of knowledge and theory through practice and from scratch, that is, by subjects, whether or not identified as women and men, who live colonial difference, turns the dominant precept of reason and its geography and geopolitics on its head. The interest then, and paraphrasing Escobar, is to pay attention to the ways in which those who live colonial difference think theory from political praxis, theorize their own practice and take the episodes (very) seriously (Mignolo & Walsh, 2018, p.28).

Another critical task assumed by the anticolonial conception of literacy is the decolonization of the thinking that sustains the matrix of literacy, an operation traversed by diverse kinds of political practices and cultural agencies, its fields of configuration confirming the reception of diverse kinds of genealogical entanglements that migrate through contributions to the literacy matrix

[...] marxist, post-structuralist, post-modernist, deconstructivist, and authors who criticized, in common, the logic and rationality of modernity and capitalism. On the other hand, the influence of these debates had an impact on the ideas of intellectuals who called themselves Indians and blacks, as well as those of Latin American origin, concerned with thinking about ethnicity based on the problem of colonial persistence in modern societies (Ávila-Rojas, 2021, s.p.).

It does not claim creation outside of this matrix, for, as Mignolo and Walsh (2018) report, “decolonially speaking there is no outside and, therefore, decolonial thought does not claim to be a modern (or postmodern) version of God or observational science/philosophy” (p.114). To which he adds, “decoloniality is the exercise of power within the colonial matrix to undermine the mechanism that holds it in place requiring reverence. Such a mechanism is epistemic and so decolonial liberation implies epistemic disobedience” (Mignolo & Walsh, 2018, p.114).

In this conception, the act of reading is a singular displacement of senses, a process of liberation of consciousness, a system of immersion in revolutionary processes that work to decenter the configurations of the “process of ideological and political domination sustained in patterns, practices and forms of power and politics of Western modernity and Eurocentrism” (Quijano, 2008; cited in Ávila-Rojas, 2021, s. p.), imposed through the gears of written culture, which is the result of a complex structural-heterogeneous-ontological-political process of cultural subordination and ideological control, depriving multiple collectivities

of thinking, expressing and living their own practices of literate agency, demonstrating their modalities of construction of the linguistic and reading code and the intimacy of their scriptural systems. As Federici (2010) argues, the best-known literate practices are the result of “capitalist expansion, with a colonial, racist, classist and sexist logic” (Federici, 2010, p. 34). The proposal does not deny this type of phenomena, rather, it explains how they are caught in an alphabetical matrix that makes it impossible to make visible certain “power relations articulated and put in function of racism and colonial persistence” (Ávila-Rojas, 2021, s.p.).

The dominant alphabetic matrix responds to the racist colonial intersection in charge of reducing the cultural agency of multiple collectivities, reinforces the differentialism by expression and essence of the multiplicity of literacies present in the social bosom. Recognizing this fact, it assumes “the need to create institutions and a form of government that would allow the reproduction of such logic of power” (Avila-Rojas, 2021, s.p.) and, with this, it managed to affirm its identity through reading as a universalized provincialism, a “constitutive part of the epistemic privilege of Western men” (Grosfoguel 2013, p.39).

Premises for an anti-colonial theory of reading

The study of written culture assumes the need to promote a rationality that supposes a new consciousness in the handling of the language through heterological resources. A space that makes us aware of the various kinds of oppressions that take place and are silently reproduced through the colonial linguistic discourse. Indeed, the linguistic structures with which a multiplicity of student groups interact are the property of this engineering. Let's examine some crucial ideas below. Some answers that the anticolonial theory of reading tries

to offer to otherness and to the configuration of the margins are typical of subalternity.

Linguistic and, especially, reading-writing modalities are the property of high literate culture –presence of central teleological and egological principles in the understanding of an imperial epistemology–. It would be unthinkable for a literacy education curriculum to consider knowledge from cultural groups built outside of history. This fact documents a deeper methodological problem: we do not know exactly what the cultural agency of these groups is like. The only thing we must not forget is that we educators are at the service of subaltern groups, our task is to learn from their environment, to become a disciple of their cultural space. Learning how literate agencies and their events are configured in groups built outside of history or internalized by hegemonic linguistic structures, is one of the most imminent challenges in educational provisions lacking ethical responsibility. This is a task shared by educational justice, critical-transformative inclusive education and linguistic decolonization.

Such processes are the result of complex articulations of what Spivak (2010) calls: 'epistemic violence'. How is this syntagm expressed in the (neo)colonial experience of acculturation? Coinciding with the approach of Raja (2021), the constitution of the matrices of colonial-cultural insemination was materialized through two modalities. The first, fundamentally, based on the control of the land and physical violence, while the second is crystallized through an ideological-discursive device of existential impoverishment. Attribution that is produced by hijacking the existential ways of thinking, feeling and governing our own subjectivity. An anti-colonial theory of reading deconstructs conventional modes of literacy sanctioned by educational structures. In addition, it is an invitation to recover the meaning of our language, its multiple

assemblages and, very especially, the way we think through our idiomatic singularity. The work of literacy is not, exclusively, that the students effectively manage the decoding of the spellings of the dominant language, since it is widely known that such a process does not ensure a comprehensive reading of the world we inhabit and its problematic knots.

The pedagogy of this process is fed through a way of thinking about the idiomatic condition of the oppressor –the settler–. Let us remember that the problem of reading and handling the language is an area of critical tension that tells us about how we think about the world through such mental performances. The process of immersion in the written culture is nothing more than challenging the rules of intelligibility through which the colonial written culture works. The literacy conditions of our language trace intersubjective relationships that lead to an act of semiotic violence in certain groups with a presence in educational structures. We can graph this more clearly through the conditions that reify the voice-consciousness of non-readers or neo-readers. We are facing an act of functional and political disqualification of the agencies through which they build their linguistic codes. Learning to read is a way of learning to think about the world, it is something that is reinforced through various ideological strands.

Let us now examine, albeit briefly, some methodological premises linked to the construction of an anti-colonial theory of reading. To do this, we will resort to some key ideas of Paulo Freire's thought, especially with regard to his contribution to the pedagogy of the oppressed, since from it, crucial epistemological nuances emerge for the configuration of the anti-colonial theory of the reading. Some ideas about the same author are brushed around the formation of critical consciousness (CC)^{iv}. Another key idea to challenge

modern/colonial regulations on literacy. If we start from the affirmation that, on certain occasions, literacy can act in terms of a praxis of transformation or what constitutes a fully revolutionary moment, not only does it teach us to change the world and its regulatory structures. How is it possible to achieve the affirmation of being and a revolutionary process through learning to read? This question can be answered by considering that the literacy process requires that the literacy agents become disciples of the student's environment. This, with the intention of avoiding turning such a process into an oppressive cultural immersion device. It is an invitation to protect the forms of silent reproduction of injustice and oppression present in the world.

An anti-colonial theory of reading has the mission of offering a system of action-reflection about reality, emphasizing the systematic nature of inequalities and inequities in access to education in terms of injustices. This point is essential to guarantee the right to education, especially when we try to be aware of the ethical-political and relational fissures of educational provision. When we assume this, we understand that in the literacy process the subjects become subjects in expectation (Raja, 2021), it is something that allows them to solidify a new pedagogical-cultural-relational-political-ontological ethos. This fact informs the construction of an anticolonial theory of reading that the revolutionary force of the 'reading' section lies in the action, in the embodiment of it. what we enjoy defining as a habit of passionate thought. His true critical sense is lived in praxis. By no means, an anti-colonial theory of reading is a simple practice of thought characterized by the absence of any revolutionary action. Rather, they converge in their formation, action, and reflection to offer a structure, a morphology, a dynamic system of understanding literacy outside of and beyond the systematic and regenerative imputations of colonial alphabetic reason.

The instituted frameworks of literacy are, to a certain extent, expressions of the colonial deafness used to reproduce the structures of domination – conceived in terms of brakes on self-development. Literacy skills in this context become technologies at the service of the colonial matrix of power. It is a space where language is totalized. What I propose here is to offer a defetishization mechanism, that is, a rupture of the symbolic-political structure that has the strength to disrupt the cultural, symbolic-relational and reading-writing organization that has contained the organization of groups crossed by subalternity. We are facing a system of repression of their true linguistic-communicative consciousness.

[...] The coloniality of power and being, in this case linguistic coloniality, that colonial hierarchy of languages and words. The silencing of subaltern groups is due to linguistic displacement, a fact that began in the colony. But this fact not only subalternized the indigenous languages, placing them at the base of the chain of colonial domination by considering them pre-modern dialects lacking in writing, but also "the word of the speakers of these languages" was "colonized" (Garcés, 2007: 227) (Sarzuri-Lima, 2012, s.p.).

In some way, when we maintain that subalternity is a political-relational-heterogeneous-intersectional category, I am referring to a position with a mobile base, which crosses more ontological realities defined per se due to an effect of simplification and neutralization of multicultural racism. When we understand sub-motherhood, the perspective of decolonization and interculturality at the linguistic level, as a mere enhancement of the use of languages, we reduce its power to an essentialized use of the Other, a psychic-communicative and subjective apparatus of a specular nature, based on a negative attribution of being. It is not about endorsing a rhetorically complacent argument, but politically and ontologically perverse by legitimizing a reversal system in its cultural legitimacy. Sarzuri-Lima (2012) adds that, "it is believed that this act

(the empowerment), in itself, would allow the reproduction of indigenous cultures. That is, there is an essentialized relationship between language and culture” (s.p.). Language is always a contextual determinant; it is what allows us to overcome a homogeneous understanding of being. According to this, the mechanisms of immersion in the written culture do not favor real communication between its speakers. Thus,

[...] the conflict present in verbal language is much broader and more complex. Linguistic denial is not only a process of colonization; negation is present in language itself and this breaks the structural and deterministic conception of verbal language. Verbal language is not a powerful resonance box where all of us who share a language sympathize with our "equals" and build a community: "Verbal language is distinguished from other communicative codes and even more so from pre-linguistic cognitive features, because it is capable of denying all semantic content" (Virno, 2006: 18). Negation is a verbal function, you can affirm or say something, but the use of an element, the "no", takes all that affirmation to the realm of the false and the non-existent. When we deny something we do not do it in relation to its opposite and in this way we recognize the content of what is denied in other content. In any case, we deny with a non-recognition. For example, when we deny something black, we do not do so by affirming that it is white, but rather we recognize that it is not black. Negation recognizes what a certain element is not, but it will not lead us to recognize what it really is. Denial will simply take us to the place of the false and the non-existent: to the place of non-recognition. Linguistic denial neutralizes co-feeling and empathy between peers (Sarzuri-Lima, 2012, s.p.).

Immersion learning in the gears of culture is a process that is internalized through an act of denial of the cultural, relational and ontological identity of the Other. Literacy processes in terms of inclusion and educational justice are not an exclusive matter of "communication where "different" begin to dialogue. Nor can it be deduced that the subalternized "potentiates" the use of his language in

his particularity; there is a colonial matrix of valuation of languages and the word” (Sarzuri-Lima, 2012, s.p.).

The problem of the coloniality of literate practices

Coincidentally, it is argued that reading as a political-argumental project, cultural praxis and technology of power, in the intimacy of Western-centric alphabetic reason confirms a fundamentally ethnocentric and imperial configuration. Such definitional force frequently goes unnoticed in the research agendas of what counts as didactics of language and, specifically, of reading and writing. From such argumentative awareness, it is observed that the force of reading acquires an ambivalent character; that is, it moves between acknowledging its power of domination as it is conceived, while unveiling one of its main critical insidencies: the transformation and liberation of the oppressed. The use of the oppressed on this occasion alludes to the corpus of brakes to self-development that affect diverse collectivities in their interaction with multiple structures of literacy and linguistics constitutive of the world-systems. In addition to this, lexical and scriptural disdain, which have become part of a broader project of literary-writing domination, is a major obstacle to self-development.

The anticolonial theory of reading assumes “another” way of knowing, for this purpose it resorts to configuralogy, that is, “it does not use the categories created by/from the decolonial turn. It uses its own categories, and through them it detaches itself from the rhetoric of modernity and creates a new grammar, which is also decoloniality” (Ortiz, 2019, p.90). It accounts for a configurative decolonial thought that allows us to run the frame about each of the tensions outlined above, confirming that, we need an “alterative thought is configured with/from/by/for/for the other, but not to conform binas, but in the framework

of communality, which is its essential attribute. Alterative thinking is ontologically communal, teleologically decolonial and epistemologically situated” (Ortiz, 2019, p.90).

How to understand linguistic and literate relations from a decolonial and anticolonial perspective? As Veronelli (2015) explains, the coloniality of language and, as Ocampo (2021) argues, the literate plot configured in the zone of non-being, obeys to some extent deep processes of racialization, is to affirmatively sabotage the evocation of intellectual understandings regulated by the grammar of Eurocentrism, “egalitarian, participatory and communitarian methods. Anti-colonial research prioritizes participation and egalitarianism” (Carlson, 2016, p.7). The notions 'participation' and 'egalitarianism' are critically distanced from discursive effects that contribute to reinforce an image of generalized otherness, as will argue, Benhabib (2016). A fact that invites to the heterological reconfiguration of the modalities of participation betting on other coordinates of otherness. For this objective to be embodied in the intellectual project presented, it will be necessary to create imaginative questions and empathetic answers. Indeed,

[...] the ways in which the dominated or colonized culture can use the tools of the dominant discourse to resist its political or cultural control. Appropriation can describe acts of usurpation in a variety of cultures and domains, but the most potent are the domains of language and textuality. In these areas, the dominant language and its discursive forms are more relevant than the appropriated source text for expressing very different cultural experiences, and for interpolating these experiences into the dominant modes of representation to reach the widest possible audience (Ashcroft, Griffiths & Tiffin, 2007, p.15-16).

The anticolonial is a way of knowing, a device for action, participation and intervention in reality and a way of understanding the axes of configuration of

the self through the process of literacy and in interaction with various levels of complexity of its literatures. It is also, “that which deregulates colonial socio-cultural spaces as they emerge within school and education and across the myriad hegemonic institutions of society” (Simmons & Sefa, 2012, p.72).

What is the analytical-affective-relational micropolitical operation of reading and being literate in the zone of non-being? A critical knot that confronts the constitution of literate practices in this context refers to the absence - as a result of the configurations indicated above - of a community of communication, drives a new plot of argumentation between the parties, structured from assumptions of equity and horizontality. At this point, it is worth recovering the contribution of Boaventura de Sousa Santos, referring to diatopic hermeneutics, a modality in which two or more bodies of knowledge are placed on equal footing, forging “an exercise of reciprocity between cultures that consists of transforming the premises of argumentation (topoi) of a given culture into intelligible and credible arguments in another culture” (Sousa, 2009, p. 155).

The alphabetic heritage that is mostly enjoyed is an elaboration of the zone of non-being, the subjects do not live differential situations but singular forms of privilege, establishing a monocentric and linear analysis that becomes analytical practices that over-represent and homogenize the condition of abjection and its problematics. In contrast,

[...] the zone of non-being, because subjects are racialized as inferior, they experience racial oppression rather than racial privilege. Therefore, the oppression of class, sexuality, and gender experienced in the zone of non-being is qualitatively different from how these oppressions are experienced in the zone of being (Grosfoguel, 2013, p.3).

Another dimension to highlight describes the apartheid function of theoretical domains through violent methods that become systems of scriptural and reading appropriation, which are part of larger technologies of regulation in the constitution of the world, such as structural and relational oppression that condition the subjective experience of the reader. According to this, all literate practice, as well as the multiple forms of literacy, oscillate undulatingly between the zone of being and the zone of non-being, allowing us to affirm that literacy is heterogeneous and stratified,

[...] is that in the zone of non-being, in addition to the oppression that the subjects experience from the subjects in the zone of being, there are also oppressions exercised within the zone of non-being among the subjects belonging to this zone that are also stratified (Grosfoguel, 2013, p.5).

Returning to the question about the coloniality of language and literate practices, an anti-colonial theory of reading assumes that “dialogue as a project and method of resistance to the discursive one-sidedness and one-dimensionality of Eurocentrism is central to several authors working on forms of resistance to colonization” (Veronelli, 2015, p.35). The author recognizes that 'dialogue' is itself colonized; such recognition is key to move towards other forms of onto-political interactivity. In order to multifactorially understand the configurations of literate practices through coloniality it is, necessary to recognize the imposition of a global pattern of cultural power that possesses the capacity to sanction what kind of cultural action and linguistic-literary structures are legitimate and for which collectivities, submerging multiple linguistic-political and existential structures in the opacity of the act, thus reinforcing a monolingual understanding and a literacy system based fundamentally on a monolingualism that, at times, is inappropriate according to the structures of participation of diverse cultural groups. This is a symptom of

something much more complex: a silent and unknown legibility-effect of the gears of alphabetic reason and dominant written culture. Such rationality, reaffirms what Veronelli (2015), comments regarding that, “the coloniality of language blocks rational dialogic communication between colonizers and colonized, by denying the latter the communicative capacity and agency of the former” (p.36). Consequently, this contribution is inscribed in a programmatic direction of structural-relational-political transformation of the voice-consciousness of the diagram of alteration of the known literate reason.

The coloniality of language, according to Veronelli (2015), can be read in terms of “a process that accompanies the coloniality of power. It is an aspect of the process of dehumanization of populations colonized through racialization. The problem posed by the coloniality of language is the problem of the race/language relation” (p.37). It is an attempt to decenter the epistemic-ideological apparatus of modernity that proliferates from a Eurocentric policy that gives way to a singular literacy-writing policy universally adopted by various educational systems. Veronelli (2015), adds that “the Eurocentric idea of language connects language, grammar, civilization and alphabetic writing with knowledge, and naturalizes these characteristics and attributes as language ‘in the full sense’” (p.48). The scholar insists, adding that,

[...] Thus, in order to reveal how the coloniality of language - understood as one of the facets of the process of dehumanization of colonized populations - operates, a paradigmatic shift is necessary, since the concept of language implied by Renaissance and Enlightenment institutions makes it impossible to perceive the colonized-colonialized as a being with language 'in the full sense', or to think of him as anything other than a simple communicator. The paradigm shift would allow the linguistic relations of power to be revealed and explored. But the paradigmatic shift cannot be only relative, one cannot simply ignore coloniality. It is only from outside modern/colonial linguistic philosophy, ideology and politics that racialization can be

understood and revealed as a process of reduction, invisibilization and elimination of the worlds of meaning of colonized-colonialized beings. That which is outside of coloniality cannot simply be presupposed (Veronelli, 2015, p.48).

The anti-colonial theory of reading pursues the purpose of sharpening a commitment to a system of ontological inseparability that, in itself, in an affirmative policy in the understanding of the present, an act of recognition from the multiple forms that language adopts in relation to the multiple becomings and ways of knowing and participating in reality, confirming “an understanding of linguistic communities, of people who exist through language and the realization of particular ways of living together, spaces of coexistence that are (re)created and moved collectively. It shows an exteriority that did not exist before; that is, within the colonial/modern paradigm” (Veronelli, 2015, p.123). Such purpose is central to the heuristic imagination called ‘anticolonial theory of reading’, a space of receptivity oriented to investigate the acting forces of other lettrums, as well as, to assume the crisis of consciousness that multiple collectivities face in their passage through the main space of hope: the school.

The acting nature of reading in an anti/post-colonial key

It assumes the anti-colonial theory conception of reading that the section referring to ‘reading’ becomes the means through which the hierarchical structure of power sharpens its authority, has been wrested from the dominant European culture (Ashcroft, Griffiths & Tiffin, 2007). Despite this, Spanish and its alphabetic rationale have not been the object of intense political discussions, as such it has not consolidated “a practice in which language and literature have been called into the service of a deep and encompassing nationalism” (Ashcroft, Griffiths & Tiffin, 2007, p.3). Here, it should be noted what is the ideological content developed idiomatically in the colonial context and its implications in

the current intellectual debate and its relation to the liberal commitment to reading education.

In this context, reading can be conceived as a network of differences that underlie its forms of signification and/or communication, which is concretized, as Kristeva (1988) suggests, through “by and in a concrete matter and the objective laws of its organization” (p.6). Reading is a psychic and material form of language, a complicated system of elements and relations through which we interact with the world. Its operation occurs through an operation that reorganizes “the real and gives, in turn, to the speaking subject a knowledge of that real knowledge whose truth is confirmed through social praxis” (Kristeva, 1988, p.8). Reading is a field in which language is exercised, concretized and modified. This allows to conceive it in terms of a psychic device of alteration and participation.

What is the vision of language that civilization has today, the problem is that today? This question of the conditions that explain its scope beyond classical humanism and universal logic has been abandoned. How has the literacy process been thought and articulated in this key? Although reading and language are an object of specific reflection, the reason for the gears of western alphabetic reason is an opaque and scarcely crystalline question, very little discussed in academic circuits. There is a distancing of language from the intimacy of history, it is necessary to learn how to introduce it into the functioning of the cultural order. Such an operation requires learning to study the various manifestations of social praxis, this requires unveiling the problem of the functioning of Western alphabetic reason, that is to say, understanding how literacy practices have been conceived. Indeed, “if we pose the problem in this way, we will refuse to look for a supposed <<essence>> of language and we

will present the linguistic praxis through the process that has accompanied it: the reflection that it has provoked, the representation that has been made of it” (Kristeva, 1988, p.8).

Finally, the question of the agency of language and its powerful forces acting on the literacy process within the framework of a (neo)colonial project, is to recover the question of the functioning gears of the matrix of literacy legitimized by the Western-centric regime. The interest of this section, not only pursues the elaboration of a radical critique of the Eurocentric elaboration systems of alphabetic concepts, but also seeks to explore the critical potential of the agency of language deployed by the subalterns, to constitute a device of otherness in movement, a device of thinkability that allows the completion of conditions of cultural justice that such collectives have not been allowed. This refers to the thorny problem of not being able to be made literate through the gears of their own cultural reason. Such an operation must be conceived as a system of affirmative sabotage in the intimacy of the axes of regulation of the written culture.

By recognizing that the experiences of colonization have produced new modalities of literacy, establishing a specific reading-writing practice in various zones of the global south, a multipositional spatiality in which the subjects who live in it sharpen their structures of oppression and domination. In this zone crossed by multipositional intersectionalities, specific reading practices have been crystallized, often marginalized by the written culture legitimized by the educational systems. Latin Americans find themselves profoundly shaped by colonialism, and the structures of the educational system are deeply traversed by this imprint. However, its influence on the world of reading is much less evident. Although multiple forms of literacy emerge from the colonial

experience, not all of them succeed in denouncing this process of constitution, much less the imperial cultural hegemony.

The study of reading and literate practices is always a highly political subject, often used to maintain control by means of an inappropriate alphabetical reason that contributed to erase the cultural agency of multiple collectivities in their passage through education, reinforcing its liberal disguise. It is necessary to outline a series of questions to the assumptions that have contributed to this task. Indeed, anti-colonial reading theory arises from the “inability of European theory to adequately address the complexities and varied cultural backgrounds” (Ashcroft, Griffiths & Tiffin, 2002, p.11). Much of the theorizing about the act of reading is subject to the regulation of false notions of the universal, maintaining the status quo of various kinds of prejudice, as Derrida (1998), in “De gramatologie”, argues. In Derridean thought, the noun 'prejudices' alludes to the various kinds of reductionisms and essentializations in which part of Western-centered reason incurs, marginalizing various literate expressions.

Part of the operation ‘anticolonial theory of reading’ becomes a mechanism of critical distance and psychic recovery of the literate agency of multiple collectivities: memory. Both reading and writing constitute material forms of language. The anticolonial theory of reading orients its activity to the interpellation of the “universal characteristics of language, epistemologies and its value systems” (Ashcroft, Griffiths & Tiffin, 2002, p.11). It is an activity to de-center alternatively the alphabetic monocentrism that produces various kinds of ontological disorders or alphabetic identities expelled by modernist reason.

[...] Paradoxically, however, imperial expansion has had a radical destabilizing effect on its own concerns and power. In pushing the colonial world to the margins of experience, the "center" pushed consciousness beyond the point at which

monocentrism in all spheres of thought could be accepted without question. In other words, the alienating process that initially served to relegate the postcolonial world to the "margin" turned in on itself and acted to push that world across a kind of mental barrier into a position from which all experience could be seen as non-centered, pluralistic, and multifaceted. Marginality thus became an unprecedented source of energetic creativity. The impetus towards decentering and pluralism has always been present in the history of European thought and has reached its ultimate development of poststructuralism. But the situation of marginalized societies and cultures allowed them to arrive at this position much earlier and more directly (Brydon 1984b). These notions are implicit in postcolonial texts from the imperial period to the present day (Ashcroft, Griffiths & Tiffin, 2002, p.12).

The reading education practiced by the educational mainstream is the result of a deep colonial elaboration. This fact allows recognizing that everyone is colonized. The basic premise of this work recognizes that reading as a political and cultural device is a form of complicity with imperialism and colonialism. It sets out to dismantle alphabetic reason and the gears of literate culture, while keeping intact the cultural formation and ideological institutions of education and literature. It attempts to undo the pattern of affirmation of difference with the imperial center of power in its political-cultural dimension. How are the forms of literacy inherited by the imperialist regime that we have experienced integrated? The problem is that, to some extent, the configurations of alphabetic reason hide the imperial discourse within which they have been created. This kind of maneuvering is seen in various kinds of linguistic and cultural resources; so, what are the forms of legitimacy? The challenge remains to understand how part of the gears of the hegemonic literate culture operate and what kind of consequences this has for the psychic and material life of large groups of citizens in their passage through schooling.

Consider pausing the argument for a moment to enter into another analytical-methodological urgency: deciphering the signs of the post- and decolonial. Although both notions can function in parasynonymous terms, it is important to capture the differentiating axes that trace the analytics of each. As Rodríguez (2016) points out, decolonial practices have existed almost from the very moment of colonization. However, the decolonial is something much more complex. “As a reflection, it is recent with contributions from Indian, Latina, Black, and Chicana/o thinkers” (p.2), while the postcolonial is the result of diverse struggles undertaken by Eurasians of Indian and Asian origin, influenced on some average by Subalternity Studies. Nevertheless, the particles ‘de-’ and ‘post-’ that crystallize two powerful political-activist and cultural transformation movements, both stem from diametrically different socio-historical and socio-political moments.

Decoloniality orients its activity to the understanding of the colonial heritage translated through the colonial matrix of power, knowledge and being, all of them capitalist patterns. Its legacies can be mobilized between black Marxism, black feminism and Chicano studies. The postcolonial, on the other hand, inscribes its analytical

[...] in the obverse and reverse of the colonial system that was established within the empires. As Stuart Hall would say, "It is forcing us to reinterpret the very binary form in which the colonial encounter has been represented for so long. It is forcing us to reinterpret binary divisions as forms of transculturation, of cultural translation, doomed to forever disrupt the cultural binary divisions of here and there." (Hall, 2008:128). That is, it is not a local problem, but a global one. Both the decolonial and the postcolonial converge in the critique of domination and the colonial discourse established by the empires. The difference is that they start from different concrete experiences, but with the colonial backdrop as a background (Rodríguez, 2016., p.1).

How do literacy processes work in the multiversal field of the subaltern? It is not to try to understand the space of production/appropriation of unknown Other, it is necessary to train the imagination to know ourselves better (Spivak, 2018). Insists the postcolonialist theorist, asserting that, “all external attempts to address the conditions of the oppressed by speaking for them are fraught with “epistemic violence”. The oppressed, subaltern, therefore, cannot speak through another and cannot articulate for themselves” (Spivak, 2014, s.p.). Inclusion requires to know the world differently. This is one of the main obstructions to teaching inclusive education in pre- and post-graduate training for educators. It lies in something much deeper: the lack of imagination, especially of a political and epistemic kind.

Inclusion must keep the consciousness of the world active; it works against subalternity. If it is not conceived in terms of an epistemological training for the imagination to become a political, activist and activating imagination, the redesign and re-imagination of the world will happen weakly. Inclusion establishes an unrelated relationship with justice, both are not universalizable, they have to overcome the Kantian impulse of transcendentals, those things that cannot be felt. The task is to let singularity speak so that it is able to trace the universalizable within this, not to render it universal (Spivak, 2018). To make singularity universal is to commit the same epistemicide legitimized by the matrix of classical humanism: a specular and negative ontologizing system or the power of being.

Conclusions

By asserting that the anticolonial theory of reading is a device of subversion of the matrix of literacy legitimized by Western-centered rationality, it is argued that this becomes a differential movement of

consciousness and a critique, as Sandoval (2002) states, of the praxis that produces the alphabetic cultural superstructure legitimized by our times. The intention of thinking anticolonially the blocks of rationality of the alphabetic mechanisms finds a point of connection with the methodology of the oppressed developed by Sandoval (2002). Such an argumentative project makes it possible to understand how literate practices are the result of “previous social formations, and that now re-emerges as useful for all citizen-subjects who must learn to negotiate, survive and transform current social conditions into better worlds” (Sandoval, 2002, p.180). Anti-colonial theory of reading becomes a self-conscious operation by intervening in such “social praxis through the constant study of social powers and interjection into them by a new type of repoliticized citizen-warrior” (Sandoval, 2002, p.180).

The reading from an anti-colonial point of view adheres to an anti-humanist commitment and an ontology of the lesser, affirming that, every literacy process is mediated by a singular subjective materialism whose constructivist functions “perceive power as its world space, and identity as the monadic unity of power through subjectivity capable of negotiating and transforming the configurations of power” (Sandoval, 2002, p.180). It is a force that produces a system of displacements of the configuration devices of written culture by challenging our current cultural horizons by undoing the forms of consciousness produced in the framework of an indolent and marginalizing reason of the onto-political multiplicity of literate action. The differential meaning of anticolonial reading resides in the intimacy “where meaning escapes any final anchor point, slipping away to surprise or nestling within the mobile contours of power: it is part and parcel of the indefinable meaning that constantly escapes all analysis” (Sandoval, 2002, p.181). Anticolonial reading theory becomes an affirmative

solution to deal with the multiplicity of problems facing written culture and its multiple kinds of essentialisms, it is, above all, a poetic movement of consciousness towards the reverse of its gears. In short, a lack of loyalty to the dominant ideology of literacy

Notes

ⁱ This article is the result of the conference presented at the II International Colloquium on Intersectional and Postcolonial Literate Practices: subversive subjectivities and ontological disorders from other worlds, organized by the Centro de Estudios Latinoamericanos de Educación Inclusiva (CELEI), Chile, the Universidad Católica Silva Henríquez (UCSH), Chile, the Universidad Nacional de Córdoba (UNC), Argentina, the Pontificia Universidad Javeriana (PUJ), Colombia and the INIDE of the Universidad Iberoamericana, Mexico, on May 27-28 and June 3, 2021.

ⁱⁱ First research center created in Chile and Latin America and the Caribbean, dedicated to the theoretical and methodological study of Inclusive Education, it articulates its activity from an inter-, post-, and para-disciplinary perspective. It is a member center of the Latin American Council of Social Sciences (CLACSO) and an institution affiliated to the International Consortium of Critical Theory Programs (ICCTP).

ⁱⁱⁱ Heuristic Palimpsest is a concept developed by Ocampo.

^{iv} The critical consciousness articulated by Freire constitutes a way to break the gears of such endemic inequalities constitutive of our world-system. What I am trying to show is the transformative potential of reading and, particularly, how the process of immersion in written culture could contribute to producing positive social change at various levels of cultural participation. What is expected is that, “a person with a high level of transformative potential reflects critically on the conditions that shape her life and actively works with herself and/or with others to change her problematic conditions” (Jemal, 2017, s.p.).

References

- Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G. & Tiffin, H. (2007). *Post-colonial Studies. The Key Concepts*. London: Routledge.
- Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G. & Tiffin, H. (2002). *The Empire Writes Back. Theory and practice in post-colonial literatures*. London: Routledge.
- Avila-Rojas, O. (2021). *Anti or decolonialism in Latin America? A current debate*. Retrieved September 17, 2021 from: https://sociedadyeconomia.univalle.edu.co/index.php/sociedad_y_economia/article/view/10669/14064
- Bal, M. (2021). *Lexicon for cultural analysis*. Madrid: AKAL.
- Benhabib, S. (2010). *The self and the other in contemporary ethics feminism, communitarianism and postmodernism*. Barcelona: Gedisa.
- Derrida, J. (1998). *On grammatology*. Mexico: Siglo XXI Editores.
- Carlson, E. (2016). Anti-colonial methodologies and practices for settler colonial studies. *Settler Colonial Studies*, 1-23. Retrieved April 09, 2021 from: <https://mra-mb.ca/wp->

- content/uploads/ElizCarlsonAnti-colonial-methodologies-and-practices-for-settler-colonial-studies1-copy.pdf
- Federici, S. (2010). *Caliban and the Witch. Women, body and original accumulation*. Madrid: Traficantes de Sueños.
- Grosfoguel, R. (2013). *The decolonization of knowledge: critical dialogue between the decolonial vision of Frantz Fanon and the decolonial sociology of Boaventura de Sousa Santos*. Retrieved August 27, 2021 from: <http://www.boaventuradesousasantos.pt/media/RAMON%20GROSFOGUEL%20SOBRE%20BOAVENTURA%20Y%20FANON.pdf>
- IFAS. (2020). *The Institute*. Retrieved March 03, 2021 from: <https://affirmativesabotage.org/en/the-institute/>
- Jemal, A. (2017), Critical Consciousness: A Critique and Critical Analysis of the Literature. *Urban Rev.* 2017 Nov; 49(4): 602–626.
- Kristeva, J. (1988). *Language, that unknown. Introduction to linguistics*. Madrid: Editorial Fundamentos.
- Lee, J. (2018). *Anti-Colonialism: Origins, Practices, and Historical Legacies*. Retrieved March 24, 2021 from: <https://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198713197.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780198713197-e-24>
- Mignolo, W. & Walsh, K. (2018). *On decoloniality. Concepts, analytics, praxis*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Ocampo, A. (2017). *Epistemology of inclusive education*. Granada: UGR.
- Ocampo, A. (2021). Epistemology of inclusive education: neo-materialist tensions for an unknown world. *Revista Psicología Em Fase*, 2(2), 1-23.
- Ortiz, A. (2019). Decolonial Altersofía and Doing: 'other' epistemology and 'other' ways of knowing and loving. *Latin American Utopia and Praxis*, vol. 24, no. 85, 89-116.
- Raja, W. (2021). Webinar: *Dislodging the Colonial Linguistic Legacies*. Riphah University Conference Keynote. Retrieved on February 03, 2022 from: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-ZswUS2iJEM&t=947s>
- Rodríguez, A. (2016). *Difference between decolonial and postcolonial*. Retrieved October 30, 2021 from: <https://www.revistasur.cl/revistasur.cl/2016/05/perspectivas-y-cuestiones-decoloniales/>
- Sandoval, Ch. (2002). *Methodology of the oppressed*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.
- Sarzuri-Lima, M. (2012). From word to text: linguistic coloniality and intercultural struggles. *Rev. of Inv. Educ.*, vol.5, n.1, 59-85.
- Simmons, M. & Safe, G. (2012). Reframing anti-colonial theory for the diasporic context. *Postcolonial Directions in Education*, 1(1), 67-99.
- Sousa, B. (2009). *An epistemology of the south: the reinvention of knowledge and social emancipation*. Mexico: Siglo XXI/Clacso.
- Spivak, G. (2010). *Critique of postcolonial reason. Towards a history of the evanescent present*. Madrid: Akal.

- Spivak, G. (2014). *Interview*. Retrieved March 05, 2021 from:
<https://lasdisidentes.com/2015/07/25/entrevista-a-gayatri-chakravorty-spivak/>
- Spivak, G. (2018). Inaugural conference. *Affirmative sabotage*. Delivered on February 26, 2018 at the European Roma Institute for Arts and Culture. Accessed on March 02, 2021:
<https://www.yth.wiki/european-roma-institute-for-arts-and-culture-M7GIWRDx94s.htm>
- TucK, E. & Yang, W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1-40.
- Veronelli, V. (2015). On the coloniality of language and saying. *Universitas Humanistica*, 81(81). <https://doi.org/10.11144/Javeriana.uh81.scdl>
- Zapata, C. (2011). *Difference, colonialism and anticolonialism. Indigenous intellectuals in Ecuador, Bolivia and Chile*. Doctoral dissertation. Santiago: Universidad de Chile.

Author Details

Aldo Ocampo González, inclusive education theorist. PhD in Educational Sciences, University of Granada, Spain. Institutional affiliation: Centro de Estudios Latinoamericanos de Educación Inclusiva (CELEI), Chile. E-mail: aldo.ocampo@celei.cl. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6654-8269>.

Genoveva Ponce-Naranjo, writer and researcher, PhD candidate in Educational Sciences, University of Granada, Spain. Institutional affiliation: Universidad Nacional de Chimborazo, Riobamba-Ecuador. E-mail: gponce@unach.edu.ec. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9631-5474>