

Asking for the difference: questions on inclusion

Carlos Skliar *

* PhD. Of Phonology with Posdoctoral studies on Education Latin Americal School of Social Studies, Flacso Office, Argentine. Email: skliar@flacso.org.ar.

Cómo citar : Skliar, C.(2015). Preguntar la diferencia: cuestiones sobre la inclusión. Revista Sophia. vol 11 (1) p 33-43

Abstract

The purpose of this work is to analyze some dimensions of equity problem in education of our continent, special mention is made on Argentine situation, and relate such question to certain fundamentals, practices and reality of education named 'inclusive' in most countries of the continent. For such purpose, we will take as a reference the National Law on Education (Nr.26026, 2006), quantitative and qualitative data surged from the UN World Report "The right of disabled individuals to education¹", as well as some parts of reports by teachers during focus interviews on images found in educational sceneries on some "different" students, diversity, difference, and value attributed to school cohabitation. The main interest of the article is to establish what type of perceptions surges from programs and experiences on inclusion performed in the country, and which intention has been to turn educational environments into more equitable in Argentine and Latin America of the last decade.

Key words: Difference; diversity, equity, inclusion.

1.Application of Resolution 60/251 of the UN General Assembly, March 15, 2006, titled "The of disabled individuals to education. InforNos of the Special Reporter on the right to education" Vernor Muñoz.

Introduction

Brief historical considerations

Influenced by a strong bibliographic presence and technical assistance by some European countries (in particular Spain and, lastly, England and the United States), the speech and integrating and inclusive practices in Argentine and the rest of the continent, are of recent data. Perhaps the origin may be established around the early 90s of the last century, in coexistence with appearance and application of neo-liberal policies on education which, paradoxically but not so much, resulted in a huge amount of new excluded.

Although a detailed study has not been made yet on the influence of international networks on pedagogic innovation linked to inclusive education (perhaps with exception of studies by De Vega, 2008), a determining role was exercised, as well as in the whole continent, by texts that surged from the World Conference on Education for All of Jomtien (UNESCO, 1990), from the Convention on Rights of the Child (1990) and, with major emphasis, from the Salamanca Declaration (1994).

The influence of such bibliography and the resulting pedagogic assistance, basically consisted of deploying a series of material and resources to train teachers, documents and informative meetings, which all converged in the insistence for attention to diversity of the students, first, from an integrating sight (with emphasis on characteristics of subjects to be integrated), and then, from an *including* perspective still in effect (emphasizing on modifications to be made to school environment).

State agencies, such as the Ministry of Education nationwide and regional ministries of each province and nation, have started to join the international educational spirit in order to resolve inequity problems, ensure inclusive education, design strategies for diversity and for cohabitation, etc. The legal arrangement developed in the last years, has promoted a series of discussions on pedagogic transformation, and encouraged conviction for a new educational thought parting from two order words: equity and inclusion.

In fact, the new Law of National Education of Argentine (Law 26026, 2006), provides that:

The national State, Provinces and the Autonomous City of Buenos Aires, bear the main and non-delegable responsibility of providing integral, permanent and quality education for the whole population of the Country, ensuring equality, freeness, and equity in exercising this right, through participation of social organizations and families²(Law 26026, 2006: 2).

If the first statement makes the State as the one responsible for educational equality and equity, such statement becomes more detailed along its specific articles. Article 11, for example, provides that the purpose and objective of the national educational policy are those of ensuring education under equal opportunity and possibilities, without regional unbalance, or social inequity. It also states that equity should also include allocation of funds. Article 48, in turn, includes in its basic approaches and contents equality of genre, and cultural diversity.

It is clear that in the legal language of the new National Law, the notion of equity/inequity is related to equality/inequality, and that the State becomes responsible for the task of mitigating historical and cultural effects of inequality (regional, economic, etc.)

¿What happens with inclusion in the text of the new law?

Permanent reference is made to it as the action, both universal and particular, that should resolve inequity problems, but, as it will be seen, such formula is not still clear, neither involved pedagogic processes nor essential characteristics of teacher formation plans which may account for such transformation. It is mentioned the role to access and dominion of the new technology as a method of inclusion of information in the society. In addition, notwithstanding the fact that the idea of equity is stated in global and non-specific terms, here inclusion seems to be centered in determined priority populations: the most privileged sectors of the society, adolescents and no-school attendant young individuals, inmates, homeless boys and girls, and disabled population.

² It is worth to remember that this Law was the product of an intense discussion among the various education agents: teacher community, government officials, families, unions, etc, performed along two years in various regional contexts.

Regarding disabled population, Article 42 of the Law defines that:

Special Education is the mode of the education system aimed at ensuring the right to education of temporal or permanent disabled individuals, in every level and mode of the Education System. Special Education is governed by the principle of educational inclusion (...)

Special Education provides educational care in every specific problems which may not be approached by common education” And then, Article 43, provides that: “Provinces and the Autonomous city of Buenos Aires, within articulation of management levels and functions of the agencies (...) shall establish procedures and the corresponding resources for early identification of education needs derived from disability or development alterations, in order to provide individuals with interdisciplinary and educational care to achieve their inclusion from the Initial Level. (Law 26026, 2006:4)

The legal provision nationwide is clear: there is an initial situation of educational inequity, inclusion should be the forcible and effective response to such degraded context, and a particular attention is established for individuals who do not attend school, and for disabled individuals as well.

More recently, (April 2009), Buenos Aires city has also prepared a new law related to educational inclusion, emphasizing on the need of integrating to common education, on interdisciplinary basis, those students facing special education need in all levels and modes, whenever possible. The resolution suggests that “educational inclusion” is a process that should be managed within a network of agreements and interventions to benefit target population, and empowers a Central Cabinet to make final decisions on this matter³.

¿What conclusions may be drawn at this point on the concept of educational equity and inclusion found in the legal debate?

3. It is worth to mention, that, for example, according to data from NGO “Acceso ya” (www.accesoya.gov.ar), in Buenos Aires there are 21000 motor-disabled children in school age, who do not have access to state schools. The same organization has denounced that, in 2006, nationwide, 95% of private schools, and 75% of state schools did not provide access to such population needing it.

Equity surges here as concept of related to an educational diagnostic, an attempt to deeply modify material structures, and an expression of desires placed in the future (when there is inequity, the horizon should be, by force, equity). And inclusion takes the shape of remedy or cure, the change from inequity to equity.

There is no doubt about the reliability and enthusiasm dedicated during the last years in order to change such a situation historically stained of inequality and lack of educational justice. This enthusiasm seems to be concentrated, in particular, in search for various modes of education, in order to promote a legal framework suitable to place inclusive practices into operation. In addition, there has been a great presence of non-government organizations-NGO that, specially committed to defend the right of infancy and disabled individual to education, have been able to perform concrete tasks, which scope, meaning and evaluation, have not been conveniently studied yet. There is also at universities a relative interest in the study and cultural theorization about inclusive education (most of the times just resulting from a replacement of classic studies on “Special Education”, on vague studies on “Attention to diversity”, and, in addition, investigation mostly concentrated on middle education. The perspective assumed by studies derived from special education, (either renewed or not, both in their epistemological statements and in their practice), has led toward some investigations dealing with classroom situations, or centered on individual cases, or based on teachers narration about experience on inclusion. (for example, Dubrovsky, et al 2005).

This arrangement of actions (State actions, NGO and academic), has not been able to change a problematic situation of school educational inequality and exclusion/expulsion. It is worth to discuss, however, whether legal conditions, state policies, and academic research, impact so directly education practice, or whether they also depend on other variables somehow different, such as teacher labor situation, their job conditions, spaces for discussion and reflection at academic institutions, search for and the possibility of an academic formation which accounts for current transformation of school population, diversity conceptions spread within a particular

culture, speeches on disability and, more recently on differences, which surge at school contexts, etc.

It is true that, as seen below, inequity continues to undermine education in the region, and educational inclusion, specially regarding Middle School, and disabled population, the weakest of all populations considered as “diversity”, even today is a pending subject matter.

Situation of educational inclusion of disabled school population

Taking into account data provided by the last World Report on the right to education of disabled children and young population, it may be stated that results on the situation of inclusive education are, at least, dramatic, very similar among Latin American countries (perhaps, except Costa Rica and Cuba, but because of different reasons), and most African countries.

The first thing to consider is related to the shortage and absence of information on educational situation of disabled children and young individuals in the region. Such shortage may be interpreted in various ways, but it always seems to show disregard and negligence by public policies to approach background and suffering of disabled individuals, in school age, and their family. Ignoring what happens with certain population in the education scenery is already a part of the diagnostic of the situation.

The answers to the UN questionnaire in Argentina are eloquent regarding the political dimension, even when stated that they were created previously to the recently mentioned process on issuance of the National Law of Education.

Regarding the item “Availability” for inclusion, both governments and NGOs answered that:

There is a lack of a national program of inclusive education which promotes policies at every education level. Parents should play a very active role, even filing legal petitions. There are itinerating interdisciplinary teams in some provinces. Their efficacy and continuity are subject to fund availability for transfers, which decreased since the economic emergency in 2001 (Resolution 60/251 of the UN General Assembly, 2006:37).

There is no information on the percentage of benefited schools, the number of specialized institutions, and existence of any other education alternatives, for this population in particular.

Regarding the item “Accessibility”, the answers state that:

Still 70% of school buildings do not have any type of facilities for motor-disabled individuals, and that physical barriers are higher in middle education. That provision of the certificate of disability, which allows free access to public transportation, is delayed. That there is a marked trend to segregated education, and that there is no research on comparative desertion quotient (disabled/non-disabled children), and to comparative school success or failure (disabled/non-disabled children – regular/special education) (Resolution 60/251 of the UN General Assembly, 2006:38).

Answers to the item “Acceptability” may be summarized as follows:

Priority Learning Nucleus include tolerance and respect for the difference. There are performance evaluations to students in general at regular schools, but not at special schools. Teachers formation in general does not include this topic. (Resolution 60/251 of the UN General Assembly, 2006:39).

Finally, regarding item “Adaptability”, the following is the information:

The Federal Law of Education provides for participation in preparing guides for education policies, and the parents’ right to participate in organizations to support education management. Incorporation of disabled children to schools still depend on decisions made by directors and teachers (Resolution 60/251 of the UN General Assembly, 2006:40).

¿How to read this information, when most of educational situation is ignored and/or unknown, and when information at the base of the description of the situation is, just, a legal vague statement?

Firstly, as mentioned no another projects⁴, a separation is revealed between the legal language and ethic responsibility linked to educational inclusion. In those changes strictly initiated parting from formal-legal regimes related to education for all individuals, and school inclusion, it may be clearly seen that that legal formal recognition do not turn into effective practices which ensure a quality deserving system for children and young individuals facing any disability. And the main problem perhaps results from ignoring where this population is located, those at special institutions, those at regular schools, and specially, those not within the educational system.

When both languages become unreconcilable, or when legal language results being the sole mode to express a non-discrimination policy, of acceptance and recognition toward difference, inclusion may be seen rather as a non-desirable or improper effort or impossible for the regular system of common of teaching. Therefore, in inclusion ethic language may not be subordinated, to rhetoric of the law, because there is first a universal responsibility regarding the other, a capital law which is expressed as a concern before any other, either be disabled or not. The above is not enough to confirm the great progress achieved in the legal recognition, or the same existence of an adapted and fair legal system toward disabled individuals. However, if a course were designed involving the four main questions derived from the World Report in Argentine, and the other countries of the continent, that is: ¿Is there a proper legal context? ¿Funding for public policies is coherent with that context? ¿What percentage of disabled population is included? ¿What tracking programs have been created?, it becomes necessary to state that:

1. The legal system ensuring educational rights of disabled individuals is perfect, and has achieved its maximum expression in legal terms, specially after the International Convention.

2. There has been in our countries financing levels relatively suitable, but, perhaps, they are not directly related to the content and purposes promoted by legal tests regarding inclusion. It is clear that the question of financing for public policies on education should be carefully discussed. However, it is possible to claim

4. For example in Skliar (2007) and Skliar & Téllez (2009).

that in most of the cases they have been used almost exclusively to implement partial, ambiguous, and insufficient mechanisms for teacher training, but not, for example for research or promotion of improvement of life conditions of disabled individuals, or, even, to improve labor conditions of educators.

3. There is a very low percentage of disabled individuals of school age, effectively included in the education system, independently from any obvious division between special education and common education, or if a unique registry is performed in the general level of teaching.

4. There are no, at least according to information stressed so far, projects for tracking and guide for inclusion projects for disabled population within the education system.

From the most succinct reading of these conclusions, it is possible to claim that: Rights are ensured, there is certain specific financing, inclusion percentage of this population is not higher, according to the report, than 1 to 5%, and there no a policy for educative tracking in order to evaluate not only the presence, but, specially, existence of disabled students in the education system (Skliar, Stubrin & Gentili, 2007).

Teachers' narrations on inclusion and cohabitation in education

Along two school years (2007-2009), a group conversation has been realized with teachers in Buenos Aires, from the three types of existing institutions: special schools, recovery schools, and regular schools. Such conversations were held each fifteen days, video-taped, and material of each meeting was discussed in a next conversation.

The purpose of the research has not been characterizing the nature of speech, or narrative structure of teachers, or their "social representations", but rather, to understand the tone used in speaking of inclusion, diversity and educative cohabitation, that is, how it is talked on inclusion, what emphasis is made, what things appear to surge along the conversation, when what is at stake is, to feel, and think about questions such as the meaning of involved words, difference of perspectives, common axles and different among the various professionals.

Some ideas developed on the conversation have been taken as a theoretic reference, for example, Larrosa (2005), and Morey (2007). Both authors are concerned about costumes used to cover ideas and words turning around them, they procure the distant filiation among the what to say, or who says, and how what was said is disseminated; scrupulously they attend the institutional masks intended to regulate and manage, and by so doing, to destroy the conversation; they feel uncomfortable of conversation simulations daily occurring in supposedly academic language; they seem to say that every conversation should prohibit the “why do I say it” and the “and what about you”, in order to just become, a conversation. As if it were a matter of abandoning the idea that talking is just a double monologue of two “I”, always in a parallel but never touch each other, that is, that never affect each other.

Some of the initial questions which encouraged organization of this group and contents of the conversations were the following: ¿What journeys, what ways, what courses, what stories, lead to think regarding inclusive education, and education cohabitation? ¿Which texts, what literature, what materials are configured as specific and available? ¿What relationship is made or intended to be made on the need of educative change: reorganizations, traditions, paradigms, transformation of oneself, of others? ¿What decisions and which responsibilities are placed at stake?

These questions changed their physiognomy, and their statute, and then, other different ones started to surge. For example, and in words of some teachers: ¿Does it surge the need of thinking inclusion from outside, from an affixed disciplinary configuration, which insistently wants to become a novelty? ¿perhaps, wouldn't it have to be said, that such approach, that closeness to educative inclusion, and cohabitation talks by itself of a determined proximity for educative scene itself? Isn't it in that scene, just, where encounters, and disencounters, conflicts and passion, mysteries, affectivity, and indolence, care, and lack of concern for the other? ¿Isn't just there where it is perceived singularity, change, diversity and multiplicity of learning, the need for determined relationship for the “among us”, hospitality and hostility, the same place where occurs what we call

from “knowing” and from educative “experience”? ¿is it necessary the thematic, and the words inclusion and cohabitation, a specific formation, a particular language, and a singular curriculum for diversity? ¿how is it included the (notion, idea, experience, topic, definition, presentation, discussion, intention, materiality, policy, practice of the) inclusion and cohabitation in education?

What it is interesting to portray here is exactly concentrated in these transformations of the initial questions into other ones quite different, which denote an interesting discussion, characterized by three main questions: a) the problem on the origin of the idea of inclusion and cohabitation (pure exteriority and/or pure interiority); b) the strongly rational dimension of pedagogic processes; c) the “scenographic” character which teachers look at the education experiences at, and over all, d) transformation of a question asked such as ¿what happen with inclusion (cohabitation, the difference, etc.)?, toward another quite different: ¿what happen to us with inclusion (with cohabitation, the difference, etc.)?

That change of accent, is, no doubt, a change of posture in the conversation, since it does not refer to, or it is not interested in a category, a concept, a definition, an axiom; it rather seeks and wants to know something about our experience and our relationship with everything, it intends to listen to intimacy and interiority, learn what it resonates, (if resonates), what reverberations it has (if so), what echoes it causes on others (if so).

Questions recently asked are seen, in a great of the conversations, through appearance of images of inclusion, diversity, difference and cohabitation, related to teachers with various ways of conceiving inclusion to different “doors” or “openings.” Image of metaphor of the “door” is not new and presents an obviousness: a closed door shows no accessibility of the impossibility (or negation) of entering; the open one, suggests an opening to those who are not in the institutions. From the point of view of certain comprehension of ethics⁵ the idea of “open” bears a relevance: it supposes “opening” oneself to the other, opening toward what comes from the other, opening toward existence of the other.

5See Joan-Carles Mèlich (2001); Fernando Bárcena (2001).

The three images of inclusion and opening surged from the above mentioned conversations would be the following: the image of open-doors inclusion, through gyratory doors and through metal-detector doors. All of them refer to three different experiences. The one of those institutions which open their doors, or which were already open, or which do not consider their existence, and do not request or require anything from the arriving one (in agreement with ideas of unconditional hospitality, found in Jacques Derrida's work⁶); the one of institutions that allow anyone in particular to enter, and that, in the same movement, also exclude him, or expel him, because generally do not have or do not prepare projects specific for any kind of students; and schools that, previously to open their doors, perform an exhaustive "diagnostic" of the new-arriving one, or about to arrive (¿who are you? ¿what language do you speak? ¿what is your name? ¿how do you learn? ¿what do you have? ¿what do you want from us?)

We have mentioned the idea of hospitality. In our conversations with teachers, the idea of inclusion moved from a formula full of conditions (conditions generally attributed to certain traits of students and their family), toward a notion related to attention, availability, receptivity, that is, hospitality. Such change of perception is transcendental, not only because it refers to an individual ethic and institutional (which should suppose hosting everybody, anyone, any other⁷), and in addition because it involves a capital responsibility, but not simply a supposed personal virtue, or a mechanic pedagogic practice, or a just legal formula. On this matter, one of the teachers brought to the conversation the following phrase of Maurice Blanchot:

Responsibility or obligation to Mankind, which does not come from the Law, but which would come from them in which makes it irreducible to any way of legality through the ones which necessarily it is sought to regulate it by fully declaring it as the exception or the extraordinary, which is not claimed in any language already stated (Blanchot, 1999:104)⁸

6 For example in *De la hospitalidad*, Buenos Aires, Ediciones de la Flor, 2001.

7 As José García Molina states in "Images of distance", Barcelona: Laertes, 2008.

Educative cohabitation was discussed during such conversations, one of the most problematic features found in daily life of Argentinian schools – and also in the rest of the continent, and it was suggested joint reading of UNESCO text: "Learning to live together: ¿have we failed"?⁹.

At a first sight the title states for teachers a substantive question and associated to a rhetoric question of an ambiguous answer, specially because it involves a "we" (have we failed), hard to attribute. The central question, that "learning to live together" directly refers to *Delors Report* (1996), where a "necessary utopia" is defined supported by four pillars of learning for education of XXI Century: learning to know, to do, to be, and live together, live with others. This last pillar is detailed in that report as follows:

[...] means development of comprehension of others within a spirit of tolerance, pluralism, respect for difference, and peace. Its central point is achieving conscience – thanks to activities such as common projects or conflict management, of growing independence (ecologic, economic, social) of individuals, communities and nations within an increasingly smaller world, fragile and interconnected". (Blanchot, 1999:28-29).

¿How teachers read this paragraph in particular? The language of the text in question is well known for them, because of has been tireless reproduced in other related reports, and in speeches perhaps more academically pretentious: It would not deal with the "living together", but learning to do so; it is true that learning cohabitation is strengthened, but the aim is on the others; it is true that it deals with cohabitating, although the principal action is tolerating; it is talked of community just as differences are respected (¿differences of the others?). That is why a good part of the substantive expression fades, evaporates, in the expression of we-others duality; and it is lost, disappears, just because although reference is made to the others, it is just the "we" the one capable of designing and describing, the one aware of its own thought, the one capable of a speech.

Once placed in the introduction, the title varies a little or, better said, enlarges toward other rhetoric:

9 UNESCO (2001) ¿Learning to live together: ¿have we failed? 46th International Conference on Education, Geneva, September 5-8.

“Education for all people to learn to live together in the XXI Century: ‘need, hypocrisy, or utopia?’”. What draws teachers’ attention is that after questioning for an alleged failure, or after asking a question that can hardly be answered by a flat “no”, everything in the text turns over opposition among “need”, “hypocrisy”, “utopia”.

The following are the questions surged from this conversation in particular: ¿Have the need of living together failed, that is, isn’t it necessary for us to live together? ¿Has living together failed because it is a hypocrisy holding that it is possible? ¿Has utopia failed because, in the end, it is not more than a utopia? ¿Has the school failed because “all” will never be? ¿or, has education failed, because it did not create the need, did not erase hypocrisy, or did not support the utopia of living together?

In response to these questions the group considered the need of inquiring even more on the senses involved in the expression “inclusion”, and “cohabitation”, by searching for another bibliographies, and including in the discussion those text by Jean-Luc Nancy, Jacques Derrida and Nuria Perez de Lara.

Nancy’s selected text defines that:

Being in common, or being together, and even simpler or more direct being among others, is being in the affection: being affected, and affect (...). It is being touched, and touch. “Contact” – closeness, and friction, encounter and collision, is the fundamental mode of affection (Nancy 2001:51).

Derrida’s selected text asks:

¿Is it possible teaching to live? And even more: ¿is it possible teaching to live and cohabitare? ¿Is it possible learning to live? ¿Is it possible to teach? ¿is it possible to learn, through discipline or training, through experience or experimentation, to accept, or, better, to affirm life? (Derrida, 2007:12)

Perez de Lara’s text suggests that:

And it is that, or inclusion has been for me: habitual practice of mutual disregarding of oneself and the other; mutual disregarding between men and women, mutual disregarding among the deaf and listeners, between non-disabled and disabled ones, between the ones here and those there... ¿is there another way of including? ¿is it possible to

think inclusion of differences in any way which does not mean disregarding? (Perez de Lara, 2009:78)

In general, these three citations raised the following final reflections of the conversation group among teachers:

1. There is no educative cohabitation without affection, without affecting, and being affected.
2. Affection does not refer just to empathy, harmony, and non-conflictivity, images which it permanently remains associated to. Inclusion and cohabitation are related, over all, to friction and conflictivity.
3. It is possible to teach how to cohabitare, but not parting from leaflets or ingenuous formulas: it is a matter, over all, of affirming the life of the other, and any other.
4. Inclusion does not have to do with meeting the other, parting from technical devices and/or rationales already established, but related to entering into an educative relationship mutually unknown.

Conclusions

The question for equity, inclusion and differences is new in Latin American Education systems. New, and in a certain mode, confusing. Notwithstanding being already known that our region is the most unequal, attempts to end this situation do not seem to be firm of definitive, by positively valuating immense efforts already made from public policies regarding questions such as universal access to teaching, school retention plans, introduction of new technology, policies and legal systems which promote inclusion of all kinds of population into the school public system.

But: ¿What effects of meaning have produced all of these changes in images and speeches by teachers? ¿How do they talk about it? ¿How do they affect their practices?

This research has attempted to make one more step, by considering organization of a conversation group within education institutions, which may support along the time their questions, discomfort, confusion, and affirmations.

All teachers involved in group conversation had undergone an individual interview. Particular interest was placed on such change produced in their narration during this passage. From development of such conversation along the time, it is possible to confirm the following findings:

a) The most interesting change and deserving to be narrated produced in the change from individual interview to group interview is the passage from a problematic centered on the difference as “the different one” to the need of thinking what “being together” means at education institutions.

b) Perhaps this passage is justified by the change in the stated dynamics, especially on the need of taking perspective not so detailed – centered on the individual – or obsessive – centered on his alleged difficulties – and assume postures where the look becomes somehow more expanded, in a sort of “expanded horizon”.

c) In the passage from the alleged individual difficulty to the sense of a more general scene, it is also interesting to highlight how professional distinguish a more formal term such as the cohabitation from a more meaningful expression such as “being together”.

d) In the first group interview the image of difference has been considered as related not to an individual but to a relationship. However, this passage does not end to embody, and continues to be a cause of confusion and doubt, or conceptual insufficiency.

e) It is interesting to remark that even sustaining an idea of the difference in individual terms or specific, there is the possibility of a deep and honest conversation on the meaning implied on being-together at education institutions. Perhaps it is because in the passage from an image to the other (from the difference to being-together), in certain mode the pretention to characterize the individual identity dilutes,

and advance to the possibility of thinking on educative actions themselves.

f) In fact, the tone of the conversation on being-together has allowed to bring some discussions on naturalized topics and, therefore, not thought about again.

g) The last meeting allowed to prepare a set of meaningful phrases for the group, regarding this mentioned passage between the individual character and being together, emphasizing much more on the last expression, and assigning it a series of interesting contents to continue thinking: being together does not make any sense if it would not implied feeling and thinking what happens among us; it does not bear a moral value by itself; it speaks of a limit but not of a fusion or an assimilation; it does not suppose any determination or any legal obligation but it refers to a certain mode of thinking educative ethics; it speaks more on equality than formal policy, being together supposes at the same time hospitality and hostility; it places in suspense the idea of tolerance or simple acceptance or recognition of the other.

Contradictions are at sight, and it is possible that it is necessary to think of a long educative way, in order to be able to state that we are in front of an equitable and inclusive system in the region. To the question of a certain formative tradition and excessive distrust for the juridical reason, another central problem was added, which could be named differentialism (Skliar, 2003). This discussion could remain reflected in, at least, two insisting questions in the pedagogic scope of our Country: ¿Is educative inclusion related to equity, equality and to difference? ¿Or is it related to equity, equality or – in opposition – strictly to difference?

It is worth and necessary to describe an intend to explain here a habitual confusion found in education field, derived from the use of term “differences”, regarding other similar term: the “different” ones. It is believed that the “different” ones are subjects pointed out as such, as a result of a long process of construction and differential invention. This

process is called “differentialism”, this is, a method of categorization, separation, and decrease of some identity marks regarding the ample and chaotic group of human differences. The “differences”, whatever they are, may never be described as better or worse, superior or inferior, good or bad, normal or abnormal, etc. The fact that some identities or identity marks are considered as different, suggests that a certain type of differentialism has been produced, that is, that they are considered as negative, and are opposed to the idea of the normal, of normality. Differentialism, besides being a political process, becomes a cultural and educative trap, which makes that, for example, women are considered as the different one in the question of genre, black people as the ones different in race, children and the elder as different of age, deficient ones as different to corporal, learning and language, etc. normality.

It is worth to insist once again on that: the idea of difference could be being use as a value, but the term “different” ends to be used as an indication toward the “abnormal” ones. Perhaps, the following ethic posture should be considered as valid: “in differences there are no different subjects”. If we talk about of the differendes of body, all bodies are a part if it; if we talk about differences of learning, all ways of production and comprehension are over there. However, there is always a sutile derivation of the difference toward the different ones, as if we were able to mention the differende by itself, and we would refer to anomalous subjects, object of a permanent correction. In many education sceneries of our country, a process of inclusion has been placed into operation, but at a good part of them with a strong obsession for the different ones. However, difference is among subjects, not in the interior, or nature of the subject. And that is a paradigmatic change, which at our judgment, has not been made yet: An ethic transformation which moves from the look on those subjects regarded as different, and pass to be a look on us, on everything that happens – pedagogically – among us, for example, in inclusion and educative cohabitation.

Bibliographic references

- Bárcena, F.** (2001). *La esfinge muda. El aprendizaje del dolor después de Auschwitz*. Barcelona: Anthropos.
- Blanchot, M.** (1999). *La comunidad inconfesable*, Madrid: Arena Libros.
- De la Vega, E.** (2008). *Las trampas de la escuela integradora*. Buenos Aires: Noveduc.
- Derrida, J.** (2001). *De la hospitalidad*. Buenos Aires: Ediciones de la Flor.
- (2007). *Aprender (por fin) a vivir*, Buenos Aires: Amorrortu Editores.
- Dubrovsky, S.** (2005). *La integración escolar como problemática profesional*. Buenos Aires: Noveduc.
- García Molina, J.** (2008). *Imágenes de la distancia*. Barcelona: Editorial Laertes.
- Larrosa, J.** (2006). Una lengua para la conversación. En Jorge Larrosa & Carlos Skliar (Coord.): *Entre pedagogía y literatura*: Buenos Aires: Editorial Miño y Dávila, pp. 25-40.
- Mélich, Joan-C.** (2001). *La ausencia de testimonio. Ética y pedagogía en los relatos del Holocausto*. Barcelona: Anthropos.
- Morey, M.** (2007). De la conversación ideal. Decálogo provisional. En: *Pequeñas doctrinas de la soledad*. México: Editorial Sexto Piso, pp. 413-430.
- Nancy, J.** (2001). *La comunidad enfrentada*. Buenos Aires: Ediciones La Cebra
- Pérez de Lara, N.** (2009). De la primera diferencia a las diferencias otras. In C. Skliar & J. Larrosa. *Experiencia y Alteridad en Educación*. Rosario: Homo Sapiens, pp. 45-78.

- Skliar, C.** (2003). *¿Y si el otro no estuviera ahí? Notas para una pedagogía (improbable) de la diferencia*. Buenos Aires: Miño y Dávila.
- Skliar, C.** (2007). *La educación (que es) del otro. Argumentos y desierto de argumentos en educación*. Buenos Aires, Noveduc.
- Skliar, C; Téllez, M.** (2008). *Conmover la educación. Ensayos para una pedagogía de la diferencia*. Buenos Aires: Noveduc.
- Skliar, C; Stubrin, F; Gentili, P.** (2008). La inclusión, la responsabilidad y la ética educativa. *Revista Voces de la alteridad de las diferencias*, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, número 2, pp. 3-28.