

Educational Inclusion: biopolitical approach related to the bicentennial

Juan Carlos Echeverri-Alvarez¹

¹Universidad Pontificia Bolivariana, Medellín – Colombia

ABSTRACT – Educational Inclusion: biopolitical approach related to the bicentennial. This paper studies the historical relationship between education and society based on a problematic element – inclusion. The commemoration of independence in American countries is addressed to show that different forms of educational inclusion seen today must be analyzed from the perspective of the form of power that made them possible and necessary for the last two hundred years, that is, the liberal power. The concepts of biopolitics and governance are used theoretically and methodologically. It is showed that educational inclusion is not an altruistic contingency of power but a condition of possibility of its constant validity. Additionally, its inherent obligation to impose exclusion and promote inclusion is part of the current logic according to which ruling also entails letting others live and facilitating death for them.

Keywords: Educational inclusion. Liberalism. Exclusion. Governance. Bicentennial.

RESUMEN – Inclusión Educativa: aproximación biopolítica en clave de bicentenario. Se pregunta por las relaciones históricas entre educación y sociedad con base en un elemento problemático: la inclusión. Se asume la conmemoración de las independencias americanas para mostrar que las diferentes formas de inclusión educativa del presente deben ser analizadas desde la perspectiva de la forma del poder que las hace posibles y necesarias desde hace ya doscientos años, a saber, el poder liberal. Se recurre teórica y metodológicamente a las nociones de biopolítica y de gubernamentalidad. Se demuestra que la inclusión educativa no es una contingencia altruista del poder sino una condición de posibilidad de su vigencia constante; además, que su inherente obligación de imponer exclusiones y de fomentar inclusiones hace parte de la lógica actual según la cual gobernar también es permitir vivir y facilitar morir.

Palabras-clave: Inclusión educativa. Liberalismo. Exclusión. Gubernamentalidad. Bicentenario.

Introduction

Because inclusion is a buzzword (Duk and Murillo, 2016), it seems easy to approach it with the simple notion of invoking its unquestioned benefits for the people, societies, and democracy. However, that very positive, popular opinion makes it a complex concept to understand. Therefore, today, to address inclusion as a specific mode of the relationship between education and society, a historical approach is undertaken, one that asks about educational inclusion in the present but looks to the past to find emergency conditions of the problems that disturb us. More specifically, educational inclusion is considered the key to the events of American independence two hundred years ago. This bicentennial shows the persistence of liberal power to the present day, in which nation states have been the strategy in governing the population through processes of inclusion and exclusion. This incessant dynamic of inclusion has not been an altruistic option by the government but a constitutive element of the form of liberal power and its neoliberal adaptations (Heidegger, 1994; Foucault, 2007; Echeverri-Alvarez, 2015).

To start with, two points must be clarified: one, the objective of this work is not liberalism in its essential historical differences but an approach in the concept of liberal governance that, having been effective through the present, allows for some long-term analyses that are not theoretical innocence, neglected continuities, or impossible leaps but necessary reasoning to understand today's educational inclusion related to the logic of power that emerged more than two hundred years ago (Foucault, 2007; Echeverri-Alvarez, 2015). Additionally, this work's object of study is not Michel Foucault's thinking. It addresses two categories of his work, not by explaining them exhaustively but using them as tools to reflect on educational inclusion. In both cases, it is important to read the text related to its internal coherence and not as a lack of the immeasurable work produced around both issues. This study's hypothesis is as follows: today's educational inclusion is part of the constant validity of the art of governing the population by using a formula that has continued to produce increasingly elaborated modes of individual and collective freedom since the end of the 18th century, which is currently related to managing life in terms of letting people live and facilitating death for them. Based on this hypothesis, between the republican logics of power and the current forms of governing the population, there is a biopolitical thread of freedom construction. This is an important thread to follow, at least partially, to better understand what educational inclusion and its consequences signify today.

Methodologically, this proposes thinking about historical processes through a chosen theory. Two concepts are addressed from the work of the French philosopher Michel Foucault (2001a; 2006; 2007), namely, *biopolitics* and *liberal governance*. They are used because Foucault himself said (1993), "We must consider the critical ontology of ourselves not, certainly, as a theory, a doctrine, nor even as a permanent body of knowledge that accumulates; it has to be conceived as an at-

titude, an *ethos*, a philosophical life in which the critique of what we are is at one and the same time a historical analysis of the limits that are imposed on us and an experiment with the possibility of going beyond them” (p. 17). This methodology recognizes that, historically, there is a constant production of freedom, inclusion, and exclusion by liberal governance and, consequently, today’s educational inclusion has to be studied in the same logic of the power to govern and administer life that is liberalism (Foucault, 2007).

A final introductory comment. From the perspective of school and education, the arguments presented might appear rigid, and with good reason, one could argue that school is much more than a governance device. There are two things to consider here; first, governing in liberalism is not a practice enacted to make people submissive, but it is one to make them agents of the government itself, to liberate them. Second, of course, school is much more than just a way to exercise power; it is a space buzzing with affection, sociability, knowledge, and innovation (Guzman and Saucedo, 2015). However, we also think that all these elements make up the mechanism for governing and, in this space, it is only possible for us to begin entering through its surfaces to the detriment of that existing wealth.

This article comprises six sections: biopolitics and liberal governance; independence and education related to liberal governance; educational inclusions today: reassessing the biopolitical thread; company format: subjective inclusion; letting people live and facilitating death for them; and finally, a discussion.

Biopolitics and Liberal Governance

Michel Foucault called biopower the set of mechanisms through which the fundamental biological features of the human species are transformed into parts of politics within a general strategy of power. More specifically, since the 18th century, Western societies have accepted the essential biological feature that man constitutes a species that must be governed. To make this concept meaningful and relevant in the logic of educational inclusion, it is imperative to follow the path of *governance* that this thinker took, because only “[...] once we understand what this governmental regime called liberalism is, will it be possible to understand what biopolitics is” (Foucault, 2007, p. 41).

For Foucault (2001b), the West had just two major models to control individuals, namely, the model of exclusion of lepers and the model of inclusion of the marginalized. In the Middle Ages, lepers were the object of exclusionary practices. One of the most visible and definitive practice was being exiled from their own city, which was closed so that the sick would be relegated to oblivion in a new, exclusive space, invented to concentrate the infected without endangering the healthy inhabitants. In contrast, throughout the 17th and 18th centuries, to fight the plague, cities resorted to the inclusion of the threat posed by

sick people: the plagued city paid attention to internal dangers and power multiplied to the point of trapping the infected bodies within a normalizing system (Foucault, 2000; Castro, 2009). Transformation of a technology of power that “[...] expels, excludes, prohibits, marginalizes, and represses a positive power, which constructs, observes, produces knowledge, and multiplies its effects precisely because of this accumulated knowledge” (Foucault, 2001b, p. 55). This historical change from the leprosy model to the plague model corresponds to what Foucault called *the invention of positive power technologies*, which still function in neoliberal governance. Power that reduced both the economic costs of governing as well as the possibilities of rebellion, resistance, and the emergence of disobedience and illegality that characterized the feudal system previously used.

The new governance was established as the set of institutions, procedures, calculations, and tactics that enabled the use of a form of government whose main target was the population, its greatest knowledge the political economy, and its essential, technical instrument security policies – a way of governing through state administration. However, the State itself has not been the source of power but rather a strategy of that power that resorts to the State presence to guide people’s behavior, that is, to govern them. What general power technology has the State’s changes, development, and functioning ensured to this day? This general power technology is liberalism, which is present since the 18th century in the West and is still in effect in its neoliberal adaptations (Foucault, 2007, p. 448).

New art of organized governing based on the idea of less governance. Frugality is the liberal principle that governance should not be excessive nor insufficient (Foucault, 2007, p. 44). In this art of governing, the market is a place of *truth* for government intervention. Simultaneously, public power interventions conform to the principle of utility, meaning that exchange and utility are the engines that drive governance based on promoting individual and collective interests that, in inextricable interaction, regulate life in society. To govern, then, is to manipulate these interests and make them multiply more or less artificially in the market. Liberalism addresses the utility of government actions in a society where market exchanges determine the true value of things (Foucault, 2007, p. 67; Echeverri-Alvarez, 2015).

Calling this general form of power *liberalism* is justified by the leading role of freedom in achieving the goals of the governance of men. Freedom is not an eternally existing universal that reveals itself little by little in its variations: “[...] freedom is never anything [...] but a current relationship between the rulers and the ruled, a relationship in which the measure of the deficit of freedom that exists is given by the even more demanded freedom there exists” (Foucault, 2007, p. 83). Freedom is neither granted completely from above nor is it demanded all at once from below, it is built up daily in the relationship between rights that enhance action and gradual demands to increase it. To arrive at liberalism was not to conquer a hijacked universal freedom but to recognize

the mechanisms by which it became constantly produced (Foucault, 2007).

Governing is a practice that consumes freedom; therefore, power is doomed to produce and organize it, that is, it suggests to each individual the following: “[...] I am going to provide you what is required for you to be free. I will ensure that you have the freedom to be free” (Foucault, 2007, p. 84). Liberal governments accommodate the natural mechanics of behavior, production, and circulation without any other form of initial intervention other than surveillance. It intervenes when it recognizes that something does not happen based on the free game of behaviors and exchanges: a governing game in which people are allowed to do things and things happen (Foucault, 2006, p. 70). This, then, is the liberal power, moving toward biopolitics, which is used as a key to the historical reading of educational inclusion.

Independence and Education Related to Liberal Governance

The goal of the bicentennial celebration is for the Americas to be independent from the insufficiently enlightened administration of Spain (Subirats, 1981). However, rather than being independent, we were won over by the unmitigated expansion of liberal governance because, based on this logic of power, “[...] the players were in Europe and the world was at stake” (Foucault, 2007, p. 74); a form of power that produced the truth of the government in the market. Therefore, it was impossible for it to coexist with empires closed to the free circulation of goods and ways of thinking, because “[...] this government practice [...] can only function if there are effectively a series of freedoms: freedom of the market, freedom of buyers and sellers, freedom to exercise the right to property, freedom of discussion, and eventually freedom of expression” (Foucault, 2007, p. 84). As a new national interest that consumes, produces, and organizes freedom, independence was a strategy of its production on the path to good governance of the whole population. After independence, the State was clearly positioned as the liberal power strategy to govern the population (Echeverri-Alvarez, 2015).

In the State, the two main words of this reasoning of government converge, namely, totality and freedom. Both have been political synonyms of inclusion and, correspondingly, perverse producers of exclusion. Totality, because the State itself is a whole that comprises totalities: a mechanism that governs the totality of a free population within the totality of a free territory as well. Freedom, because as the engine of governance, it cannot fail to occur in increasingly vast territories of law; subjectivity; and, more recently, disabilities, emotions, and distress. Independence enabled collective imaginaries to adapt to the new form of power that required every single person to freely accept being governed by a regime that granted some freedoms in law to spur demand from below for many freedoms in unexplored territories of the law, body, and mind (Echeverri-Alvarez, 2015; Foucault, 2007; Veiga-Neto, 2013).

Independence made it clear that governing all meant educating all: those excluded owing to race, caste, religion, wealth, and literacy, were gradually incorporated into the new formula of *all equal under the law* and propelled to belong to the all-encompassing community that the nation was imagined to be (Veiga-Neto, 2013; Bushnell, 1996). Even the most improbable colors and the most abject positions had to be included in nationality: *mixed race, pureblood, Spaniards, Black, mulatto, Moorish, Chinese, Indian, saltapatras, lobos, Jivaro, albarazado, cambujo, sambaigo, calpamulato, undefined, no te entiendo, and torna atrás*. For example, they would no longer be excluded as castes but rather as people who were increasingly better educated to be included as citizens in the nation (López-Beltrán, 2008).

With independence, liberal governance became the general formula of power, and its constitutive institutions, such as education in schools, contributed to its expansion and definitive positioning. In fact, at the beginning of the 19th century, an educational phenomenon was introduced that today, two hundred years later, continues to make an impact because of its dimensions: the dizzying process of education's globalization through the Lancasterian method of teaching (Caruso and Roldán, 2005, p. 649). The process of diffusing schools as a privileged institution of a new scheme of society was based on modern ideas of progress, the individual, and was linked to superiority, first European and later in the United States (Caruso and Roldán, 2005, p. 646; Echeverri-Alvarez, 2015). Between the expansive pressure of freedom, independence, and the spread of education, there was no anecdotal coincidence but a convergence of the elements that constituted liberal governance in increasingly comprehensive market logics (Caruso, 2005; Echeverri-Alvarez, 2015).

The school structure was the invention of governance so that the population would recognize education as a right and educate themselves as a way of exercising their freedom. However, the republican beginning of schools was one violent inclusion because being free in this sense of the government was not optional freedom but rather an obligation imposed by political and educational means to legitimize liberal power. This obligation of individual freedom would lead to additional submissiveness in facing economic, cultural, and political inequalities. The school structure was the mechanism of overarching inclusion that, simultaneously, excluded broad sectors of the population from certain degrees of participation, well-being, or power. Schools and the Lancasterian method that enabled them were a government experiment in inclusion/exclusion logics that still exist today (Echeverri-Alvarez, 2015). For example, the inclusion of the poor in education involved excluding them from a social position. The English Manual on this method, translated in 1826 for Gran Colombia, expressed it as follows:

We owe our comforts and conveniences to the work and ingenuity of the poor: we truly have a deep interest in the state of their morals, because as in each Country they comprise the largest class, our personal security depends

very much on their moral qualities. We find ourselves obliged, on countless occasions, to entrust them with the care of our property, and what is of greater importance still, they vastly influence the spirit of our children, the good or bad qualities of the helpers in whose care they remain so long (p. 1).

The Lancasterian method, weighed down with gloomy images of punishment and verticality, was the opposite—a producer of inclusion, freedom, and equality in institutional micro-politics. It could be no other way: independence did not require submission but rather people with enough freedom to demand more and more freedom. In this sense, discipline has never been a way to suppress freedom but the mechanism of its continuous production, even more so: “[...] the panopticon is the very formula of a liberal government” (Foucault, 2007, p. 89). The Lancasterian method was the provisional mechanism of the liberal power used to establish schools, allow time for literacy, and the emergence of controlled education for the purposes of governing the population. School was an expression of inclusion that had not existed for children until then. Additionally, it also began promoting competition and the effort to succeed, stand out, and belong to the citizenship that today has moved toward performance (Han, 2014; Echeverri-Alvarez, 2015).

This method, also called monitorial (Caruso, 2005; Roldán, 2005), was the first totalizing experiment to develop freedom from below. Through its implementation, children were freed from social non-existence and weighted occupations of their parents. School gave them a voice, existence, and made them a target of power and knowledge to better govern themselves, that is, school included them as a way to build society. Education freed children from ancestral restraints and promised them that in school and in republican society, they would become everything they could achieve through their personal effort (Caruso, 2005). The need to liberate and guide children’s behavior forced schools to teach reading and writing: reading guaranteed recognition of the law and expedited the long journey that subjects such as psychology and pedagogy would undertake in the minds of people to ensure that they can each better explore their own territories as an inexhaustible source of freedom. This freedom liberates; however, it is also the liberal mechanism of governing the people (Rose, 2010); the school’s role in teaching reading also served to place the perfect guardian of self-government in subjectivity for each person (Hobsbawm, 2003)¹.

The improvement of the Lancastrian method during the second half of the 19th century led to pedagogies that, compared with the historical transformations of the last quarter of that century, demonstrated the need to avoid external, vertically disciplinary, and coercive control to make it less oppressive and more dynamic. What was sought with these pedagogies was for schools to cease being the space to exclude physical and mental pathologies, wealth, and poverty and instead to establish the possibility of valid socialization for all members of a population; socialization that was detached from class power and, more

so, linked to the truth that, from that moment, would outline medical science and the voice of experts in social engineering processes. Student resistance to this new form of socialization would be treated as individual deviations with consequences of exclusion from the system (Varela, 1992; Rose, 2010).

The educational process was accelerated, and the more the children were freed, the more the teachers were blamed. These teachers began to lose the historical authority that the role gave them, a phenomenon that accelerated the horizontalization of dignities in school among teachers and students. The more freedom that was granted to students and the more they were recognized as subjects of law, the more authority it subtracted from teachers as agents of the law to the point of showing them as guilty of the need to impart punishment on a lack of school discipline (Echeverri-Alvarez, 2015). This liberation of the child student reached a point of no return when the active school proclaimed: “[...] *Finally, children are the center of all matters at school. Finally, children are the sun!*” (Cubillos, 2007, p. 232). Education today, in the logic of market power, continues to reinforce this displacement toward students, toward their subjectivity, through shameful pedagogical models of the law (González, 1996), which, focused on learning, proclaim: “*finally, students are the center of all administrations, finally, students are the client!*”

Educational Inclusions Today: reassessing the biopolitical thread

It was previously stated that the words of governance are totality and freedom. In the 1990s, totality was the word that put inclusion back on the agenda of education. The expansion of the capitalist market surpassed the idea of the federal government, and since the second half of the 20th century, totality has been expressed through global transnational organizations or international treaties with unavoidable commitments for the signatory countries. At present, liberal governance has taken over the entire world. The World Declaration on Education for All (1990) expresses it as follows: as a global consensus on an expanded view of basic education, it constitutes a renewed commitment to guaranteeing that the basic learning needs of all, boys and girls, young people, and adults, are met in all countries.

The Salamanca declaration calls for the union of all governments and urges them to give the highest political and budgetary priority to improve their educational systems so that they can include all children, regardless of their differences or individual challenges. Totality of totalities: all States with all populations governed by increasingly refined ideas of visibility, freedom, and compliance, that is, all registered in the market. Further, in social terms, although saying *everybody* is always – paradoxically – vague, this Salamanca declaration clarifies provisionally who are all the ones that must be included:

[...] schools must welcome all children, regardless of their physical, intellectual, social, emotional, linguistic, or other conditions. They must accept disabled and gifted children, children living on the streets and working, children from remote or nomadic populations, children from ethnic or cultural linguistic minorities, and children from other disadvantaged or marginalized groups or areas (Unesco, 1994, p. 6).

Totality: because to govern is to include. Schools are destined to face the multiplicity of exclusions found in society because they remain the mechanism of experimentation for how to best govern the population (Veiga-Neto and Corcini Lopes, 2007). Schools must address what society is not capable of fully recognizing in citizenship, and it must include this, thereby contributing to the process of its social legitimacy to turn it into a market interest. Schools receive the abnormal, disabled, marginalized, mistreated, shy, self-conscious, drug addicted, thieves, pregnant women etc. and are increasingly pressured to include LGBTI, the tattooed and pierced, transvestites, those who are depressed, stressed, suicidal, and violent to make them effective or to turn them into submarkets that take advantage of them as well as their entire environment. This forces them to consume the products that these exclusionary conditions generate. The seemingly altruistic process of inclusion has an underground productive basis.

The logic of the school – pedagogical mechanism is twofold. On the one hand, it involves calling for an increasing number of people throughout the territory, and with increasingly wide age ranges, as stated in an educational policy in Colombia: from zero to always (Law No. 1804, 2016). On the other hand, it liberates them in a systematic process of legal, psychological, and cultural empowerment before teachers, parents, and adults in general transform them into narcissists who are only concerned with themselves (González, 1996). The growing freedom of students has the effect that while adults lose their authority, those who are trained become empowered in the law, and the self-blame of adults and teachers who feel responsible for squandering these children's experiences in the logic of an intolerable adult authoritarianism is multiplied. The result is a horizontalization of the relationships between children and adults that ends up generating, first, infantilization and dependency of children and young people and, second, a lack of adult authority and shame to promote the law for students' entry into culture. Both extremes generate violence and conflict that have characterized schools in the past few decades (Echeverri-Alvarez, 2015).

Company Format: subjective inclusion

The current biopolitical dimension of inclusion is related to the market, totality, and concepts of freedom. By a certain administrative logic, including children in school is a zero-sum game based on which the gradual increase in inclusion eliminates both disappearing and emerging forms of exclusion. The game involves not leaving any child out of the school system to enable everyone to succeed there as well as in society. The management idea of *all children in the educational system* is a promise that encourages educational policy efforts to generate more inclusion and increases the individual effort of those who are not yet in-

cluded to gain participation in the promised democratic totality. The *all children* formula erases the exclusive differences through appropriate procedures and planning that is capable of producing individual identity within the generalization that this *all* expresses (Popkewitz, 2010).

Since independence, inclusion has been the mandate that gave validity to the State's rationality. Simultaneously, it served the liberal power as a government strategy for individuals and the population (Lopes; Dal'igna, 2012). Currently, this also includes the imperative of forming a citizenship to build a nation. Inclusion names social, cultural, educational, and health practices that are directed at a population that requires discipline, monitoring, and regulation. Consequently, the excluded, that is, those who "[...] take on the majority of social disadvantages: poverty, lack of work, restricted sociability, poor housing conditions, higher exposure to the greatest risks of existence" (Boneti, 2008, p. 21) are considered as poorly governed, who will make bad electoral and social decisions. To not risk these bad decisions of the excluded, new situations considered life-threatening are included in public policy. These situations, however, were not initially covered by the State's management reasoning. Schools, within this logic of generating risks to promise inclusion, are precisely the incubator of situations in society that demand inclusion processes so that they do not affect governing the population properly.

In the case of the disabled, the government's management strategy seeks to keep them in school to positively increase attendance statistics. Simultaneously, it prevents the population from increasing risk factors associated with these disabilities. Therefore, the business logic of managing the population turns educational inclusion into a biopolitical strategy that serves to control the entire school-age population to guarantee collective safety by monitoring a series of statistical data on race, housing, income, family composition, and, of course, disabilities.

School inclusion makes it cheaper for States to manage populations, because in schools, those who are included enjoy hygiene, healthy eating, disease prevention, a peaceful culture, environmental respect, and ethics of sexuality, among other training, to coexist in the group despite their physical or mental differences. The families of these students who are included also receive guidance on various matters that interest them and the group: "[...] in this way, communities, families, and individuals are managed all at once, avoiding a series of risks" (Hattge, 2007, p. 194). School inclusion enables investment in human capital to produce people who work on their own, who will be able to compete within the market dynamics in place through neoliberalism's management rationality (Corcini; Lockmann; Hattge, 2013).

The market dictates the truth about society and organizes forms of government with increasing emphasis on a path that moves individuals toward themselves. People recognize themselves as a company, and thus everyone must become their own manager; ruling through an economy of self-government, which is included in society and in edu-

cation, everyone achieves self-realization instilled in school, no matter how different they seem at first glance. Self-realization works as a liberal power strategy to force market penetration into the private sphere. People who do not have a fulfilled life in terms of economic success and social standing are subject to therapies to help them achieve this fulfillment psychically. Psychology promises that its techniques enable increased profits, they combat conflicts, organize harmonious relationships, and neutralize violence against others or against oneself by incorporating a sweetened language of unreserved emotions (Illouz, 2007; 2010).

This totality of solo entrepreneurs comprises subjects constructed in mechanisms of subjectivation that drive them to self-manage and self-discipline. Psychic technology that serves as a panopticon of the self, monitors one's own life, and – when it does not function based on the criteria of social recognition – demands self-punishment that increases a withdrawal toward the self to avoid trauma in the global market in which its own company, or personal life, failed to prosper because of the faintheartedness of the individual manager (Vázquez, 2005). The psychic within is the new region of neoliberal freedom: people psychologically designed to use their experience of freedom to liberate themselves and to reprimand themselves because of their incompetence in achieving continued success. This maximizes the liberal government as a producer of subjects that need social approval to feel good about themselves. When subjects refuse to invest in projects that allow them to integrate into these circles of approval, they experience feelings of exclusion, devaluation, illness, and a gradual loss of meaning in life.

Self-managers must gain competences, manage emotions, exploit possibilities; they must develop a useful subjectivity based on criteria and rhythms established in a heteronomous manner, even if it are experienced as authentic and suitable. If a person is their own company, the management dimension must be strengthened. Neoliberal governmental rationality requires freedom, and it produces it in people's psyche with an increasing entrepreneurial, self-motivated, and restrained capacity with affective mechanisms of self-control: "The self as a project, which believes itself to be free from external and unconnected coercions, subjects itself to internal and its own coercions in the form of a performance and optimization constraint" (Han, 2014, p. 7).

Feelings are commodities that create emotions: happiness becomes an investment, and even old romantic love becomes consumption. Having good feelings is an educational exercise evaluated by pedagogues and psychologists, just as economists evaluate markets. Emotions have, of course, always been a part of humanity; however, the therapeutics of liberalism have been responsible for normalizing and managing them socially until they become commodities to vitalize the market that produces truth while serving as a partition of self-government to prevent social outbursts. The individuals in these societies are educated to interpret their emotions based on the principles of economics, which are nuanced by psychological models that serve as a tool for

the market to conceal its economic purposes: “[...] emotion and capitalism go together: various actors have converged in creating a sphere of action in which mental and emotional health is the main merchandise that circulates” (Illouz, 2010, p. 219).

In neoliberalism, affective vulnerability is decided in *affect management*. The State decentralizes its responsibility for individuals’ emotions so that they govern and punish themselves when necessary. The journey toward the self that began with the pedagogies of the 19th century has arrived at the station of emotion (Echeverri-Alvarez, 2015). These emotions are an unprecedented space of inclusion and exclusion, although they are directly related to the normal/abnormal pair of pedagogies from the late 19th century (Varela, 1992). It is an area of biopolitical inclusion that concerns living and dying. Biopolitical management *from zero to always*. Therefore, children are the first to be included in managing their emotions at school: it teaches them from an early age to live or to know how to die when necessary.

Letting People Live and Facilitating Death for Them

If inclusion involves generating interest, that is, producing market sectors for the economy to expand without limits, emotions also have their market, and if they do not produce the effects of sufficient self-government, there is always a contingency plan with the new market of afflictions that complements it (Martínez-Hernández, 2007). This market appears when fear is instilled in individuals and groups, because “[...] there is no liberalism without a culture of danger” (Foucault, 2007, p. 87), namely, fear of climate change, fear of foreigners, fear of armed conflict, fear of layoffs, fear of illness, fear of anything that will make the current situation worse, no matter how bad it may be. When this fear is not well channeled by the market of emotions, the market of afflictions takes over, within which schools include children with astounding ease, which some consider a shift from biopolitics to psychopolitics (Han, 2014; Comelles and Perdiguero-Gil, 2017).

In statistics from the United States, bipolar disorder, commonly known as the *illness of emotions*, has increased by 4000% since the mid-1990s. The curious thing about this new territory of inclusion/exclusion is that the symptoms of childhood bipolarism – grandiosity, diminished sleep, talkativeness, racing mind, distractibility, psychomotor shaking – all allude to the characteristics of a happy childhood. However, in the 1990s, the beginning of this epidemic expansion of bipolarism coincided with the maturity of antidepressant drug patents, and the pharmaceutical industry pushed for psychiatry to re-categorize a set of symptoms, the combination of which became pathological, and consequently, this led to an increase in the number of psychotropic drug users who were tempted by the promise of emotional stability (Rendueles, 2017, p. 83; Christofari; Rodrigues de Freitas; Baptista, 2015).

The commodification of emotional states, the biopolitics of afflictions, is reflected in increased diagnoses of depression, anxiety, and

other related disorders. By 2020, depression will be the second most common disease worldwide, behind ischemic heart disease (Martínez-Hernández, 2007), and one of the leading causes of disability and mortality caused by suicide. While, as Han (2014) says, depression is not the result of fatigue from *becoming oneself*, but the effect of the performance imperative that liberalism imposes on that self until someone *can't take it anymore*. The processes of naturalizing human afflictions and their restructuring into diseases are amplified today by the improved availability for users to resolve their ailments by taking psychotropic drugs – in other words, depression and afflictions – for the market.

In truth, this expansion of the commodification of subjectivity, this freedom of consumption, and this pathologizing of afflictions have to do with a particular perverse effect of the market's expansionist need that gives coherence, existence, and validity to liberal governance. While it violently turns the forms of feeling, desiring, and acting into disease to expand markets, it also legitimizes this practice with inclusion processes that, instead of including, label people in a category of interest, consumption, and management. It is a form of government that clearly allows people to live; however, it also makes it easier for them to die, including children in school.

Letting people live and facilitating death are simply an update to Michel Foucault's investment in the relationship of power with life: sovereignty would be the "right to die and let live" – power that is exercised in an asymmetric way, privileging death to the detriment of life; exercising power biopolitically would be "to live and let die," because it is about defending life to the point of only letting someone die when there is no other alternative. In the new biopolitical formula, it is no longer an exercise of power from above that kills or lets one live according to one's privileges but rather that people have to justify being alive, through success, entrepreneurship, and participation, and the system will allow them to live. If they do not succeed, they are guaranteed all the legal, psychological, and scientific weapons to be included for those who have the right to die (Forrester, 1996).

In a way, neoliberalism tells people the following: I will create the conditions so that you can live, and if you fail to manage yourself, I will make it easier for you to die. In fact, the market increasingly expands freedom to the untouched extremes, for example, with suicide, euthanasia, abortion. Although suicide seemed a resistance against the actions that regulated being a person, desiring, and fixing things that should or should not be done in normal behavior, the truth is that death – by way of suicide – for example, among young schoolchildren, has to do with the supreme exhaustiveness of the market, self-government of subjectivity, poor treatment of emotions, and fall into afflictions. It is a process that tells individuals that if they fail, despite the fact that the system created the conditions for them to live, the same system makes it easier for them to die to save the government money. Moreover, with death, it will also nurture another interest within the market that supports the general form of power, because to govern is to manipulate interests (Foucault, 2007).

As a biopolitical issue, inclusion is not a mechanism for killing but for preserving life and, therefore, preventing suicide by the excluded who are at imminent risk. However, the various modes of inclusion do not simply serve to recognize and intervene in social problems; simultaneously, they are also subtle mechanisms for creating and enlarging them. Suicide is a constitutive part of the biopolitical mechanism of governing the population in market logic. In scenarios of exclusion, impossibility of success, and inability to manage oneself efficiently through emotional and subjective ways, suicide is an ever-closer possibility, more subtly induced by ways that seem to reject it, but which actually make it more and more present. As Foucault would say, referring to sexuality: prohibitions do not inhibit it, but require constantly talking and thinking about it (Foucault, 2008b). Suicide, then, is one of those areas that, like sexuality, will have to come out of the closet and stop hiding from society in general.

The overvaluation of emotions, commercialization of afflictions, and exacerbated freedom of young people as preferred customers of the market make suicide equally a possibility, a challenge, and a spectacle. Death is the final conquest of freedom. School inclusion that identifies risks and minimizes them cannot hide the fact that more and more suicidal people are manifesting their intentions (Mondragón, 2008). In fact, biopolitics, for which death was an enemy and has now become a government strategy, as has been said, allows people to live, but makes it easier to die for the sake of the market and the population.

Discussion

This text, through a historical interpretation of the relationship between education and society, shows that inclusion is not an invention of today's democratizing rhetoric, nor an alternative to current education. Rather, it is the condition of the possibility of a form of power that emerged in the 18th century, which is nourished by freedom and, therefore, it is destined to produce and administer it incessantly, both in the factual spaces of law and in the vast territories of subjectivity. If in the dawn of liberated republics citizenship was the population's independence to generate freedoms in the field of law, in neoliberalism, the self has been the independence of territories of people's internal side to produce freedoms without more limits than individual imagination and death. In this sense, education still has an important place as a mechanism of liberalism to maintain a constant experience of freedom through exploratory incursion into new spaces of market interest, for example, the body, sexuality, emotions, and death. That is why inclusion is presented as a constant effort because the widespread existing inclusion is less than the increased inclusion that is demanded. In other words, the system thrives on inclusions that force exclusions which, in turn, struggle to be included; the incessant movement of liberalism—Educational inclusion can be understood in terms of governing the entire population—a form of power that builds its truths in the market;

therefore, because its geographic expansion has ended, it fosters interests that revitalize that market in exclusions, disabilities, and people's bodies and minds. Further, when inclusions are not accepted in some way, which should never affect the market itself, even with the last act of freedom: dying. If schools emerged to accept everyone, teach everything to everyone, liberate everyone, and allow everyone to compete in society, then the current state of education must be viewed in historical logics to ask what its effects are in terms of inclusion. From the perspective of governance and biopolitics, inclusion certainly has perverse effects on the market logic, transforming it into merchandise and interest; however, those same perversions must produce social transformation effects for the benefit of an increasing number of people. In other words, inclusion as a mechanism of governing is not pure negativity, because neither the government itself nor power is as such: inclusion is part of a dynamic of building society based on ideals and interests.

Finally, two comments. First, in relation to school and its role in society, this article does not argue that schools have a sole function of biopolitical and biopsychological governance, that is, a prison of *zero to always* in people's lives; however, this is one of its vital aspects. It is, as Nikolas Rose said about freedom: school, while it traps us, also frees us to create more of the freedom that governs us. Second, in relation to the theoretical use of some works by Michel Foucault, clearly, this thinker is not the subject of the article; therefore, it does not intend to account for all the nuances of his work but to use it as a toolbox. However, with the two chosen concepts – biopower and liberal governance – it is also possible to recognize the influence of this thinker in the concepts of subjectivity and the unfolding of the self, which he touches on in his later works, that is, *Technologies of the Self* (2008a), *The History of Sexuality* (2008b), and *The Hermeneutics of the Subject* (Foucault, 2008a; 2008b; 2002)².

Received on December 3, 2019

Approved on August 21, 2020

Notes

- 1 The idea of governance, in terms of governing the population, is complemented by Michel Foucault's later works, in the logic of subjectivity and technologies of the self, as will be seen (see: Foucault, 2008; Nikolas Rose, 2010).
- 2 The author thank Crimson Interactive Pvt. Ltd. (Enago) – <https://www.enago.com/es/> for their assistance in manuscript translation and editing.

References

BONETI, Lindomar. Exclusão, Inclusão e Cidadania no Ideário Neoliberal. In: ALMEIDA, Maria Lourdes; BONETI, Lindomar Wessler (Org.). **Educação e Cidadania no Neoliberalismo**. Da experiência à análise crítica. Campinas: Mercado das Letras, 2008. P. 19-34.

- BUSHNELL, David. **Colombia: una nación a pesar de sí misma**. Bogotá: Planeta, 1996.
- CARUSO, Marcelo. The Persistence of Educational Semantics: patterns of variation in monitorial schooling in Colombia (1821–1844). **Paedagogica Historica**, v. 41, n. 6, p. 721-744, 2005.
- CARUSO, Marcelo; ROLDÁN, Eugenia. Pluralizing Meanings: the monitorial system of education in Latin America in the early nineteenth century. **Paedagogica Histórica**, v. 41, n. 6, p. 645-654, 2005.
- CASTRO, Rodrigo. La Ciudad Apestada. Neoliberalismo y postpanóptico. **Revista de Ciencia Política**, v. 29, n. 1, p. 165-83, 2009. Disponible en: <<http://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0718-090X2009000100009>>. Acceso en el: 3 ago. 2019.
- CHRISTOFARI, Ana; RODRIGUES DE FREITAS, Claudia; BAPTISTA, Claudio. Medicalização dos Modos de Ser e de Aprender. **Educação & Realidade**, Porto Alegre, v. 40, n. 4, out./dez, Epub 25 ago. 2015. Disponible en: <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/2175-623642057>>. Acceso en el: 3 ago. 2019.
- COMELLES, Josep Maria; PERDIGUERO-GIL, Enrique (Org.). **Educación, Comunicación y Salud**. Perspectivas desde las ciencias humanas y sociales. Taragona: Publicaciones URV, 2017.
- CORCINI, Maura; LOCKMANN, Kamila; HATTGE, Morgana. **Políticas de Estado e Inclusão**, UPN, Facultad de Educación, n. 38, p. 41-50, 2013.
- CUBILLOS, Julio. **Agustín Nieto Caballero y el Proceso de Apropiación del Pensamiento Pedagógico y Filosófico de John Dewey**. Bogotá: U de V y GMB, 2007.
- DUK, Cynthia; MURILLO, Javier. La Inclusión como Dilema. **Revista Latinoamericana de Educación Inclusiva**, v. 10, n. 1, p. 11-14, 2016. Disponible en: <<file:///C:/Users/juane/Downloads/Dialnet-LaInclusionComoDilema-5505139.pdf>>. Acceso en el: 3 ago. 2019.
- ECHEVERRI-ALVAREZ, Juan. **Escuela y Métodos Pedagógicos en Clave de Gubernamentalidad Liberal**. Colombia 1821-1946. Medellín: UPB, 2015.
- FORRESTER, Vivian. **El Horror Económico**. Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1996.
- FOUCAULT, Michel. ¿Qué es la Ilustración? **Revista de Filosofía**, Murcia Universidad de Murcia, n. 7. p. 5-18, 1993.
- FOUCAULT, Michel. **Historia de la Locura en la Época Clásica**. Vol. 1. Madrid: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2000.
- FOUCAULT, Michel. **Defender la Sociedad**. Buenos aires: Fondo de Cultura Económico, 2001a.
- FOUCAULT, Michel. **Los Anormales**. Cursos en el College de France (1974-1975). México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2001b.
- FOUCAULT, Michel. **La hermenéutica del sujeto**. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica. 2002.
- FOUCAULT, Michel. **Seguridad, Territorio, Población**. México: Fondo de Cultura Económico, 2006.
- FOUCAULT, Michel. **Nacimiento de la Biopolítica**. México: Fondo de Cultura Económico, 2007.
- FOUCAULT, Michel. **Tecnologías del Yo y Otros Textos Afines**. Buenos Aires: Paidós, 2008a.

- FOUCAULT, Michel. **Historia de la Sexualidad I: la voluntad del saber**. 2a. Edición. Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI Editores, 2008b.
- GONZÁLEZ, Carlos. Autoridad y Autonomía. **Cuadernos Académicos**, n. 1, Medellín. Documento, Universidad Nacional, 1996.
- GUZMÁN, Carlota; SAUCEDO, Claudia. Experiencias, Vivencias y Sentidos en Torno a la Escuela y a los Estudios: abordajes desde las perspectivas de alumnos y estudiantes. **RMIE**, México, v. 20, n. 67, oct./dic., 2015.
- HAN, Byung-Chul. **Psicopolítica**. Barcelona: Herder Editorial, 2014.
- HATTGE, Morgana. A gestão da inclusão na escola: estratégia de controle do risco social. In: LOPES, Maura Corcini; DAL'IGNA, Maria Cláudia. **In/Exclusão: nas tramas da escola**. Canoas: Ed. ULBRA, 2007. P. 189-200.
- HEIDEGGER, Martin. **Serenidad**. Barcelona: Ediciones de Serbal, 1994.
- HOBSBAWM, Erik. **La Era del Imperio 1875-1914**. Barcelona: Crítica, 2003.
- ILLOUZ, Eva. **Intimididades Congeladas**. Las emociones del capitalismo. Buenos Aires: Katz Editores, 2007.
- ILLOUZ, Eva. **La Salvación del Alma Moderna Terapia, Emociones y la Cultura de la Autoayuda**. Buenos Aires: Katz Editores, 2010.
- LÓPEZ-BELTRÁN, Carlos. Sangre y Temperamento: pureza y mestizajes en las sociedades de castas americanas. In: GORBACH, Frida; LÓPEZ-BELTRÁN, Carlos (Org.). **Saberes Locales: ensayos sobre historia de la ciencia en América Latina**. Zamora, Michoacán: El Colegio de Michoacán, 2008. P. 289-342.
- LOPES, Maura Corcini; DAL'IGNA, Mária Cláudia. Subjetividade Docente, Inclusão e Gênero. **Educação & Sociedade**, v. 33, n. 120, p. 851-868, 2012.
- MARTÍNEZ-HERNÁNDEZ, Ángel. La Mercantilización de los Estados de Ánimo. El consumo de antidepressivos y las nuevas biopolíticas de las aflicciones. **Política y Sociedad**, v. 43, n. 3 p. 43-56, 2007.
- MONDRAGÓN, Liliana; CABALLERO, Miguel. Del sujeto que ha intentado suicidarse y el Otro: la Institución Psiquiátrica. **Revista Observaciones Filosóficas**, n. 7, p. 11, 2008.
- POPKEWITZ, Thomas. Inclusión y Exclusión como Gestos Dobles en Política y Ciencias de la Educación. **Propuesta Educativa**, n. 33, p. 11-27, jun. 2010.
- RENDUELES, César. La Gobernanza Emocional en el Capitalismo Avanzado. Entre el nihilismo emotivista y el neocomunitarismo adaptativo. **Revista de Estudios Sociales**, v. 62, p. 82-88, 2017. Disponible en: <<https://dx.doi.org/10.7440/res62.2017.08>>. Acceso en el: 3 ago. 2019.
- ROLDÁN, Eugenia. Order in the Classroom: the spanish american appropriation of the monitorial system of education. **Paedagogica Histórica**, n. 1, p. 655-675, 2005.
- ROSE, Nikolas. **Powers of Freedom**. Reframing political thought. London: Cambridge University, 2010.
- SUBIRATS, Eduardo. **La Ilustración Insuficiente**. Madrid: Taurus, 1981.
- UNESCO. Conferencia mundial sobre necesidades educativas especiales: acceso y calidad. **Declaración de Salamanca y marco de acción para las necesidades educativas especiales**. Salamanca, España, 7-10 de junio de 1994.
- VARELA, Julia Categorías espacio temporales y socialización escolar: del individualismo al narcisismo. **Revista de Educación**, n. 298, p. 7-29, 1992.

VÁZQUEZ, Francisco. Empresarios de Nosotros Mismos. Biopolítica, mercado y soberanía en la gubernamentalidad neoliberal. In: UGARTE, Javier (Comp.). **La Administración de la Vida**. Estudios biopolíticos. Barcelona: Anthropos, 2005. P. 73-103.

VEIGA-NETO, Alfredo. Biopolítica, Normalización y Educación. **Pedagogía y Saberes**, Bogotá, UPN, n. 38, p. 83-91, 2013.

VEIGA-NETO, Alfredo; CORCINI LOPES, Maura. Inclusão e governamentalidade. **Educação & Sociedade**, Campinas, v. 28, n. 100, out. 2007. Disponible en: <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0101-73302007000300015>>. Acceso en el: 3 ago. 2019.

Juan Carlos Echeverri-Alvarez is a historian and has a master's degree in history; PhD in education. Professor at Universidad Pontificia Bolivariana, Medellín, Colombia. Director of the Pedagogy and Didactics of Knowledge Research Group (PDS), ranked A1, in Colciencias. Director of the PhD in Education at UPB.

ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9577-468X>

Email: juan.echeverri@upb.edu.co

Editor-in-charge: Luís Armando Gandin

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 International. Available at: <<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>>.