REVISTA PERSPECTIVAS UFPS

Original Article

Capitalism and Social Inclusion: Divergences, Utopias and Challenges.

Capitalismo e Inclusión Social: Divergencias, Utopías y Desafíos.

Fabian Andrey Zarta-Rojas[1*]

[1*]*Doctor in Complex Thought, Fabian.zarta@uniminuto.edu.co, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5536-3712 , Minuto de Dios University Corporation, Bogotá D.C., Colombia.*

	RESUMEN
Palabras clave: Inclusión Social, Capitalismo, Resistencias, Performance, Crítica.	La presente reflexión es una invitación a la apertura de acciones colectivas que contribuyan a ponerle límites a la intervención del capitalismo frente a la inclusión social. El texto se desarrolla en tres acápites: (a) ¿Capitalismo inclusivo o Inclusión capitalista?; (b) La inclusión social como performance en el mundo capitalista; (c) Acciones de resistencia ante el pensamiento neoliberal. Debido a las particularidades de tema en cuestión, se consideró que merece ser revisado desde una metodología interdisciplinar (ciencias humanas y sociales), en la que se puedan gestar puentes epistémicos que permitan combinar modelos teóricos y conceptuales para enriquecer el estudio desde múltiples campos y así conseguir una visión compleja. Las conclusiones apuntan a que los procesos de inclusión social que actualmente existen, deben ser potenciados, buscando, de manera constante, mutar hacía unos horizontes transdisciplinarios con los cuales pueda enriquecer la labor que se realiza como acto de resistencia.

	ABSTRACT
Keywords: Social Inclusion, Capitalism, Resistance, Performance, Criticism.	This reflection is an invitation to open collective actions that contribute to limit the intervention of capitalism to social inclusion. The text is developed in three sections: (a) Inclusive capitalism or capitalist inclusion; (b) Social inclusion as performance in the capitalist world; (c) Actions of resistance against neoliberal thought. Due to the particularities of the subject in question, it was considered that it deserves to be reviewed from an interdisciplinary perspective, in which epistemic bridges can be created to combine theoretical and conceptual models that allow enriching the study from multiple fields and thus achieving a complex vision. The conclusions suggest that the processes of social inclusion that currently exist must be strengthened and constantly seek to mutate towards transdisciplinary horizons with which to enrich the work carried out as an act of resistance.

*Corresponding author.

E-mail address: Fabian.zarta@uniminuto.edu.co   (Fabian Andrey Zarta-Rojas)

Introduction

Our ability to reach unity in diversity will be the beauty and the test of our civilization.

-Mahatma Gandhi-

The "capitalist machine" is the term used within the political philosophy of Deleuze and Guattari (2004) to denote the economic system that prevails in the 21st century. Why? Because of its perfection in subjectifying and updating itself through axioms to monetize activities that were previously only hobbies.

This machine, in its latest updates (axioms), traverses various conceptualizations and practices that social scientists had foreseen; one of them is the so-called social inclusion. If we review the concept, Chuaqui et al. (2016) offer the following description: "it is the social relationship that prevents or hinders the achievement of a better social position, overcoming a situation or a right to which one should have access" (p. 163).

This definition is pertinent to the purposes of this text because the neoliberal system makes the power relations, which Foucault (2015) spoke about, be affected by it to achieve two of its purposes: individualization and compulsiveness in consumption practices in individuals until their own annulment (death). In other words, capitalism seeks individuation, that is, to dismantle any kind of collective that resists the system. Meanwhile, social inclusion aims to develop community actions that open spaces of resistance to contain the coercions of the capitalist machine.

All this brings several facts into discussion: on the one hand, that capitalism seeks to dissipate the resistance practices implemented, within the framework of social inclusion, in the territories or contexts where it is necessary; on the other hand, that there are divergences, but also relationships, to a certain utopian extent, between the neoliberal system and social inclusion; finally, that capitalism has traversed social inclusion by monetizing it and making it a part of the prevailing economic system. In this sense, the question that arises in the face of this contemporary emergency is: what are the divergences between capitalism and social inclusion, and how do they manifest?

Following this line of thought, the starting point of this discussion is a consequence of the decline in resistance practices generated from social inclusion by the public-private enterprise, political acts, and performative acts of citizenship. Likewise, not less important, it seems that academia has not developed sufficient critical thinking (although in some circles these issues are discussed, such as in linguistics, anthropology, or intercultural education) in the face of the savage facts of the neoliberal system, as if they too had been subjectivized by the system. The issue, although it may be overwhelming, cannot be more potent than all social sectors together, because the whole is not the sum of its parts, as Morin (1995) states, indicating that there is a force beyond imagination when all social actors generate resistance against the same threat.

At this point, it is worth recalling the teachings of Mirowski (2014), who points out that capitalism is not a machine that stops for any reason. What it generates in its path is a series of crises in the social structure, indicating that we must not let it "win the game." Hence, the present reflection is an invitation to open up collective actions that contribute to setting limits on the neoliberal apparatus.

In this logic, fostering a critical discussion and alternative solution routes allows both the author and the readers of this text to position themselves as political subjects and, following Arendt (1997), enable the emergence of political action. Only within this understanding of the subject can an interaction occur that allows for the emergence of a practice of thought on joint paths, as well as the opening of a performance that disrupts the manipulation of the

body and identity by the capitalist system (Butler, 2009).

Thus, the present reflection will be developed under the following headings, which will advance the discussion and facilitate the review of certain points that challenge academia, citizenship, and the dimensions they involve: (a) Inclusive Capitalism or Capitalist Inclusion? (b) Social Inclusion as Performance in the Capitalist World; (c) Actions of Resistance Against Neoliberal Thought.

To conclude this brief introduction to the topic, it is essential to mention the epistemic approach or method from which the analysis will be developed. Due to the particularities of the topic in question, it was considered that it deserves to be reviewed from an interdisciplinary perspective, building epistemic bridges to combine theoretical and conceptual models that enrich the study from various fields to achieve a complex vision, as proposed by the principles of complex thought by Morin (1995) and the transdisciplinary approaches of Zarta (2022).

Inclusive Capitalism or Capitalist Inclusion?

Research on the various strands of capitalism—psychology of capitalism (Han 2014), platform capitalism (Srnicek and Giacometti 2018), gore capitalism (Valencia 2012), capitalist ideology (Zizek 1992), the pathologies capitalism develops in individuals (Deleuze and Guattari 2004), and capitalism and the environment (Klein 2015)—not only highlights how this apparatus is composed and deployed but also indicates that it has, so far, no form of containment.

This consideration is fundamental when thinking about how the system acts in the face of practices labeled as "resistance," such as social inclusion. This puts into crisis the way we are conceptualizing the praxis corresponding to this concept, which has become so popular in recent decades; could it be

this very popularity that exposed social inclusion to capitalist monetization?

As Arias and Costas (2016) state in "The New Skin of Capitalism," the essential hallmark of the system is its adaptability to changes, no matter how rapid they may be; the key point is that it sells itself as a naturalized fact amidst human practices. This can be termed "inclusive capitalism," a tactic of the neoliberal system to capture all possible activities involving social inclusion actions, because, in addition to traversing inclusive practices, it is also doing so with the inclusive discourse itself, which is becoming increasingly popular. Capitalism has ended up monetizing both issues.

Talking about inclusive capitalism sounds absurd because its aim is not that at all; it is solely economic and accumulative (of wealth), which makes it function like a savage machine, as Valencia (2012) indicates, and schizophrenic, in terms of Deleuze and Guattari (2004). Thinking that capitalism acts as a system that considers the human aspect is to adopt an attitude of naivety towards the inequalities, wars, and bloodshed unleashed by the rules imposed by this economic model.

To understand this intricate system in real terms, it is worth recalling an illustration from the academic developments and practices of social inclusion from a few years ago. These were understood as a series of practices, rules, policies, and protocols that facilitated access to better living conditions for people in special conditions (the disabled, those in extreme poverty, etc.), thus improving their own reality. All this was supported by the government, NGOs, and private sector companies that presented joint projects (within the increasingly popular "corporate social responsibility") to contribute to regional, territorial, and national development. This was considered a form of resistance, where academia (scientists and students from various programs) collaborated as volunteers within their disciplinary fields.

However, over the years, thanks to the contribution of all social actors, both the conceptualization and practice of social inclusion were consolidated. Some studies worth mentioning in this regard include Booth et al. (2000); Arnaiz (2002); Stainback and Stainback (1996); and finally, Ainscow (2017), whose contributions propelled discussions in many arenas about the "new" way to interact with otherness given the emerging demands of the contemporary world. But this significant development in human history, which aimed to humanize the issue, began to decline when the notion of social inclusion started being used indiscriminately.

This occurred, in fact, due to the large conglomerates and luxury brands that aimed to "reach" all audiences so that their customers could easily access their products. This was merely a strategy for people who dreamed of owning a luxury or expensive item to acquire it and showcase it in different settings. At this very point, the discourse of social inclusion began to blur, as the concept initially did not include sales strategies at all. Nonetheless, this crisis continued to escalate until it reached social media, where everything worsened.

On social media (Facebook, Instagram, and more recently TikTok), influencers capitalized on the trend and the exponential growth that the "inclusion" strategy had generated in many well-known companies, making it the central axis of an advertising strategy consisting of contests, giveaways, and ways in which people of limited means could, through "great sacrifice," acquire high-end or expensive items. This model provided an excuse for influencers to create videos where they gave away money, jewelry, and luxury clothing to homeless people. None of this was free, as with each view, like, and increased number of followers, influencers received payments from the platforms; this supposed "inclusive" campaign was used without any ethical consideration, purely for economic gain. By then, capitalism had already envisioned its new objective: to co-opt the discourse and practices

involving what had become a complete trend—talking about social inclusion.

This brief example illustrates how the practical implications that the notion of social inclusion encompassed were gradually distorted, to the point of completely losing its most powerful purpose: to resist. With the loss of this condition, progress is impossible, as it puts in checkmate the operability of all disciplines that promoted good practices of inclusion.

At this point, it is appropriate to examine the divergences and utopias present in this antagonism-agonism, as Mouffe (2008) calls it. One of the first, as previously mentioned, is the condition of an inclusive or humanistic capitalism, which is a sharp contradiction due to the voracious and insatiable nature of capitalism. Furthermore, the incompatibility between capitalism and inclusion is increasing because they are conceptually antonymous. Capitalism generated a discursive overexposure to distort the notion of inclusion, explaining how neoliberalism managed to infiltrate and capitalize on the practices and discourse of social inclusion. This antagonism is marked by two elements: on one hand, the economic vision of capitalism that seeks individuation within the societal structure; on the other hand, social inclusion that aims for community work to sustain a struggle and resist with a view towards social justice, equality, and equity for those who make up society. Thus, the confrontation between the two situations becomes evident.

Among the divergences that may exist, it is worth daring to account for certain utopias that can generate uncertainty or clarify some ideas of this reflection. One possible chimera is that capitalism has helped consolidate certain processes of social inclusion around the world. Specifically, in the academic field, where state investment has grown to improve the quality of life in schools: actions that, although they may not be an explicit action of capitalism, show the level of corruption during investments. The focus is not expressly on education

but on certain individual economic ends behind social inclusion projects.

Another illusion, from contemporary social theory, is to think about how capitalism and inclusion could be linked; a question that has been debated since their origins, allowing social scientists to continue scrutinizing the possible elements and complexities of both concepts. This allows political enunciation, from academia, to re-emerge with clear positions on how to address the complex power relations that this duo entails.

What has been discussed so far is nothing more than an equilateral review of the topic, as it can lead to other understandings of the political, ethical, and cultural implications arising from the interaction between schizophrenic capitalism and social inclusion practices today.

The next step in this discussion is to explore the other side of the coin: attempting to understand the more organic and potent function of inclusion by considering the performances carried out from different spaces, realms, contexts, and disciplines. This aims to continue constituting a collective identity that confronts the relentless norms of capitalism with both body and mind, as Butler (2009) suggests. Additionally, it is intended that new generations, through these acts of performance, gain political awareness and raise their voices in resistance to vital issues that concern them, as Zarta and Juliao (2022 a and b) assert. All these arguments will be discussed in the following section.

Social Inclusion as Performance in the Capitalist World

Performance is a term that has undoubtedly become popular in recent years, but it has always been present in a discreet and prudent manner, particularly in the fields of dramaturgy and literature. However, over the years, it has expanded into other areas, embracing interdisciplinarity, and establishing itself as a key tool for the social and human sciences.

To mention something fundamental about this concept and its relevance, it is important to note that it began as "performance art," meaning "live art," which involves using the body as a means of expression for something that language itself cannot convey. This was one of the main reasons why social scientists investigated the implications of this type of bodily expression, especially in matters of dissent, as Rancière (2019) stated. These gaps between the body and reality are framed between the aesthetic and the political, two fundamental elements in gender studies conducted by various authors in the last century, which guided future ideas and debates that led to the development of a performance theory.

Authors such as Hughes and Bartlett (2002), Mujika (2009), Butler (2009), Taylor (2015), and Taylor and Fuentes (2011) globally form a theoretical staff that contributed to the creation of an academic space where the potentialities, folds, and functions of this new way of seeing the corporeal, as well as its intervention in political, economic, and cultural processes, could be explored.

Other authors also contributed ideas to define the issue, such as Goffman (2001), who asserts that performance is "the total activity of a given participant on a given occasion which serves to influence in some way any of the other participants" (p. 27). Or Haraway (1984), for whom it was a strategy that allows the exchange of situated knowledges from our own codes, that is, from our own body. For Butler, when the gender perspective is removed from performance, what remains is an act that disrupts the immediate reality where the body does not feel belonging or included.

These theoretical developments undoubtedly allowed the idea of performance to achieve the consistency it has today. The technical blend of these philosophical, anthropological, sociological, psychological, literary, and communicative reflections gave performance the status of an "act of resistance." Added to this was a whole discursive trend in which practical and dialogical elements were

merged, creating a process to open paths, routes, and relationships to express indignation against the barbarities of the modern world, as it seemed that no one cared about abused children, socially murdered leaders, and sexually abused women.

That moment in the early 21st century when governments seemed to ignore the needs of the people generated collective indignation to such an extent that there was no other possibility but to take academia to the streets, not in theoretical terms but in practical ones. Many sectors joined this trend, for whom taking to the streets, visually and discursively interrupting passersby, became a tactic to persuade citizens about the government's actions and its appalling decisions regarding violence against innocent people's bodies. It was at that moment that global organizations linked up, promoting performative strategies to achieve a more inclusive world; that is, to address political corruption that was closing the door to a dignified life for people living in precarious conditions or, as Wacquant (2010) put it, "punishing the poor."

Thus, the fusion of performance and social inclusion became a resounding success because it was a tool that enhanced inclusion processes in various social, political, and economic sectors. Thus, discussing gender, dignity, poverty, equality, equity, and justice in settings such as schools, companies, universities, or high-risk areas was no longer considered absurd, but rather processes of raising awareness about quality of life and transforming reality were undertaken. It was something akin to communication for social change, where the individual enunciates politically, as Dagron (2004) says.

Given this panorama, the path forward would be a collective action of resistance against anything that generates processes of biological or existential precarity, which places capitalism as the main adversary. In this sense, resistances linked to social inclusion were framed within everything that the capitalist machine alienated from individuals until it

nullified them. In other words, the capitalist system extracts the vital energy from human beings until exhausting them, leaving their bodies in deplorable conditions and existential precarity, as affirmed by Zarta and Juliao (2022a) drawing on Foucault's (2002) reflections on biopolitics.

With the above, it is affirmed that social inclusion changed the sense, notion, and parameters in which it was established; that is, it underwent a whole reengineering (which it should continue to achieve) regarding its objectives and practical applications. Thus, inclusion is constituted as an act of resistance (of a performative type) and reflective disobedience that confronts neoliberal processes that seek to subjugate and subjectify humanity through consumption practices (and other forms), risking their bodies and mental health.

In summary, the socio-political function of social inclusion in the 21st century will be twofold. On the one hand, to dignify the lives of those who suffered the ravages of atavistic voracious capitalism; on the other hand, to generate social policies to maintain social justice, equity, and equality. And within that same horizon, to ensure that capitalism does not continue to disturb the mental health of human beings, especially those who do not grasp the consequences that this naturalized vicious cycle can generate in the multiple dimensions of human existence.

Actions Of Resistance Against Neoliberal Thought

In the preceding sections, various events surrounding social inclusion have been discussed, examining how it came to have the cultural and political significance it is recognized for today, as well as the disputes generated between neoliberalism and social inclusion practices. There was also discussion about the constitution of these processes as a performative act triggering resistance actions. In this section, some tactics will be addressed to consider when developing resistance actions against

the current economic system, which proves to be inhumane and cruel: (a) controlling consumption practices; (b) adopting a critical attitude towards markets; (c) self-care in mental health; and (d) processes of alterity with otherness.

Before describing each of the routes or actions from which resistance processes against attacks from capitalism can be strengthened, it is interesting to justify why they are suitable and relevant. One of the first considerations is the contribution of Althusser et al. (1974), who warned us that ideologies and systems of thought must be fought from their core ("from the inside") as it is futile to wage war outside of this. In this sense, achieving performative acts within the system weakens the elements of the apparatus trying to penetrate such activity, making it more effective and coherent to aim at the internal structure of the neoliberal system; this would constitute what Žižek (2020) calls a "Kill Bill-style blow" to capitalism. The following are the points mentioned as acts of resistance:

1) Controlling consumption practices: Hyperconsumption generated by digital media is one of the ways capitalism intercepts subjectivity. Therefore, not paying attention to what we consume is the window through which these processes of subjection occur. Once within this spectrum, getting out becomes quite a challenge, as recognizing that one is linked to such manipulation processes is unthinkable for citizens. In this situation, the prudent approach would be to generate conscious processes regarding our own demands or the offers that come to us daily through various means, from the various brands, products, and companies that have our personal data.

2) Adopting a critical attitude towards markets: When we confront the market and the countless products and needs that capitalism creates to make us believe that a certain product is vital for life's development, we are being submissive to the hidden message that neoliberalism recreates to intercept and capture the subject. The function of critical thinking (here it is worth recalling the teachings of Lipman, 1987), who points out that the cognitive processes of critical thinking involve a discrimination of what should or should not be done; in this sense, the individual can choose whether to adopt this position or not, being able to opt to let themselves be penetrated by the apparatus or to resist it.

3) Self-care in mental health: According to Han (2022), contemporary society experiences the illnesses that capitalism itself has created to keep the entire society subjugated and, therefore, under control. This, besides being an alarm regarding the psychological and social damages produced by the capitalist apparatus, opens the option to generate certain self-care practices in the face of the violence and "internal" conflicts that may arise: resilience, meditation, and sports constitute ways to achieve mental liberation, which will allow for greater clarity about one's desires.

4) Processes of alterity with otherness: In this point, two issues are important; on one hand, the individual does not constitute itself as a place of autonomy outside of any structure (Morin and Cyrulnik, 2005), which implies that, to develop reality and, therefore, identity, another is necessary to recognize the subject. But mere recognition of otherness is not enough, as Krotz (1994) points out in his anthropological inquiry into otherness, but rather a "feeling-thinking" with that other with whom one co-exists is indispensable. Thus, affective connections are a place from which resistance actions can be generated because they go against the first rule of contemporary capitalism: individualization. Therefore, it is performative, in any case, to generate groups and collectives, as well as the construction of communal knowledge that challenges social inclusion, from territories where processes of individuation seem to naturally emerge.

These ways of responding to the emergency produced by capitalist thought do not constitute unique forms or safe havens from which resistance can always be made; it is opportune to constantly

reflect on the mutation of the elements of the capitalist apparatus. This is because, as a machine, it is perfect and always seeks to attack directly those dynamics that pretend to escape monetization or subjectivation processes. Therefore, resistance actions must be aligned with how this machine operates. In other words, resistance actions and performances should aim for a self-management of permanent change with the objective of not obtaining a fixed identity, upon which capitalism can fix its gaze and decompose the advances of such action in the territory or collective.

Finally, the bet on social inclusion as an act of resistance focuses on redirecting its purposes against the distinctive establishments of neoliberalism to counteract the attempts of this economic system to absorb everything in theoretical and practical terms. Likewise, it is imperative to continue with the conceptualization of the term and the contemporary implications it presents to elevate performative practices to spaces that generate real impacts on the cunning actions developed by capitalism. This work concerns social scientists and those who are challenged by the issue at hand; these two lines then seem to constitute challenges for collectives and territories in a world where demands for greater inclusion are still standing.

Conclusions

Discussions about the problems and havoc generated by capitalism as the dominant economic system in the 21st century are important and relevant because we are political subjects and therefore susceptible to being dominated by systems. In other words, we are exposed to being oppressed by dominant systems of thought. However, as long as citizens maintain a critical thinking approach to these contemporary issues, there will continue to be a glimmer of hope for humanity.

Under this premise, one cannot speak of an inclusive capitalism; it is more accurate to speak of a capitalist schizophrenia that seeks to intercept, monetize, and penetrate all elements, subjects,

and social functions as much as possible to obtain maximum vital or economic benefit from them. Likewise, proposing a capitalist inclusion, which would be vertical in nature (where the powerful includes the powerless but subordinates them to benefit from or exploit them), would expose us to being overlapped by the elements of such a device, something that social inclusion policies should not allow if they want to maintain their solidity as a concept of resistance against injustice, inequity, and social inequality, from an intercultural perspective: respect, tolerance, and positive acceptance of others' differences.

Faced with the voracity of neoliberalism in the face of social processes, there is only one alternative: to strengthen collective actions that allow for the generation of spaces of resistance in the face of the pretentious coercion of oppressive thought. In this sense, resisting with the body, with art, with and from academia, can be alternative solutions, in any case creative, that give rise to performativity as a possible route to contain the disasters of capitalism if it continues to be allowed to completely permeate social inclusion, whether as theoretical development or practice.

In summary, the social inclusion processes that exist today must be enhanced, constantly seeking to evolve towards transdisciplinary horizons that enrich the work done as an act of resistance. Therefore, any activity that contributes to this discussion should be considered a vote of confidence in the future of our civilization.

Acknowledgement

References

Ainscow, M. (2017). Haciendo que las escuelas sean más inclusivas: lecciones a partir del análisis de la investigación internacional. *Revista de Educación inclusiva,* 5(1). https://

revistaeducacioninclusiva.es/index.php/REI/article/view/220

Althusser, L., (1974). *Ideología y aparatos ideológicos de Estado.* Nueva visión.

Arendt, H. (1997). *¿Qué es la política?* Paidós.

Arias, X.C. y Costas, A. (2016). *La nueva piel del capitalismo.* Galaxia Gutenberg.

Arnaiz Sánchez, P. (2002). Hacia una educación eficaz para todos: la educación inclusiva. *Educar en el 2000: revista de formación del profesorado.* https://www4.congreso.gob.pe/comisiones/2006/discapacidad/tematico/educacion/inclusion.pdf

Booth, T., Ainscow, M., Black-Hawkins, K., Vaughan, M., & Shaw, L. (2000). Índice de inclusión. *Centro de los Studios en la Educacion,* 1-116. https://bibliotecadigital.mineduc.cl/handle/20.500.12365/17276

Butler, J. (2009). Performatividad, precariedad y políticas sexuales. *AIBR: Revista de Antropología Iberoamericana,* 4(3), 321-336. https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/623/62312914003.pdf

Chuaqui, J., Mally, D., & Parraguez, R. (2016). El concepto de inclusión social. *Revista De Ciencias Sociales,* (69). https://doi.org/10.22370/rcs.2017.69.927

Dagron, A. G. (2004). El cuarto mosquetero: la comunicación para el cambio social. *Investigación & desarrollo,* 12(1), 2-23. https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=26800101

Deleuze, G. y Guattari, P. F. (2004). *Mil mesetas.* Pre-textos.

Foucault, M. (2002). *Vigilar y castigar: nacimiento de la prisión.* Siglo XXI Editores.

Foucault, M. (2015). *Microfísica do poder.* Ed. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.

Goffman, Erving (2001). *La presentación de la persona en la vida cotidiana.* Amorrortu.

Guattari, F., & Deleuze, G. (2004). *El Anti-Edipo: capitalismo y esquizofrenia.* Paidós Ibérica.

Han, B. C. (2014). *Psicopolítica: neoliberalismo y nuevas técnicas de poder.* Herder Editorial.

Han, B. C. (2022). *La sociedad del cansancio.* Herder Editorial.

Haraway, D. (1984). Manifiesto Ciborg. El sueño irónico de un lenguaje común para las mujeres en el circuito integrado. https://xenero.webs.uvigo.es/profesorado/beatriz_suarez/ciborg.pdf

Hughes, M. D., & Bartlett, R. M. (2002). The use of performance indicators in performance analysis. *Journal of sports sciences,* 20(10), 739-754. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/12363292/

Klein, N. (2015). *Esto lo cambia todo.* El capitalismo contra el clima. Paidos.

Krotz, E. (1994). *Alteridad y pregunta antropológica.*

Lipman, M. (1987). Critical thinking: What can it be? *Analytic Teaching,* 8(1). https://journal.viterbo.edu/index.php/at/article/view/403

Mirowski, P. (2014). Never let a serious crisis go to waste: How neoliberalism survived the financial meltdown. Verso Books.

Morin, E. (1995). *El pensamiento complejo.* Gedisa.

Morin, E., & Cyrulnik, B. (2005). *Diálogos sobre la naturaleza humana.* Barcelona: Kairós.

Mouffe, C. (2008). Art and democracy: Art as an agonistic intervention in public space. *Open,*

14, 6-15. https://readingpublicimage.files.wordpress.com/2012/04/mouffe_open14_p6-151.pdf

Mujika, I. (2009). *Tapering and peaking for optimal performance* (Vol. 1). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Rancière, J. (2019). *Disenso: Ensayos sobre estética y política.* Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Srnicek, N., & Giacometti, A. (2018). *Capitalismo de plataformas*. Caja negra.

Stainback, S. B. E., & Stainback, W. C. (1996). *Inclusion: A guide for educators.* Paul H Brookes Publishing.

Taylor, D. (2015). *Performance*. Duke University Press.

Taylor, D., & Fuentes, M. (2011). *Estudios avanzados de performance* (pp. 7-30). México.

Valencia, S. (2012). Capitalismo Gore y necropolítica en México contemporáneo. *Relaciones internacionales* (19), 83-102. https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=3846981

Wacquant, L. (2010). *Castigar a los pobres*. El gobierno neoliberal de la inseguridad social. Gedisa.

Zarta Rojas, F. A. (2022). El rizoma literario: lo performativo del sujeto. *Enunciación*, 27(1), 45-55. https://revistas.udistrital.edu.co/index.php/enunc/article/view/18218

Zarta Rojas, F. A., & Juliao Vargas, C. G. (2022a). Anatomopolítica de las tecnologías digitales. *Sociedad & Tecnología*, 5(3), 491–502. https://doi.org/10.51247/st.v5i3.258

Zarta-Rojas, F. y Juliao-Vargas, C. G. (2022b). Los movimientos sociales y la educación media: el

inicio de una conciencia política. *Educación y Ciudad,* 42, 181-192. https://revistas.idep.edu.co/index.php/educacion-y-ciudad/article/view/2666

Žižek, S. (1992). El sublime objeto de la ideología. Siglo XXI.

Žižek, S. (2020). Coronavirus es un golpe al capitalismo al estilo de 'Kill Bill'y podría conducir a la reinvención del comunismo. *Sopa de Wuhan*, 185. http://www.relats.org/documentos/FTLecturas.Zizek.abril.pdf