

READINGS OF THE MULTIPLICITY: FOR THE ARTICULATION OF THE RIGHT TO READING FROM THE RELATIONAL PERSPECTIVE¹

LECTURAS DE LA MULTIPLICIDAD: PARA UNA ARTICULACIÓN DEL DERECHO A LA LECTURA EN CLAVE RELACIONAL

LEITURAS DA MULTIPLICIDADE: PARA UMA ARTICULAÇÃO DO DIREITO À LEITURA NA CHAVE RELACIONAL

Aldo OCAMPO GONZÁLEZ & Concepción LÓPEZ-ANDRADA
 Centro de Estudios Latinoamericanos de Educación Inclusiva (CELEI)

Received date: 13.XI.2018

Reviewed date: 20.XI.2018

Accepted date: 23.XII.2018

<p>KEY WORDS: reading critical literacy inclusive multiplicity of difference social justice</p>	<p>ABSTRACT: The purpose of this paper is the detailed analysis of the field of knowledge of reading education, understood as a field that displays its actions in the complex and in the production of multiplicity. The critical task facing reading from socio-political perspectives lies in the unveiling of new intellectual and methodological ways that interrogate the ways of thinking, experimenting and practicing reading education through the concretion of educational tactics and strategies that help to mobilize new rationalities in the problematization of literacy, schooling and the construction of citizenship. Therefore, the relational thinking is key in the design of reading policies and programs of animation of reading habits, since it explores the ways of acting of the structures of culture, socialization and their devices of drag to the margins of the so-called right to reading.</p>
<p>PALABRAS CLAVE: lectura alfabetización crítica inclusión multiplicidad de diferencias justicia social</p>	<p>RESUMEN: El presente trabajo tiene como propósito el análisis pormenorizado del campo de conocimiento de la educación lectora comprendido como ámbito que despliega sus acciones en lo complejo y en la producción de la multiplicidad. La tarea crítica que afronta la lectura desde perspectivas socio-políticas radica en el develamiento de nuevas formas intelectuales y metodológicas que interroguen los modos de pensar, experimentar y practicar la educación lectora mediante la concreción de tácticas y estrategias educativas que contribuyan a movilizar nuevas racionalidades en la problematización de la alfabetización, de la escolarización y de la construcción de la ciudadanía. Por tanto, el pensamiento relacional se manifiesta clave en el diseño de políticas de la lectura y de programas de animación de los hábitos lectores, puesto que, indaga en las formas de actuación de las estructuras de culturización, socialización y en sus dispositivos de arrastre a los márgenes del denominado derecho a la lectura.</p>

CONTACT WITH THE AUTHORS: ALDO OCAMPO GONZÁLEZ. Carmen 566, Of. 1907. Santiago Centro, Santiago, Chile..
 E-mail: aldo.ocampo@celei.cl

<p>PALAVRAS-CHAVE: leitura alfabetização crítica inclusão multiplicidade de diferenças justiça social</p>	<p>RESUMO: O objetivo deste trabalho é a análise detalhada do campo do conhecimento da educação em leitura, entendido como um campo que mostra suas ações no complexo e na produção da multiplicidade. A tarefa crítica voltada para a leitura a partir de perspectivas socio-políticas reside na inauguração de novas formas intelectuais e metodológicas para interrograr as formas de pensar, experiência e prática de leitura educação através da realização de estratégias táticas e educacionais que ajudam a mobilizar novas racionalidades a problematização da alfabetização, da escolarização e da construção da cidadania. Portanto, o pensamento relacional é fundamental na concepção de políticas de leitura e programas de animação de hábitos de leitura, uma vez que explora as formas de atuação das estruturas de cultura, socialização e seus dispositivos de arrasto para as margens do chamado direito à leitura.</p>
--	--

1. Introduction: reading on the axes of production of multiplicity

The work on the intersections of disciplines is one of the most significant conditions of epistemological production, along with translation and the ecology of wisdoms of Inclusive Education. In this article we explore the conditions of epistemological production that are involved in the Studies on Critical Literacy and reading education from a socio-political perspective. Both observe a production order -from the Foucaultian perspective, they correspond to internal laws which define its functioning- which participates in the dissemination. It is a knowledge which is built in movement, meeting and combination of diverse kind of objects, methods, discourses, disciplines, theories, influences and subjects. This is the reason why its main condition of production operates according to an extra theoretical dimension¹.

Among the main disciplines why this knowledge comes into operation, we find Gender Studies, Philosophy of Difference, Politics and Analytics, Intersectionality, Women Studies, Postcolonial Studies, Visual Studies, Feminisms Studies, Black Feminism, History of Consciousness, Intercultural Hermeneutics, Narratology, Philosophy of Liberation, Cultural Studies, Cultural Analysis, New Literacy and Critical Literacy Studies, Sociology of the Body and Emotions, Cultural, Linguistic and Literary Anthropology, Revolutionary Critical Pedagogy, Studies on Social and Educational Justice, among others.

Every discipline mentioned above becomes an area of convergence which generates and ensures the emergency of the authentic knowledge of reading as sociopolitical praxis, where each one is conceived as an epistemological singularity through which this knowledge moves, extracting the most significant features from each discipline in an analytical and methodological manner, with the aim of building a new knowledge free of axiological, ontological, conceptual, epistemological and methodological stances which can be contradictory and antagonistic. This knowledge travels through a wide range of fields, disciplines, objects, discourses, methods, influences and concepts

-which is why the field of knowledge of reading conceived as sociopolitical praxis moves towards the consolidation of a well-traveled and mixed theory that becomes problematic and complex-. With prior determination of every element aforementioned, it is essential to identify which influences converge on the configuration of the intellectual field, as well as which ideas and conceptual and political frameworks activate the main categories that sustain their production network. This work is part of the axes for the organization of its field of knowledge in terms of "net" (Beuscart & Peerbaye, 2006), defined as a set of -not linearly-intertwined threads which, through an unceasing movement, capture, nest and twist in a series of elements of a diverse nature. A significant area of epistemological activity is the work with concepts. Concepts, according to Bal (2009), are intersubjective strategies which promote the dialogue and understanding. They can also be described as intermediation strategies, that is to say, they are capable of connecting diverse fields and disciplines. Concepts help us to position in reality. Epistemologically, the concepts of Inclusive Education belong to the grammar of multiplicity; in other words, the notions of diversity, heterogeneity, otherness, difference, distinctiveness, etc., are contained in the notion of multiplicity. This approach enables us to observe that epistemological concepts that reading education turns to from a sociopolitical perspective resort to the grammar of multiplicity demanding the characterization of itineraries, trajectories and movements of each one of these concepts towards every discipline, discourse and field where the sociopolitical approach of reading mobilizes, twisting and readjusting their meanings and interpretative forms.

Among all these fields of knowledge, we could think of an open map: connectable, detachable, reversible and in constant modification and alloy in the bonding system; their operations are non linear, and they are characterized by multiple inlets. This way, the field of knowledge of reading education is described as a versatile field, which articulates its activity through complexity, discontinuity and production of the new -epistemological externality-. It is a polyphonic field and in

a permanent state of movement. In accordance with this, we can ascertain that, once established that its production uses diverse genealogical weaves and elements from many fields of knowledge, it can be described -before translation- as a mixed perspective, acknowledging mixture as a complex process within an epistemic and political project of such magnitude. Therefore, scientific research faces the challenge of identifying the political and theoretical frameworks that determine its task.

The plurality of conceptual, symbolic, political and epistemological universes that converge in the study of reading as social praxis requires the enlargement of hermeneutics, in accordance with Fornet-Betancourt (1994) regarding the need of hosting a proper understanding of the multiplicity of subjects and factors which have an impact on the processes of literacy and reading. The enlargement of hermeneutical tasks encourages us to the questioning of the diverse methods and cultural practices that support pedagogical activity in the context of schooling and literacy processes throughout life. Pluritopic hermeneutics constitutes one of the most decisive basis in the didactic comprehension within the framework of education of multiplicity of difference. Moreover, its aim is to make visible and eradicate the excesses of the predominant literate culture and its universal legitimation.

In later pages, and inspired by the work of the American political philosopher Seyla Benhabib, we examine the difficulties of the notion of universalism in the context of human rights through a set of analytical distinctions, such as: a) justifying, b) moral, c) essentialist and d) legal. It is a critical, didactic and hermeneutic task for social reading to assume the ethical imperative which bases cultural and educational space in the understanding of difference, not considered as closed, restricted and total but as multiple, opened, infinite.

This way, one of the interpretative options supporting the understanding of reading as social praxis emerges in relation to pluritopic hermeneutics by Fornet-Betancourt (2001), conception that, instead of ontologically define the processes of literacy and the uses of reading education, allows us to prove how complex processes of domination, oppression and subalternization -various expression of power- affect and/or shape it. Likewise, reading conceived as social praxis promotes intercultural dialogue, political action and its multiple political processes, and is interested in participating in social grammar, with the aim of mobilizing processes of freedom consistent with the infinite multiplicity of constituting differences of human nature.

In this context, an essential aspect consists in recognizing that the field of study of the right of reading lacks understandable and appropriate epistemic and methodological inscriptions which can enable the location of its tasks in front of the multiplicity of differences that it tries to legitimate. This way, reading becomes a structural, political and cultural phenomenon; that is to say, it is inserted into a problematic configured by the functioning of the structural relations which sustain social activity. In other words, it is a problem of social performance, instead of a technical problem based on policies of absorption of minority groups through a fake inclusion, oriented towards the implementation of a set of structures for schooling and culturization which indiscernibly forces the adoption of the predominant values in written and training culture.

The technical and objectivist views operate as reciprocal systems. The former is based on the assimilation and arbitrary accommodation of the difference in cultural, political and educational structures. In other words, the right is distributed from a counterbalancing perspective, recreating an ideal of homogenization, ensuring the right to reading and the right in education through the motto "giving the same to everybody", which emphasizes the value of universality, totality and absolute diversity. The latter is reduced to the consolidation of a cultural and educational structure that joins subjects from diverse cultures in a single space. From our theoretical stance, we consider that both conceptions are redundant and can be synthesized in a blind and uncritical vision of the right to reading, given that they only assume that oppressed groups are influenced by technologies of power, slowing their development. None of them is capable of unveiling the functioning of the distributive injustice that occurs in policies for cultural equity and social equality. The technical and objectivist views of the right to reading and education are uncritical expressions of the theory of Inclusive Education and they specially constitute a notable part of the policies for positive affirmation. Both views contribute to the right to reading and to education regarding a mechanism "that disseminates predominant ideologies and instrumental cultural values when recreating social and economic disparities" (McLaren & Farahmandpur, 2006, p. 130). Assuming that the right to reading and the right "in" education are phenomena and/or structural problems, it will be necessary to face the predominant and critical forms that strengthen homogeneity in the redistribution of elemental rights when fighting for the extension of their areas of development. We support the proposal of distributive value by Lazzarato (2006)

and complex equality by Young (2002), which are intrinsically consistent with the ontological level required by social and political reading, in other words, infinite multiplicity.

The study of the right to reading from the relational perspective focuses on the understanding of the cultural practices represented and mediated by a “cultural imperialism [which] enables the access to a borderless world of capitalist markets where cultural practices are meticulously adapted” (McLaren & Farahmandpur, 2006, p. 46), and silently serve to the propagation of the interests of the ruling capitalism. We observe the existence of a conception of inclusion and social justice inside the capitalism identifying the presence of uniform cultural practices; as a consequence, the liberal version of equality and equity contributes to the division of social classes regarding the access to literate culture. “Marginalized minorities adhere to consumption practices instead of production or working practices. Similarly, identity politics effectively separates cultural practices from working practices” (McLaren & Farahmandpur, 2006, p. 189).

The right to reading has a critical task: identifying the type of cultural practices that take place in the mediation of reading in determined social groups, unveiling under which circumstances can those practices be influenced by the predominant ideology of literate culture. This permeability affects not only the development of programs for reading promotion, book policies and especially of teacher training. The right to reading must offer a wide and diverse group of conditions that enable the “critical interpretation of the world and the language, as well as the courage to denounce oppression and social injustice arising from capitalism and, for some time now, globalization” (Bahruth, 2006, p.10). Therefore, the task of the right of reading is to restore critical topics of the processes of reading education from the point of view of educational justice, considering the risks as one of the multiple structural, cognitive and cultural injustices.

The relational comprehension of the right to reading demands an interpretation of the diverse styles of political intervention which converge and intersect in the field of Inclusive Education and social justice. How are such forms of intervention configured? Which performative actions are implicit in their constitution? The relational approach applied to the study of the mechanisms of displacement of the right to reading –in its different dimensions–, introduces changes in the theorization of reading, Inclusive Education and educational justice. Moreover, it intends to dismantle –without implicitly reproducing a set of contents,

values and methodological strategies that confirm the opposite to what it really is– the epistemological scaffolding that sustains the practices of structural disparity, exclusion and cultural oppression holding the *essentialist call for cultural action*. Its aim is to expose the extent to which cultural workers –teachers, researchers and reading mediators– contribute to the preservation of diverse axes of power in the intellectual level. It is essential to discover and voice their consequences in the theoretical understanding of Inclusive Education, conceived as an intrinsic feature of education. The study of reading as social and political praxis becomes an area of complex, non-linear and dynamic reassembling; it travels through an infinite multiplicity of discourses, concepts, grammars, disciplines, influences and political frameworks. How does relational comprehension applied to the study of the right of reading offer a radical interruption of literacy practices and oppression through literate culture? It is necessary to assume, as McLaren & Farahmandpur (2006) indicate, a structural analysis that includes an analytical and methodological detailed examination on “capital, State and educational institutions” (p. 50).

The relational perspective reveals the means of configuration that affect the political and social objectives implicit in the right of reading. In this framework, reading praxis becomes a tool for resistance and fight and transcends reductionism, which locates pluralism in spaces of abjection or vulnerable groups –objectivist, institutionalised and inclusive view– delving into the diverse affirmative forms that contribute to the wear of purposes, concepts and revolutionary and counterhegemonic ideas, resulting in the proliferation of restrictive and excluding actions for diverse groups. For this reason, the relational perspective of the right of reading provides a set of analytical distinctions which enable the exploration of the mechanisms which coopt certain students, locating them in the limits of the right to reading. This includes the set of technologies of oppression and domination and complex obstacles. All of them performative, regenerative and dynamic; for this reason, the reading praxis aims to free the wide multiplicity of readers through political terms, identifying the complex and critically democratic forms.

The present article tackles the strengthening of the critical frames of reading practices from a sociopolitical point of view. The main target of this work assumes, then, a complex and at the same time hopeful struggle that can allow us to free the concepts of inclusion, literate culture, difference, right to education and reading, social and educational justice from the inner liberal roots that enclose its functioning nowadays. This way,

the notion of transformation becomes an absolute performative, turned into an absolute affirmation unable to modify social and educative grammar. A social and particular compromise is needed in order for the performative to act in the event.

2. The relational perspective in the right of reading

The arguments presented in the first part of this work allow us to recognize reading as a social, political and cultural praxis conducted to the focus and / or understanding of the systematic obstacles that relationally affect the exercise of this right. There is a need to understand the institutional operating rules defining the operation guidelines of the right to reading.

The relational approach proposes to create conditions of redistribution that avoid the reductionism of the “generalized other”, which is a being conceived from an absolute and homogeneous difference. This conception according to Lazzarato (2006) is property of the collective value of rights, which in the opinion of Benhabib (2008) becomes a modality which enables the recognition of:

[...] each and every one of the individuals as beings with the same rights and duties that we all wish for ourselves. By assuming this point of view we make abstraction of the individuality and the concrete identity of other individuals. We assume that the others, like ourselves, are beings with concrete needs, desires and affections, and their moral dignity is not our greatest difference but what we, as beings that speak, act, and live in a context, have in common. Our relationship with the other is governed by the rules of *formal equality and reciprocity*: everyone has the right to expect from us what we can expect from him or her. By treating you in accordance with these norms, I confirm human rights in your person and I legitimately demand you to do the same for me (p. 190-191).

In this case, the relational understanding of the right to reading emerges from the visualization of the “concrete other”, shifting our attention towards singularity, whose norms and strategies implied in the achievement of cultural progress operate, according to Benhabib (2008), through strategies of complementary reciprocity. In this framework, differences –the foundational field of the ontological problem which affects the understanding of the social group– become areas of complementarity; the right thing to do is to assume difference as an infinite multiplicity. This way, the “generalized other” constitutes an abductive property of modernist universalism that discovers

the weaknesses of law and reading education, particularly. What defines the practical possibility and the political reality of the right to reading? A possible answer would be to pay attention to:

[...] the reciprocal recognition of individuals as beings possessing the “right to have rights” implies political struggles, social movements and learning processes within and via classes, genders, nations, ethnic groups and religious beliefs. This is the true meaning of universalism: universalism does not consist in an essence or human nature that we have been told to possess; instead, it consists in the experience of establishing community through diversity, conflict, division and struggle. Universalism is an aspiration, a moral goal to fight for; it is not a fact, a description of the way that the world is (Benhabib, 2008, p. 191).

In this framework, the relational approach of the right to reading can be conceived as a discursive-theoretical formulation of cultural practices and ideology which infiltrates cultural workers and is committed to a critical literacy whose conditions of possibility emerge from the recovery and exhaustive analysis of language, history and experience. It is proposed to reveal the specific competency formations established as alliances that oppress the hegemonic literate culture, demonstrating how knowledge is inscribed in social grammar, being complicit in its operating guidelines. In this way, McLaren (1992) explains that:

[...] certain linguistic competences, forms of narrative discourse and signs of ideological solidarity are privileged over others and allow teachers to acquire forms of critical practice that can interrogate, disrupt and disorganize dominant strategies of power and power / knowledge relations and, doing so, teachers can foresee a way to adhere pedagogy to the construction of a radical and plural democracy (p. 11).

When rethinking the margins, limits, borders and centrality of the right to reading we agree with Brah (2011) when he recognizes that the core-periphery metaphor becomes one of the main Eurocentric fictions in the study of inequalities and mechanisms of oppression that affect the study of law in education and reading. Through the relational approach, the notion of margins is considered as circular, dynamic and in constant change; in this, the multiplicity of collectivities considered as oppressed, subordinate or vulnerable, transcends the interpretation of groups with special interests and the regeneration of a harmonious and uncritical pluralism. Its purpose is then to consolidate a structural examination from different stances of dialogicity; the difference –infinite possession of

humans- is not reduced to an exchange and or an arbitrary system of coexistence formed by socially distinguished subjects, located in a presumed cultural, political and social homogeneity.

The relational approach articulates its methodology, to a certain extent, cautiously attending to the experiences of oppression that cross a wide multiplicity of subjects, providing according to Freire (1975), Mohanty (1990) and McLaren (1992) strategies to demystify and transform the predominant social order. The reasoning systems articulate diverse practices of resistance to the liberal pluralism turned into a pseudo-inclusion, equality, cultural expansion and equity, connecting with the need to:

[...] to name their own stories, and to claim the required personal and collective strength to resist the disfiguring effects of social power, telling us that literacy practices are practices of power. As such, literacy can link hope to possibility through the development of various means of resisting oppression so that a better world can be summoned, fought and finally understood (McLaren, 1992, p. 16).

The study of literacy practices as part of education is framed within a functional mechanism, consolidating a reading of the world that reproduces the semiotic forms, the ontological and axiological frameworks of the hegemonic literate culture. It interrogates the forms of implicit reproduction and domination that are generated through language. In the relational approach, linguistic-symbolic uses and effects are placed at the service of the dismantling of the oppressive structures of cultural action. Critical literacy, the expression of relationality, externalizes the methods for the production of truth that support certain literacy practices that aim at expanding the social destiny of individuals who are its targets: which social arrangements are demanded by the practices of education and literacy in the framework of educational justice and social inclusion?

For Young (2002), rights constitute non-material goods; as such, a question will be asked: what does it mean to redistribute a right? To understand the role of law applied to cultural goods, arts and information, it will be necessary to analyze the nature of redistribution, since it is in line with a policy based on pluralism and multiplicity. As Lazzarato (2006) points out, western politics was founded on a homogenizing conception that emphasizes collective value, in other words, totality and universality. It is necessary to move towards a way of building public policies to promote reading focusing on the complex distributive value, that is to say, on the plurality and multiplicity

of needs, interests and motivations assumed by each social group. In this case, we should understand “the relational nature of how meaning is produced, that is to say, the intersection of subjectivities, objects and social practices within specific power relations” (Giroux & McLaren, 1991, p. 90). The relational character collaborates with the Freirian concept of ‘critical transitivity’, based on post-Cartesian ideas and interested in the subversion of the conditions that deny the inherence of the word as constitutive action of the world. Reading and critical transitivity become forms of social empowerment, attend to the recognition of every personal expression and are part of a specific social formation; there, ideological debts and traces of a collective memory converge. Therefore, reading becomes a political process.

The relational approach of the right to reading proposes to critically and methodologically analyze the set of heterogeneous values that promote the vision of a functional and uncritical Inclusive Education that supports a conception of literate culture inspired by axiological frameworks typical of patriarchy and liberal pluralism. Therefore, it is necessary to discuss the main meta-theoretical concerns that inclusion and social justice generate within the framework of policies to promote reading. Under the ‘relational’ literacy practices are conceived as specific power practices and regimes of truth, becoming a political device of a complex nature that silently destroys the frames of hope. The right to read in this conception articulates a profound process of critical literacy whose purpose will be to demonstrate the operatives of the “prevailing hegemony in which the cultural spaces of everyday life are developed displaying asymmetric relations of power and privilege, relations that we must combat if we wish to build a more equitable society” (McLaren, 1992, p. 4).

The exercise of the right to reading in relational terms assumes a condition of ‘reflexive action’, orienting its activity towards the progressive consolidation of the active transformation of the world and cultural experience, moving away from any regime of truth and epistemological monism which pursues its adaptation. In this regard, McLaren (1992), inspired by Freire (1975), points out that through literacy devices, various groups, such as precarious readers, neo-readers or even functional illiterates, will articulate mechanisms to avoid being absorbed by the multiplicity of technologies typical of the predominant culture; they recognize that their categorization is product of the mentioned interpretive forces.

The relational approach strengthens, then, the processes of social empowerment, interrogates

cultural competences accepted and legitimized by the hegemonic literate culture on reading education. In fact, the inauguration of this thinking style allows the multi-axial analysis of the contradictions that arise from the implementation of standardized evaluations –typical of neoliberal engineering– through which the tensions noted above become more acute; specifically, a set of neoconservative interests are reproduced. A similar situation occurs regarding the development of book policies and, especially, the educational policies and the promotion of reading. It is a critical task of the relational approach to dismantle the structures that support oppression through concrete policies and practices.

Educational, social and cultural policies (Taylor, Henry, Lingard & Rizvi, 1997; Rizvi & Lingard, 2009) have adopted a legal approach applied to cultural goods, from a perspective of collective value, emphasizing a homogeneous totality that conceives differences as axes of social differentiation –increasing the conditions of oppression, domination and injustice– and implanting a conception of the right to reading in bulk, whose rationality restricts the potential of redistribution and difference. Each educational institution forges a certain cultural capital and a social destiny. An analysis with these characteristics will delve into the variables that participate in this dispersion, since traditional analytical frameworks offer a biased view of capital, strengthening the universalist and homogenizing logic, which will need the research to be capable of critically describing the set of:

[...] conscious actions of many individuals daily contribute to maintaining and reproducing oppression, but those people are usually simply doing their job or living their life, and do not conceive themselves as agents of oppression (Young, 2002, p. 75).

Part of the critical task facing the right to reading, is to emerge intellectual systems that allow the understanding of how systematic institutional processes that prevent certain groups from enjoying cultural goods operate, while at the same time these exclusion technologies limit their capabilities and possibilities of action, impacting on the social destiny of the multiplicity of collectives and social groups and in the creation of new political and cultural horizons that allow the implementation of the ideas presented in this article in society.

The construction of social justice (Benhabib, 1987; Fraser, 1995, 1997; Young, 2002) and educational justice (Rivas, Mezzadra & Veleza, 2013) through the right to reading has to reflect on the concept of ‘social group’ and of ‘social ontology’,

unintelligible analytic notions (Young, 2002) in contemporary political and analytical philosophy. This vision allows us to move from a categorial approach which insists on the regeneration of processes of devaluation, differentiation, essentialization that articulate an uncritical and absolute alterity to a relational approach that recognizes the existence of different social groups traversed by variables of multiple inequality (Hill Collins, 1990); while other groups are favoured in certain contexts and patterns of culturization and in experiences of socialization. The relational approach is consistent with the language of inclusion whose analytical force is based on multiplicity.

This approach leads us to a reformulation of the social and cultural space in which the reading takes place. One of its main analytical objectives is to understand how to articulate a universalist vision that assumes the complex singularity and multiplicity of differences –an intrinsic condition that affects the social group–. Conceiving the exercise of reading in relational terms opens a philosophical and political debate poorly addressed by the Studies on Critical Literacy, Cultural Analysis and Literacy, on difference, multiplicity, social justice and intercultural and inclusive praxis. Its aim is to expand the limits that sustain the imaginery on social justice and the right to reading, trying to strengthen a set of reasoning systems capable of articulating a *critical pluralism* through the right to reading, conceived as a complex and dynamic practice. This conception articulates its activity through the following question: what are the basic conditions to guarantee pluralism and multiplicity through the right to reading? To answer this question we cite the significant contribution of Benhabib (2008), listing the following basic conditions required: a) ‘complex’² egalitarian reciprocity, b) voluntary consent and c) freedom of association and resignation. These dimensions significantly contribute to understanding the functioning of the critical core of the problem that crosses the social ontology of the groups and the institutional practices that relate to the controversy that sustains cultural diversity and the struggle for democratic equality. Our interest goes beyond the practices of positivization of the right to reading, proposing a change in its implementation, in its ontological, epistemological and methodological frameworks consistent with the critical center that places Inclusive Education as a mechanism of transformation of all fields and domains that create and guarantee the functioning of the so-called Educational Science.

Continuing with the contribution of Brah (2011), we would like to insist on the need to methodologically explore the multiple modalities of power

through the exercise of reading and, in particular, of the hegemonic literate culture. In this sense, the study of the social and political dimension of reading becomes a way of thinking in and through subjectivity, power and social transformations, as well as the type of reading practices that are implemented at school. A relational approach understands and raises awareness on the fact that the multiplicity of differences conceived as multiple singularities are affected by conditions of oppression, domination and injustice, being these areas common and transverse in the social, cultural and educational experience.

If we relationally reflect on the right to reading, what will it entail? To answer this question, we use the contribution of the intersectional trend boosted by Crenshaw (1989) and widely disseminated through the works of authors as Hill Collins (1990), Brah (2014) and Yuval-Davis (2014), among other researchers. The building of the analytical category of the right to reading methodologically demands the articulation of a model of a non-oppressive categorical analysis which respects differences. In fact, it is necessary to create specific and possible political categories which facilitate the relational thinking, with the aim of subverting the colonialist, imperialist and capitalist logics that hold in their focus of activity the notion of educational and social justice and inclusion, contributing to the imposition of ahistorical and essentialist categories in order to undertake the pursuit of the subject inside justice and inclusion.

It is common to observe that the efforts to think the differences have mainly been incapable of getting rid of the emergency of the new forms of homogenization and social differentiation. Indeed, political and pedagogical praxis of the right to reading must have reasoning systems that enable the understanding of how interrelations among racism, gender, sexuality, social classes and other elements of differentiation become essential resources in the struggle for the expansion of the social destinies of a wide multiplicity of social groups. A reading policy based on a conception of inclusion –focused on the multiplicity of differences–, will conceive “intersectionality” as “the complex, unyielding, diverse and changeable effects resulting from the intersection of multiple axes of difference –economic, political, psychological, subjective and experiential difference– in specific historical contexts” (Brah & Phoenix, 2004, p. 75).

This vision of “cultural justice” and “reading citizens” clearly sets out the need of a systematic decentralization of the “normative subject” –*subject effect* (Spivak, 2008)– which organizes research agendas while noting that book policies (Fraatz, 1987; Perfetti, 1991; Edmondson & Shannon, 2002),

programs for reading promotion and research agendas particularly tend to omit the experience of multiple differences of significant social groups considered “different”, imposing a logic denominated as *liberal essentialism*, in other words, the marginalization of the experience of certain readers through programs of reading promotion and mediation. Intersectionality goes through each of these relations. A program of reading promotion should explore the micropraxis generating mechanism of displacement, cooptation methodologies and kidnapping of certain groups, dragging them to the limits of the right to reading. It will be thus necessary to offer an exploration around the macro and micro regimes of power and the diverse axes of difference inserted in specific structural formations, areas of opportunities and new forms of legitimacy and social legibility. How can we expand opportunities through reading? To answer this question, we turn to the Derridian notion of difference, emphasizing the conception of process, transformation and permanent difference.

In line with this, the policies on promotion of reading from a perspective of cultural equity and inclusion have reassured an assimilationist or accommodationist interest on groups that have been historically left out of the literary trend provided by the predominant culture, which tries to engage them in interests that neglect or subordinate their own means of approaching the comprehension of the world. This way, the technical problem of Inclusive Education is the presence of contradictory discourses regarding the framework of values of their activity and praxis. On the one hand, equality and cultural justice are sought, recognizing reading as a right while at the same time the mentioned conditions are assessed using patterns that deny plurality, multiplicity of formats and means of expression of reading. Such book policies and programs of reading promotion are inscribed in what we have defined as *liberal essentialism*, which means that they are inspired in grammars that call for progress, and enable the emergency of new forms of homogenization and devaluation of diverse groups of readers.

According to McCall (2005) and her contribution to the triple categorization of the right to reading, we identify: a) an intracategorical, b) inter-categorical and c) anticategorical approaches. The first, explains the existence of different intersections, trying to describe the axes of relationship or linkage among various groups and their transformation strategies. The second, on the other hand, reflects on the limitations that certain categories impose on certain groups in the construction of encouraging social destinies, associated with the shrinkage of opportunities that they face as a

result of the means of differentiation that each difference offers. Finally, the anticategorical approach delves into:

[...] the criticism of the assumption that the categories are provided beforehand. Instead, it deconstructs the categories while paying attention to the regimes of power through which categories are constituted in the first place. Here, social categories are considered as if they were historically, culturally and linguistically produced (Yuval-Davis, 2014, p. 17).

3. Conclusions. Emancipatory policies on reading education

The interest of emancipatory policies on reading education aims to perform an ecology of wisdoms (Sousa, 2010) regarding the intellectual and conceptual systems which support the definition of strategies that enable the fair redistribution of the right of reading. So far, the scope of action that is implicit in the management of cultural opportunities constitutes a regulatory field. We observe the absence of ethical criteria in the operationalization of conditions that allow to move forward the actual redistribution of justice in terms of reading promotion. The question that arises is: what position does the notion of social justice occupy in an emancipatory policy of reading and in the promotion of readers among citizens? On the one hand, it tackles a set of problems that are permanent in the building of democracy regarding the kind of criteria that should guide the multiplicity of differences in the educational and cultural context.

Reading as social and political praxis requires the creation and mobilization of new rationalities, conceived as regenerative and performative expressions, in order to understand the functioning of the formats in which power is displayed. Finally, the analytical contexts which organize the justification of the radical theory of reading are: a) researches and projections in the field of critical literacy and social justice, b) redefinitions of reading and writing in educational and training spaces for educational justice, equity, equality, inclusion and the critical views required for the transformation of education, c) record of the practices of reading and writing instruction in the context of critical literacy and educational justice, d) political dimension of reading and new epistemological

tendencies, e) critical studies on literature and its promotion from a social justice perspective, f) political spatiality and citizen exercise through reading and critical literacy, g) critical awareness and decoloniality action in the context of teaching practices of reading and writing, h) reading and book policies from an anticapitalist and anticolonialist perspective, i) human rights and promotion of reading and j) cultural mediation for social change.

The consideration of reading as social, cultural and political praxis suggests acknowledging that the concepts –which require the unveiling of its methodological status, with the aim of turning them into analytical categories- of inclusion, totality conceived as multiple singularities, commonality, difference, etc., are relational axes and underlie at the deepest of the epistemological field of inclusive education, striving to unveil their meanings through diverse critical stances.

The production of key topics in programs for reading promotion should join together the knowledge and practices which define cultural action of these groups, with due regard of the grassroots knowledge. In that case, the micropolitical agenda will converge in the visualization of resistance patterns of minorities facing the mechanisms of institutionalization and performativity of the predominant cultural and intellectual values which try to position via the promotion of reading. On the other hand, the guidelines of work will focus on the rupture of the diverse mechanisms that shape the set of epistemic colonization imposed through the reproductive strategies of social, cultural and civic world (Guattari & Rolnik, 2006).

Policies on reading education inspired in the epistemological foundations of Inclusive Education which gears towards the construction of a political space based on singularities will guide its activity towards the exploration of intellectual systems in order to capture difference without generating processes of differentiation requiring the exclusion or subalternization of certain groups. This way, a new political space based on difference, considered relational, will be created and it will promote the development of people according to their own skills, instead of to the features defining a specific social group. Philosophically, its actuating force is based on an ideal of freedom conceived as elimination of the differences, giving rise to an emancipatory policy on reading education and promotion of reading.

Note

- ¹ Condition of production that refers to the manufacturing of a determined phenomenon through social forces, instead of purely theoretical conditions.
- ² We added the adjective 'complex'.

References

- Bahruth, R. (2006). Prólogo, In McLaren, P., Farahmandpur, R. (2006). *La enseñanza contra el capitalismo global y el nuevo imperialismo. Una pedagogía crítica*. Madrid: Editorial Popular, 9-12.
- Bal, M. (2009). *Conceptos viajeros en las humanidades. Una guía de viaje*. Murcia: Cendeac.
- Benhabib, S. (1987). "The Generalized and the Concrete Other", In Benhabib, S., Cornell, D. (eds.), *Feminism as Critique*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 77-95.
- Benhabib, S. (2008). "Otro universalismo: sobre la unidad y diversidad de los derechos humanos", *ISEGORÍA. Revista de Filosofía Moral y Política*, 39, 175-203.
- Beuscart, J. S., Peerbaye, A. (2006), "Histoires de dispositifs", *Terrains & Travaux*, 11, 3-15.
- Brah, A. (2011). *Cartografías de la diáspora: identidades en cuestión*. Madrid: Traficante de Sueños
- Brah, A. (2014). "Pensando en y a través de la Interseccionalidad", en: Zapata, M., García, S., Chan de Avila, J. (Edit.). *La interseccionalidad en debate*. Actas del Congreso Internacional "Indicadores interseccionales y Medidas de Inclusión Social en Instituciones de Educación Superior". Berlín: Aimee Heredia, 14-20.
- Brah, A., & Phoenix, A. (2004): "Ain't I A Woman? Revisiting Intersectionality". En: *Journal of international Women's Studies*, 5(3), pp. 75-86.
- Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. University of Chicago, Legal Forum, 139-167.
- Edmondson, J., & Shannon, P. (2002). Politics of reading: The will of the people. *The Reading Teacher*, 55(5), 452-454.
- Fornet-Betancourt, R. (1994). *Filosofía Intercultural*. Mexico: UPM.
- Fornet-Betancourt, R. (2001). *Transformación intercultural de la filosofía: ejercicios teóricos y prácticos de filosofía intercultural desde Latinoamérica en el contexto de la globalización* (No. 1 (8)). Bilbao: Desclée de Brouwer.
- Fraatz, J. M. B. (1987). The politics of reading: Power, opportunity, and prospects for change in America's public schools. *Teachers College Press*, 1234 Amsterdam Ave., New York, NY 10027.
- Fraser, N. (1995). From Redistribution to Recognition? Dilemmas of Justice in a "Postsocialist" Age, *New Left Review*, 1/212, 68-93.
- Fraser, N. (1997). *Justice Interruptus. Critical Reflections on the "Postsocialist" Condition*. New York: Routledge.
- Freire, P. (1975). *Acción cultural para la libertad*. Buenos Aires: Tierra Nueva.
- Giroux, H., & McLaren, P. (1991). "Radical Pedagogy as Cultural Politics: Beyond the Discourse of Critique and Anti-Utopianism." *Theory/Pedagogy/Politics*. Ed. Donald Morton and Mas'ud Zavarzadeh. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 152-86.
- Guattari, F., & Rolnik, S. (2006). *Micropolítica: cartografías del deseo*. Madrid: Traficantes de Sueños.
- Hill Collins, P. (1990). *Black feminist thought: knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. London: Routledge.
- Lazzarato, M. (2006). *Por una política menor. Acontecimiento y política en las sociedades de control*. Madrid: Traficante de Sueños.
- Mccall, L. (2005). "The Complexity of intersectionality". En: *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 30(3), pp. 1771-1800.
- McLaren, P. (1992). Critical Literacy and Postcolonial Praxis: A Freirian Perspective. *College Literature*, 19(3)/20(1): 7-27.
- McLaren, P., & Farahmandpur, R. (2006). *La enseñanza contra el capitalismo global y el nuevo imperialismo. Una pedagogía crítica*. Madrid: Editorial Popular.
- Mohanty, Ch. (1990). "On Race and Voice: Challenges for Liberal Education in the 1990s." *Cultural Critique* 14 (Winter 1989/90): 179-208.
- Perfetti, C. A. (1991). The psychology, pedagogy, and politics of reading. *Psychological Science*, 2(2), 70-83.
- Rivas, A., Mezzadra, F., & Veleza, C. (2011). *La construcción de justicia educativa*. Buenos Aires: Unicef.
- Sousa, B. (2010). *Descolonizar el saber, reinventar el poder*. Montevideo: Ediciones Trilce. Extensión Universitaria de la República.
- Spivak, G. (2008). "Estudios de la Subalternidad. Deconstruyendo la historiografía", In: Mezzadra, S., Spivak, G., Tapadle, Ch., Sota, E., Hall, S. Chakrabarty, D., Mbembe, A., Young, R., Puwar, N. y Róala, F. *Estudios Postcoloniales. Ensayos fundamentales*. Madrid: Traficante de Sueños, 33-68.
- Taylor, S., Henry, M., Lingard, B., & Rizvi, F. (1997). *Educational policy and the politics of change*. Psychology Press.

Young, I.M. (2002). *La justicia y la política de la diferencia*. Universitat de València.

Yuval-Davids, N. (2014). "Más allá de la dicotomía del reconocimiento y la redistribución: interseccionalidad y estratificación", In Zapata, M., García, S., Chan de Avila (Coord.). *La interseccionalidad en debate*. Berlín: MISEAL, 21-34.

HOW TO CITE THE ARTICLE

Ocampo, A., López-Andrada, C. (2019). Lecturas de la multiplicidad: para una articulación del derecho a la lectura en clave relacional. [Readings of the multiplicity: for the articulation of the right to reading from the relational perspective] *Pedagogía Social. Revista Interuniversitaria*, 33 31-43. DOI:10.7179/PSRI_2019.33.06

AUTHOR'S ADDRESS

Aldo Ocampo González. Carmen 566, Of. 1907. Santiago Centro, Santiago, Chile. E-mail: aldo.ocampo@celei.cl

Concepción López-Andrada. Facultad de Formación del Profesorado. Campus Universitario, Av. de la Universidad, s/n, 10071 Cáceres, España. E-mail: clopezc@unex.es

ACADEMIC PROFILE

Aldo Ocampo González. Director fundador del Centro de Estudios Latinoamericanos de Educación Inclusiva (CELEI), primer centro de investigación creado en Latinoamérica y el Caribe en esta materia: celei.cl. Académico del Programa de Magíster en Educación Inclusiva de la Univ. Santo Tomás, La Serena, Chile. Profesor invitado en el Programa de Maestría en Educación desde la Diversidad de la Univ. de Manizales, Colombia; Profesor Máster en Creatividad, Educación y Bienestar de la Universitat de Barcelona, España y director de Tesis Doctorales en el Programa Oficial de Doctorado en Educación de la Univ. Internacional SEK, Chile. Doctor en Ciencias de la Educación aprobado sobresaliente por unanimidad, mención "Cum Laude" (UGR, España). Profesor de Educación Básica, Licenciado en Educación, Magíster en Educación, mención Currículo y Evaluación (UAC), Magíster en Educación, mención Política Educativa (ULARE), Máster en Lingüística Aplicada a la Enseñanza del Español como L2 (Univ. Jaén, España), Máster en Integración de Personas con Discapacidad (Univ. Salamanca, España), Post-titulado en Psicopedagogía e Inclusión, Postitulado en Pedagogía Universitaria con Orientación en Enseñanza para la Comprensión, Diplomado en Estudios de Género y Diplomado en Investigación Social del Cuerpo y las Emociones (U. Chile). Ha sido académico de importantes universidades chilenas y autor de numerosas publicaciones en el campo de la Educación Inclusiva. Permanentemente imparte conferencias en congresos internacionales gracias a sus escritos (España, México, Brasil, Ecuador, Colombia, Perú, Argentina, Chile, etc.), así como, capacita universidades extranjeras y docentes e imparte seminarios en sus principales líneas de investigación a nivel nacional e internacional. Actualmente cursa el doctorado en Filosofía donde escribe su tesis doctoral sobre Historia Intelectual y Conceptual de la Educación Inclusiva, en el Depto. de Filosofía II de la UGR, España.

Concepción López-Andrada. Directora del Observatorio sobre Educación Lectora, Nuevas Ciudadanías y Educación Lectora “Emilia Ferreiro”. Licenciada en Filología Hispánica por la Universidad de Extremadura (UEX), Máster TIC en educación: análisis y diseño de procesos, recursos y prácticas formativas por la Universidad de Salamanca (USAL) y Máster Universitario en Investigación en Arte y Humanidades (UEX). Es coordinadora de editores de Polyphonia. Revista de Educación Inclusiva. Actualmente se desempeña como Investigadora Asociada al Centro de Estudios Latinoamericanos de Educación Inclusiva (CELEI) y como Profesora Asociada en la Facultad de Formación del Profesorado de la UEX.