

Lesser Inclusion: An Essay Inspired by Deleuze and Guattari's 'Kafka'

Orru , S. E.

University of Brazilia,

Federal University of Alfnas,

Brazil

Laboratory of Studies and Researching Learning and Inclusion (LEPAI)

Abstract

Education is a fundamental right of citizens. To guarantee this right, legislation was implemented so disabled students could access and remain in schools. This movement was called inclusion. Despite the legislation established, many students have suffered from pseudo-inclusion, because despite them having physical access to the school, the welcoming that promotes the feeling of belonging to the group is non-existent. The objective of this text is to make known the concept of 'lesser inclusion' inspired by reading Deleuze and Guattari's 'Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature'. Two interviews were conducted — with a principal and a teacher — as well as a conversation with a group of first-grade children. The results are presented as experiences, in which inclusion is part of the pedagogical philosophy and life of the school community. Finally, lesser inclusion is conceptualized as that which occurs in the difference that differentiates itself without legal impositions as the motivation.

Keywords: *lesser inclusion, difference, education, singularities.*

Introduction

Education policies postulate a collection of national and international laws dealing with everyone's right to education. Nations have been impacted by the inclusion movement, which has resulted in international documents, of which 161 countries are signatories, including Brazil. Some of the international laws that support inclusion are: World Declaration on Education for All (1990), Salamanca Declaration (1994), Guatemala Convention (1999), Charter for the Third Millennium (1999), International Declaration of Montreal (2001), and Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (2008).

In Brazil, public policies in favor of inclusive education have been developed from contemporary social movements in international and national context. In the scenario of struggle for

equal opportunities to provide education for children, expository indicators and legislations were built to assure the rights of every citizen. Such public policies are designed to end the exclusion mechanisms existing in several social spaces. Here are some of the international and national laws that support inclusion:

Table 1. International and national public policies for inclusive education

Year	International Context	National Context
1988	--	Federal Constitution, Article 205 – Education as the right of every citizen
1989	--	Law No. 7,853/89 – support to people with disabilities and their social integration
1990	World Declaration on Education for Everyone	Child and Adolescent Statute
1994	Salamanca Declaration	National Policy on Special Education
1996	--	Chapter 5 th – Law of Guidelines and Bases of National Education,
1998	--	--
1999	Guatemala Convention Letter to the Third Millennium	Decree No. 3,298/99 – regulates Law No. 7,853 / 89, set forth and confirms Special Education as a transversal modality
2000	Montreal International Declaration	
2001	Montreal International Declaration	National Guidelines for Special Education in Basic Education Law No. 10,172 / 01 – National Education Plan
2002	--	Decision No. 01/2002 - National Curricular Guidelines for Training of Basic Education Teachers
2008	Convention about Rights of Persons with Disabilities	National Policy on Special Education from Inclusive Education Point of View

Source: research data (Orrú, 2017).

Even if the laws exist, annihilating probity breaches coexist, as well as the gaps for descending into jurisprudence. Jurisprudence is more important in its occurrence than the laws themselves. It fuels itself and is constituted not by the complex of greater laws, but by the lesser, particular, singular events.

This essay was inspired by reading Deleuze and Guattari's 'Kafka: Toward a minor literature' (published in 2003), in which we reflect on the problem of inclusion. 'Kafka: Toward a minor literature' is a meeting of essays by Deleuze and Guattari, based on issues present in the work of Franz Kafka. It consists of analyses and questions regarding not only the work of Kafka, but a whole political and social period. Minor literature is a concept used by Deleuze and Guattari in a dimension based on the idea of deterritorialization, which refers to a dislocation triggered by the loss of true cultural character via marginalization of ethnic groups that become foreigners in their own language and hide creative power within the indigence of the language. The meaning of 'minor' is related to a 'becoming' that belongs to a minority, which produces lines of escape for the language in order to reinvent resistance and power (Deleuze, 1992).

Although there are greater laws and policies that guide it, inclusion always returns and recreates itself in hostile spaces of cultural, political, and territorial disputes and conflicts, creating chaos and unbalancing what appears to be harmonized. Despite legislation that legitimizes inclusion in the macrosocial context (e.g., school, health, and the labor market), we still encounter the harshness and brutality of discrimination, which creates exclusion mechanisms due to differences in the individual. These spaces envisaged in this study as 'greater' provoke inclusion in their complexity to transcend difficulties, thus creating possibilities for them to occur in contexts in which excluded persons enunciate their voices, which shows that difference is not only theirs, but a quality of the human

species. These microcontexts — in which inclusion is present in a fierce contest with what is already inserted in the macrocontext of the society to differentiate and classify people — is what we conceive as a 'minor/lesser' space that exists and coexists with the 'larger/greater' space.

The objective of this essay was to discuss the concept of lesser inclusion and present experiences in which inclusion is part of the educational philosophy of the school community so that all are beneficially involved.

Method

The methodology was based on the qualitative approach. We held an open interview with the adult participants about inclusion, in order to know what they think about 'difference'; while for the children there was a conversation circle.

According to Mello (2007), conversation circles favor the stimulating of dialog on a particular theme and enable participants to make their voices, contradictory or not, heard, so that everyone hears what each person has to say, while also encouraging them to position themselves on the topic.

The conversation circle made dialog possible so that the children could talk about the theme. While the children talked about 'difference', they also had the opportunity to observe the thinking shared by their colleagues, and the possibility of giving meaning to the occurrences.

Two interviews were conducted at an elementary school in the south of Minas Gerais state, Brazil: one with the school principal and another with a first-grade teacher. This school was selected because it is: the only one in the city with a pedagogical policy project based on project learning, contrary to the textbook system; and a school with inclusive principles.

The interviews occurred as follows: the words difference, inclusion, and management were presented to the principal; and the words difference, inclusion, and learning were presented to the teacher. The interviews were recorded and the researcher did not intervene.

The conversation circle was conducted with the class of the teacher interviewed — children between 6 and 7 years old. The class had 25 children — two with a diagnosis of autism, one with motor and speech impairments, and four children from different cultures, with three of them the children of immigrants. The children sat side by side. We explained that we would like to talk to them about the contents of a music video. The children were shown the video 'Você vai gostar de mim' [You will like me], sung by Xuxa Meneguel. The lyrics address differences between people, and the images show children who: use wheelchairs, are visually impaired, or have other characteristics. After the video, the children were invited to say whatever they wanted about it. Everyone remained attentive during and after the video presentation. Some appeared shy and preferred not to speak; however, they nodded in agreement or disagreement with their classmates who spoke in the conversation circle. Others recounted various facts about playing around and moments with their classmates in order to indicate that they liked each other, supported each other, and that they all participated in the activities.

We chose excerpts of the speeches that help to understand what we propose as 'lesser inclusion'. There was no intention to analyze content or discourses, but rather to highlight how inclusive processes can occur when respect for differences and the understanding that we are all different is present in the educational philosophy of the school, independent of a 'greater inclusion' established by legislation, which does not guarantee that there will actually be an inclusive education process in the school community.

Lesser inclusion: A concept of welcoming

Lesser inclusion — taking and stimulating the ‘minor’ concept in ‘Kafka’ that is latent due to its authors — is not a diminished or less valuable inclusion. We understand that it is the inclusion occurring daily in the various tiny spaces — regardless of the greater law promulgated by the State that demands inclusion — by the conviction that its presuppositions are like a philosophy of life that the minority generates in the territory of a larger policy. It is not a question of the existence of a binarism between 'lesser inclusion' and 'greater inclusion', because according to Deleuze, in the context of Kafka, the minor/lesser language will always occur at the heart of the major/greater language as an ingenious combination of tension in the prevailing language (Deleuze, 1977, p. 38-39).

Lesser inclusion is not pseudolized; however, it is present beyond the role of the school's pedagogical project, and the abstract and the intellectual of the public policies promulgated for greater inclusion. This inclusion — that coexists at the borders, on the dividing line of the excluded/included binary link — is what we call lesser inclusion.

Lesser, in the sense of Deleuze (1977), is that habitual way of proceeding that assumes its scarce and secondary importance regarding the representations and ideologies of the language (in our case, of inclusion), and which accepts exile into the bowels of the loquacious customs of the majority, thus becoming like an outsider in one's own territory, in one's own language, consenting to appear to the particular regional inflection and the non-recognition of the one who speaks out of place or who takes for himself spaces of uncharacteristic and impersonal anonymity.

In a way, the concept of lesser inclusion envisaged here may seem to be at odds with that established by Deleuze (1977). This is because, at first, lesser inclusion should be beneficial only to the minority (those categorized as excluded), but in the understanding that there are no identities, only one identity (that of human being), and that the difference is unique to the human species — not only to those designated as disabled. Thus, lesser inclusion, in its power, is beneficial to all, given that it deterritorializes the territory of those excluded and those included, because every human being, at some time, experiences circumstances in the role of excluded and included.

Every society — and also every individual — is, therefore, crossed by the two segments at the same time: one molar and the other molecular. If they differ, it is because they do not have the same: terms, correlations, nature, or multiplicity. However, if they are inseparable, it is because they coexist, they pass between each other, following different figures such as in the primitive ones or in us — but always with one presupposing the other. In short, everything is political, but all policy is simultaneously macropolicy and micropolicy (Deleuze; Guattari, 2012, p. 90).

Regarding the notion of difference in Kafka, the authors state: '*Because we don't see any difference in all these things (who can tell the difference between a structural, differential opposition and an imaginary archetype whose role is to differentiate itself?)*' (Deleuze & Guattari, 2003, p. 25). Precisely due to being of the human species is why we show immense differences, because we are identical in our unique identity as human beings. Therefore, inclusion that accentuates a certain factitious territoriality becomes a center of disruption of the circumstances and the people, a kind of membrane that is boldly tied to the process of deterritorialization.

Thus, lesser inclusion communicates and manifests itself as a revolutionary process in the bosom of greater inclusion, ruining its call to support or solidarize with a certain homeland ideology — an ideology that, when convenient to the State, supports the excluded, and in another situation, assigns them to perpetual exclusion.

Lesser inclusion involves the production of an organization of beliefs — it transgresses the universal patterns of categorization via difference, and occurs beyond its enforcement mandated by

law. It makes possible the access and permanence of all in the learning spaces, even if they are marginalized by the deficiency-centered diagnoses. The organization of beliefs is a set of values that permeates national and international documents on inclusion and considers that everyone has the right to education.

In lesser inclusion, these occurrences do not happen only to contemplate the legislation and legitimize the intentions of the State. This organization of beliefs in the context of lesser inclusion generates an educational philosophy that encompasses the community — a non-utilitarian or specific philosophy that proposes to think of inclusion as a fundamental problem and, from it, to reinvent inclusive actions in the understanding that people learn in different ways and take different paths, which multiply, so that universal diagnosis does not determine who the learner is.

It provokes the break from the Cartesian paradigm of teaching everyone equally, for it considers the singularities in learning based on the problem of the reinvention of methodological strategies that emerge at the creative power, together with the learners, in order to transgress what is conceptually set — including the decolonization of thought for the production of non-hierarchical knowledge (Deleuze, 1975).

Lesser inclusion — besides being established at the borders and not at the extremities that determine who is in favor or against it — connects the individual in the contiguous historical, political, and social scenario, because 'everything is political' (Deleuze & Guattari, 2012, p. 90).

The 'border' concept is a historical-social process from the symbolic point of view (Deleuze, 1988, 1992). Borders are places of metamorphoses. They are: professed by the ability to transgress what is established; and imbued with multiplicity, reciprocity, and relativity. At the borders, the confines are transposed and other powers are sighted. The border teaches us to live with differences, with the incompleteness of the being and things. They are places where becomings happen, where there is production of the *hybris*. A place where the cry is echoed, where coexistence is evoked. It is where there are comings and goings. Where there are unpredictable connections and occurrences. Lesser inclusion makes real the occurrence of the plural assembling of the voices, which were previously silenced.

Lesser inclusion transgresses the conventional and the tradition of: overestimating certain scholarly knowledge to the detriment of others, and underestimating individuals who have had their identity dulled by the prophecies of universal diagnosis. It does not disqualify someone by the materialization of symptomatic frameworks. It does not yield to the modes of subjectivation derived from biopower. Lesser inclusion creates conditions so that transformations occur in the sinuosity of the education that — contained in the Law — is ordered, but on many occasions, diverted by the political yearnings of a collective project for a nation that should not be unbalanced by unforeseen events, always at the service of the State's interests.

Lesser inclusion — unlike that which is contained in the laws (greater inclusion) and which is known more in its universal-abstract form — is present as an occurrence beyond the controversy and express problem. It cannot be categorized or understood as static. But with a radical innovator it coexists in the molar and molecular field; that is, in the whole and in the parts, within the greater inclusion and outside it, and it enables the learning and sharing of knowledge through various forms of expression, considering the singularities of the individuals, the difference in the difference¹ in its multiplicity.

If they differ, it is because they do not have the same: terms, correlations, nature, or multiplicity. But, if they are inseparable, it is because they coexist, they pass from one to another, following different figures such as in the primitive ones or in us — but always with one presupposing the other (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 90).

Thus, there is only the variety of multiplicity; that is, the difference, rather than the enormous opposition of the one and the multiple. And perhaps it is an irony to say 'everything is multiplicity, even the one, even the multiple' (Deleuze, 1988, p. 174).

When inclusion is invoked by those excluded, the actors in the learning communities who weave welcoming webs are called upon to reinvent inclusion, as there are no methods or recipes for doing so. What there is, are assumptions of an organization of beliefs that give life and concretization to the occurrence of inclusion, scrutinizing in its condition of being a fundamental problem the possibilities of favoring the learning of all, without immediate or palliative solutions, but with a framework that understands and accepts differences as something unique to the human species. We understand that, through lesser inclusion, the minority (those with disabilities) deterritorializes the territory; thus, it is composed of those not labeled as disabled or different. Lesser inclusion occurs at the borders, not in territories of those excluded or included.

The path toward inclusion is not easy or simple to grasp or understand. It is complex because it does not: despise the ills existing in the various contexts, feign the absence of obstacles, overvalue certain actions to the detriment of others, or choose enlightened pedagogies for it to materialize. Lesser inclusion all the time at all times is constituted within the borders where all walk, where the hybrid nature of the human condition is present.

Thus, it always traverses long stretches without turning its back on deterritorialization, due to the need to remain tenacious. Lesser inclusion is that which revolutionizes, transgresses, and transforms greater inclusion (provided for in the Law) into a dialectical and ingenious event. It subsists to the extent of the legalistic inclusion that now: serves the interests of the State, grants the right to citizens, and bends to the microphysics of biopower.

Lesser inclusion subsists and coexists with legalistic inclusion (greater inclusion), because its vigor and rhizomatic strengthening are found in the organization of beliefs that constitute the way of life of its subject-actors who conceive and perceive inclusion beyond what is announced in the legislation. And, through conviction, they make their choices for a lesser inclusion, without pseudolizing, maculating, or perpetuating exclusion mechanisms that may be subtle, but are potentially maleficent.

Between lines and borders

Many borders separate one people from another, although our only real identity is that of human being. Borders are invisible; however, they announce ways to dominate others via cartographic policies of the different areas, from the economic to the hierarchization of knowledge.

This apartheid is determined by the invisible lines that are vectors for social exclusion, for they determine how the 'other' is seen and conceived. This case is exemplified by the postcolonialist theories in which there is the presence of a colonizer and his colonizing and, consequently, there is or will be the presence of a mestizo, whose nature will be hybrid, mutant.

Thus, we can say that the inflexible school that supports its practices in determining and accepting only what it considers to be irrefutable — a perpetuator of the homogenization and hierarchization of knowledge — is, in fact, an institution of power, with its students as merely colonized subjects, dispossessed of their knowledge emanating from their experiences.

Decolonization is the encountering of two congenitally antagonistic forms, which have their origin precisely in this kind of substantiation, which the colonial situation excretes and feeds. The first confrontation of these forces unfolded under the banner of violence, and its cohabitation — more precisely the exploitation of the colonized by the colonizer — continued thanks to bayonets and cannons. The colonizer and the colonized are old acquaintances. And, in fact, the colonizer is right when he says that he 'knows' them. It was

the colonizer who made and continues to make the colonized. The colonizer takes away their truth; that is, their belongings, from the colonial system (Fanon, 2005, p. 52).

The docilization of the bodies by disciplinary power and control regulates the other, mutates the body into fractions of organs, annihilates and brutalizes the individual who is subjected to the colonizing power so as to become fragile and vulnerable to all kinds of brutality, both physical and psychic (Foucault, 1998, 2005). This body, under the test of the colonization that converts everything into capital, is consciously gathered by categories of equality from pre-established identities that are converted into the most uncivil forms of difference and social inequality.

The same occurs with disabled students in the school environment. They are colonized. Their differences, subjectivity, and bodies are disregarded — they are seen as one more in the statistics of the institution that serves the interests of the State, whose social function is far from an emancipatory education. To be one more means that you are only a production element for the purposes of capital and, therefore, invisible to society. As a colonized subject, the student is oppressed and silenced, suffering apartheid and falling into social oblivion.

Socio-educational colonization constructs inhospitable, rocky and risky areas of survival. Even if there are laws (greater inclusion) for an inclusive education, the gaps produced by the exclusion mechanisms expel or annihilate the different categorization of that territory. There are various possible exclusion mechanisms; however, the diagnosis delivered by the biopowerⁱⁱ is legitimized by the *júris*ⁱⁱⁱ for the apartheid of this different. Thus, it assures the convenience and interests of those on this side of the border, ignoring the lethal occurrences (physical and/or psychic) of those on the other, colonized, side.

(...) this series of phenomena which I think is quite important: the set of mechanisms by which that in the human species that constitutes its fundamental biological characteristics will be able to enter into a policy, a political strategy, a general strategy of power. In other words, like society, modern Western societies — from the eighteenth century onward — returned to take into account the fundamental biological fact that the human being is part of a human species. It is in general terms what I call, what I have called — to give it a name — biopower (Foucault, 2008, p. 3).

Inclusion coexists in both spaces and journeys between the lines, at the borders. It is not found in specific territory of its property. It is the escape line itself. It does not serve the interests of the State for capital, but it is the materialization of the cry of the excluded in the territory of the colonizer. Inclusion is the transgression, the transforming agent in this inhospitable territory, and in this condition causes the chaos and imbalance to the predetermined order of the institution of education, of human molding.

However, despite the colonizing territory of the institution of education, whether public or private, education is not in its legal possession, it is not the thing possessed. Education is beyond the territories, it is found at the borders, in the spaces where learning is favored, whether formal or informal. That is why it, by itself, is a Fundamental Right (Unesco, 1990).

Inclusion and Difference

Inclusion brings together the unequal and is composed of its own differences, which differ in their multiplicity. Lesser inclusion is not simply a model of educational inclusion to be followed. It is the power in the occurrence and conducts a transvaluation of principles, which is distinguished by 'opposing higher values, and even denying these values, life as a condition of the value, proposing the

creation of new values that are the values of life, or better, proposing the creation of new possibilities of life' (Machado, 1999, p. 87).

Inclusion neither encourages the division of grades into classes organized based on psychometry, nor does it segregate into a space — separate from the institution — others categorized by the biopower, much less admit exclusion in places created only for the excluded. Inclusion is a movement against all forms of apartheid. Inclusion is hybrid in nature. It is present in the territory of the included ones through the cry of the excluded. In inclusion, merging is a habitual occurrence. It is in the 'hybris that each one finds the being that makes it return, as well as the kind of crowned anarchy, reversed hierarchy that — in order to ensure the selection of difference — begins by subordinating the identical to the different' (Deleuze, 1988, p. 49).

Inclusion requires plural learning spaces in every sense. And the learning process in the context of inclusion must be constructed by the individuals themselves and not hierarchically ordered. In its philosophy it combines and mixes elements for one to: learn to think for oneself, know realms beyond the classroom, live with differences, and be resilient.

In this reinventing of inclusion, learning is an occurrence of the canon of the: unforeseen, creation of the new, and singular thought. There are no recipes on how to learn or teach, and behavioral training is not accepted. Inclusion transgresses the methods for controlling and measuring learning. Nevertheless, learning occurs in a unique way with each person, even if unconsciously. And what is not learned is simply a becoming that will be.

Results

Inclusion, difference, and welcoming: the voices enunciated

There was no intention to analyze the content or discourses of the interviewees, but rather to highlight how inclusive processes can happen when respect for differences and the understanding that we are all different is present in the pedagogical project of the school.

The concept of difference worked on by us and based on Deleuze was not presented to the interviewees, so that they could demonstrate a concept of difference more related to common sense; that is, difference as a quality of: that which is different, and diversity. This must be considered so that the text does not appear to be a contradictory idea of what we discuss as difference.

We presented the words difference, inclusion, and management to the school's principal and asked her to say what she wished about these things. The selected excerpts show a lesser inclusion in which difference and welcoming are the foundation of the school's pedagogical proposal.

- The principal's voice

I'll start talking about a former female student who made me think about many things. She is already finishing up high school and someone asked her what she thought about inclusion when she studied here. She said there was no inclusion here. Then her mother asked her: 'but how can you say there is no inclusion there? You studied with that boy!'. She replied, 'No mother, it's because there was no exclusion, so for us nothing was different'. That was the girl's story. In her class there was a boy with cerebral palsy, but he belonged to the group, he did all the activities, all the projects, and there was respect. So, she said that inclusion didn't exist here because there was no exclusion. She made me think a lot and this message occurred to me and I said 'wow!'. I think we have to increasingly refine the idea that the less exclusion, the less inclusion too. The moment you start with the specifics is when you notice the differences.

Lesser inclusion is represented naturally in the school. For the student with cerebral palsy, belonging to the group is such a vital event that his classmate responded to her mother that there was no inclusion. This, in the sense that for that student there was not the binary exclusion/inclusion encounter orbiting in the same common center.

When the teacher commits, she commits to everyone, to the one who is shy, the one who needs special care, the one who is more inattentive, and the one who is more aggressive — she commits to everyone.

The occurrence of lesser inclusion is perceived in the voice of the school principal. She does not refer only to students with a disability, although they are present because of their singularities that require 'special attention', as she says. On the contrary, she mentions students with their own human differences. The meaning of the verb 'commit' engages with the noun 'welcoming'. You commit to, believe in, and invest in who you welcome. In other words, lesser inclusion occurs within the greater inclusion itself (inclusion that is provided for and mandatory in accordance with the current legislation) and beyond it.

- The teacher's voice

The words presented to the teacher were: inclusion, difference, and learning. Here are the excerpts from the interview for the objective that was proposed for this essay.

When I came across this class, it was me who was in fact included! I started thinking differently. Everyone, with their particularities, adds a lot to each other. This class is different, yes! And it has several children who are outside the standards set by society, who need a different outlook. They learn differently. But I think they teach more to the others, who we consider 'normal' [I don't like to use this word], than the others teach them. I learned how to see and discover behind a barrier that is not concrete. And that for me was a priceless [oh, I cannot cry] experience.

The teacher's voice is the mirror of the meaning of a lesser inclusion that welcomes everyone, including herself. A lesser inclusion that does not happen by legal imposition. It happens because the school is involved in a belief system in which being different is characteristic of the human species, and this difference is not duplicated, but multiplies, because people are not duplicated.

My gaze became differentiated. It is not I who accept the different, who works with the different, but it is the different that managed to put me in their world in the most wonderful way possible.

With John, who is wheelchair-bound, we learnt to be his legs. And I see the children in this and it's very beautiful! The children lend their legs to him, they show concern and it is a concern that comes from them. The school works a lot with this project of integration, of respect for the next person, but nevertheless, it comes from them, which is fantastic!

The experience of receiving John suggested to the teacher and his classmates that some things should be done differently. Solidarity and sharing are principles that are part of welcoming others, and this welcoming is one of the singularities of inclusion that is performed in the difference itself, which is never duplicated.

The teacher's voice is consistent with the principal's voice, in which the school's philosophy enables the integration of all, including the teachers WITH their students and everyone among themselves. It is the occurrence of lesser inclusion within the greater inclusion.

They learned to look at the different with respect, by imagining themselves in another's shoes. For example, Mark's echolalias — they know they need to respect this because sometimes it's uncontrollable. They know that in these echolalias Mark wants to say something regarding his well-being, how he is feeling. They know that this decreases when Mark is calmer, when they contribute to the environment. With John it's the same thing. When he positions himself to participate in the conversation circle they stay silent, one pokes the other and they say 'John wants to talk!'.

In the same class there is an autistic student — Mark — and another with motor and speech impairments — John. The relationship between them is one of: respect for the differences, observing what each one needs, and paying attention to what they have to say. It is not a question of feeling sorry for them or ignoring them, but of constructing dialogical possibilities and experiencing the difference as something present in the human being.

So, I realize that the children are very open. But the adults are more resistant. Today, after this experience, I would receive any child without any reservations. It was a very powerful experience!

The teacher shows that the inclusion experience is engaging and beneficial for the disabled students (the minority); however, it is still not conducive to all (greater inclusion in the legislation). It is not only the disabled students who benefit from the lesser inclusion (a realizing power beyond the *júris*). This experience is an occurrence of lesser inclusion, one that occurs in spaces with infinite learning possibilities for all. It favors those who are in the minority territory (as excluded), and it involves the others in the perception and understanding that difference is in us all.

- The children's voices

We presented the music video 'You will like me'. We asked the children what they wanted to say about what they heard. We selected the excerpts that exemplify the meaning of inclusion and difference.

Renato: *I liked the part that had the people in a little square. They danced and sang. They were all different!*

Roger: *I most liked when it said 'you are different'. It means that one person is not the same as another.*

Bruna: *I thought the music was cool because everyone is different. And everything really is different. Julia is blonde, her hair is the same color as mine, but she's not the same as me, she's another person.*

Jean: *If John cannot play a game, like tag, then we do it differently: you get John in the wheelchair and run alongside him. And the person who is 'it' goes running with him and if the chair touches someone, if Joao touches, then he has tagged and so the other person is then 'it'.*

Moisés: *I play with Mark. He's different, but I really like him. I discovered that we can play differently.*

Renato: *When John wants to swing, he does so in the box swing [adapted with a supermarket box]. And when he wants to go down the slippery slide, someone slides with him on their lap. [On hearing what his classmate says, John — the boy in the wheelchair — smiles on the other side of the room].*

Helton: *Hey John, what do you want? What don't you like?* [Helton has autism. He asks John the question due to realizing that he was trying to say something, and he spoke softly, so it was difficult to understand].

John: *I do everything!!!* [he says after smiling, realizing that the classmates were referring to him] and he also gives his opinion on the video that was played: *I don't like Xuxa!* [Everyone laughs with him].

The perception about 'difference' is notorious. They are between 6 and 7 years old, but they understand the meaning of difference through the experiences they have had of being involved in the particularities of a lesser inclusion. They have not consolidated the theoretical concept of inclusion or difference, but they experience it. They found different ways to play, based on the demands of classmates who, due to some deficiency, require different and creative actions. This is how inclusion is reinvented.

We perceived the occurrence of a lesser inclusion in which teachers and students are learners of the difference that differentiates them. Lesser inclusion is not surrounded by the school walls, but in an involving way it expands its spaces beyond the walls, because it is shared by all each time the parents leave and collect their children in the school and observe the occurrences. It happens within the greater inclusion, because it is known by this school community that there is legislation for the promotion of inclusion; however, it transcends this. Lesser inclusion occurs: at each teacher-parent meeting, in which school activities are seen as different from other schools that standardize knowledge and learning rhythms; and every year when everyone meets in different spaces, but with the profound density of the lesser inclusion that welcomes everyone.

Final considerations

Inclusion is often an occurrence imposed by laws organized by the State to guarantee rights, including the right to education. For the promotion of the inclusion in several and different territories around the globe, firstly we must understand that the difference does not affect only the minority, instead, the difference affects everyone, therefore, there are many ways to live and learn. In this scenario, pro-inclusion public policies in international and national context are established beyond beliefs, values and assumptions that are committed to principles of social equality and justice. Such commitment results in a change in basic assumptions of life in society from the academic life of every child. The implementation of public policies in favor of education for everyone is an achievement of many social movements around the globe against prejudice and social discrimination witnessed in contemporary society, also establishes the school space as a place for everyone. By promoting an education that welcomes everyone in their singularities, we build a legacy of fair and compassionate society to future generations.

The law, as a resource for the guarantee of rights, needs to exist, for there are many who see inclusion as a problem that requires immediate solutions in order to not create problems with the State. They do not perceive inclusion as a fundamental problem in which they themselves construct possible solutions that are not statistical or prescriptive. Without the law (greater inclusion), lesser inclusion would perhaps not exist. They coexist.

Inclusion moves, it occurs in the difference that differentiates itself in its multiplicity. Because being singular we are unique, and being one, therefore, we are of the order of the difference. The fact that we are unified does not mean we are the same or similar. We are one because the only identity that really exists is that of being human. Therefore, difference is not the attribute of only a few, because it designates the universal diagnosis of the biopower that creates a specific group of marginalized, excluded, minority individuals. Difference is in everyone, because people are not duplicated — they

differ. Difference contains diversity itself — it is inexact and also the excess of a greatness, and in it there is no repetition.

The inclusion movement is complex, singular, rhizomatic, and radical. For inclusion to occur, difference must be its pair. Inclusion and Difference in their incompleteness can only exist in the difference itself. Inclusion will never be static, it will never be duplicated. It will never occur as a compromise. And it will not be based on homogeneity. Lesser inclusion is a complete occurrence, in which the subjects-actors experience it, and promote it by organizing the beliefs that they generate, which are far beyond the legal impositions.

It is in lesser inclusion⁴ that we find an infinite possibility of us being learners so that inclusion is always reinvented, in order to benefit everyone nearby through an increasingly less exclusionary society.

ⁱ The difference cited refers to the persons designated as different by the diagnosis. For example, the trisomy of chromosome XXI is conceived as difference — an abnormality in relation to what is considered normal by scientific literature. However, this difference (trisomy of chromosome XXI) differs in its own difference; that is, there will never be people similar or equal via the diagnosis of this trisomy that is repeated. The trisomy is repeated, but the people are not, they are different and they multiply.

ⁱⁱ Whose focus is not the individual body, but the collective body.

ⁱⁱⁱ Latin expression meaning ‘only right’.

⁴ The article *Lesser inclusion: An essay inspired by Deleuze and Guattari's 'Kafka'* was originally published in Portuguese (Orrú, 2016). The concept of "lesser inclusion" is addressed in the book *The Reinventing of Inclusion* (Orrú, 2017).

References:

- Brasil (2008). *Convenção sobre os Direitos das Pessoas com Deficiência [Convention on the Rights of People with Disabilities]*, Brasília.
- Brasil (1999). *Carta para o Terceiro Milênio [Charter for the Third Millennium]*, London.
- Deleuze, G. (1988). *Diferença e repetição [Difference and repetition]*. Rio de Janeiro: Graal.
- Deleuze, G. (1992). *Conversações [Conversations]*. São Paulo: Ed. 34.
- Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1975). *Mil Platôs: capitalismo e esquizofrenia [A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia]*. v. 1. Rio de Janeiro: 34.
- Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (2012). *Mil Platôs: capitalismo e esquizofrenia 2 [A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia 2]*, Vol 3. São Paulo: 34.
- Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (2003). *Kafka – para uma literatura menor [Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature]*. Lisboa: Minuit.
- Deleuze, Gilles; Parnet, Claire. (2004). *Diálogos [Dialogs]*. Lisboa: Relógio D'Água.
- Fanon, F. (2005). *Os condenados da terra [The damned of the Earth]*. Juiz de Fora: UFJF.
- Foucault, M. (1998). *Microfísica do poder [Microphysics of power]*. Rio de Janeiro: Graal.
- Foucault, M. (2005). *Vigiar e Punir [Monitor and Punish]*. 30 ed. Petrópolis: Vozes.
- Foucault, M. (2008). *História da loucura [History of the madness]*. São Paulo: Perspectiva.
- Machado, R. (1999). *Nietzsche e a verdade [Nietzsche and the truth]*. Rio de Janeiro: Graal.
- Mélló, R. P. et al. (2007). Construcionismo, práticas discursivas e possibilidades de pesquisa [Constructionism, discursive practices, and research possibilities]. *Psicologia e Sociedade*, v.19, n.3, p. 26-32.
- Orrú, S.E. (2016). A inclusão menor: um ensaio inspirado na obra “Kafka” de Deleuze e Guattari. *Educação em Foco*, v. 19, n.28, p. 47-73.
- Orrú, S.E. (2017). *O Re-inventar da Inclusão [The Reinventing of Inclusion]*. Rio de Janeiro: Vozes.
- Unesco (1990). *World Conference on Education for All*. Jomtien, Thailand: Unesco.
- Unesco (1994). *Salamanca Declaration*. Salamanca: Unesco.