

Manifestations Of Inclusion In Voices Of Power In Colombia

Jenny Natalia Torres Zambrano

Leader of the Exploratory Nucleus and professor at the Icesi University (Cali, Colombia)

PhD student in Human Sciences at the University del Cauca (Popayán, Colombia)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0921-9343>

Abstract

This research examines how the notion of inclusion has been configured in Colombia's presidential discourses between 1991 and 2025. The purpose of this examination is to identify the associated symbols that are mobilized in these official interventions and the cartographies of citizenship that are woven into them. The study was supported by Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) tools, with a hermeneutic approach and a longitudinal qualitative textual analysis design, applied to a corpus of 145 presidential speeches corresponding to the different periods of the temporal reference. The selection of open access texts was conducted with a focus on texts that comprehensively address all mandates, thereby emphasizing their public nature, textual stability, and institutional relevance. The analysis was conducted using a multifaceted approach, encompassing six distinct moments. These moments included the following: the initial socio-historical contextualization; an examination of thematic macrostructures and discursive formats; the identification of argumentative logic and enunciation strategies; a microtextual analysis; the tracing of ideological veins and interdiscursivity; and the profiling of social actors along with the mechanisms of symbolic discrimination. The findings indicate that the phenomenon of inclusion functions as a presidential legitimization technology, thereby absorbing demands, expanding symbols of participation, and projecting cohesion. However, this process does not result in alterations to the structures that sustain inequality and reinforce a center of power.

Keywords: Inclusion, presidential discourse, power, legitimization, trans-positions

Resumen

Esta investigación estudia cómo se ha configurado la noción de inclusión en los discursos presidenciales de Colombia entre 1991 y 2025, con el propósito de identificar los símbolos asociados que se movilizan en estas intervenciones oficiales y las cartografías de ciudadanía que en ellas se tejen. El estudio se apoyó en herramientas del Análisis Crítico del Discurso, con un enfoque hermenéutico y un diseño de análisis textual cualitativo de carácter longitudinal, aplicado a un corpus de 145 discursos presidenciales correspondientes a los distintos períodos de la referencia temporal. Se seleccionaron únicamente textos de acceso abierto que abarcan todos los mandatos, privilegiando su carácter público, su estabilidad textual y su relevancia institucional. Para el análisis se definieron seis momentos: contextualización sociohistórica; examen de macroestructuras temáticas y formatos discursivos; identificación de la lógica argumentativa y de las estrategias de enunciación; análisis microtextual; rastreo de vetas ideológicas e interdiscursividad; y perfilación de actores sociales junto con los mecanismos de discriminación simbólica. Los resultados muestran que la inclusión ha operado como una tecnología de legitimación presidencial que absorbe demandas, amplía los símbolos de

participación y proyecta cohesión, sin alterar las estructuras que sostienen la desigualdad y reforzando un centro de poder.

Palabras clave

Inclusión, discurso presidencial, poder, legitimación, trans-posicionamientos

INTRODUCTION

This text is part of the doctoral research called Inclusion: manifestations, dilemmas and emergencies in the Colombian context¹, whose purpose is to critically examine inclusion as a historical, political and cultural category. Based on the recognition of their genealogies and epistemologies, the discourses that have shaped their meaning, the purposes that have guided their appropriation and the symbolic and material effects they generate are analyzed. This perspective recognizes that inclusion is not a fixed concept, but a field of disputes in permanent reconfiguration, crossed by tensions between the prescriptive and the lived (Skliar, 2008; Booth & Ainscow, 2011). By situating reflection at the intersection of institutional, popular, and situated knowledge, the research questions the readings that reduce inclusion to a social ideal of harmony and justice, and proposes to understand it as a conflictive and changing social process (Torres, 2025).

To substantiate this line of questioning, a review of a documentary corpus of one hundred and sixty-eight recent texts was carried out. In this review, paradigms, regulatory frameworks, and conceptual approaches were mapped that stabilize the sense of inclusion as a desirable and measurable objective. However, it should be noted that this objective is stressed by cultural, economic, legal, and technological contexts (Torres, 2025). In the extant literature, inclusion is configured as a practice that responds to the demands of recognition, participation, and access. However, it is also noted that, in most theoretical reflections and technical orientations, it is structured as a device that translates diversity into manageable categories within pre-existing systems. Contemporary definitions prioritize a dynamic and contextual approach, including its projection in digital and technological environments. This approach necessitates agendas of accessibility and equity. However, it also highlights the risk of exacerbating existing disparities if fundamental material conditions are not transformed (Torres, 2025). This comprehensive view underscores the necessity for a meticulous examination that discerns discrepancies, lacunae, and incongruities.

In this vein, the argument is posited that inclusion becomes a mandate for functional integration that, under the rhetoric of universality, functions as a technology of regulation. The concept of Empire facilitates comprehension of the manner in which the administration of diversity can be subjugated to a hegemonic rationality that categorizes, directs, and standardizes disparities, thereby transforming transparency into a refined apparatus of governance and selective compliance with the prevailing order (Hardt &

¹ The thesis "Inclusion: manifestations, dilemmas and emergencies in the Colombian context" is developed within the framework of the Doctorate in Human Sciences of the Faculty of Human and Social Sciences of the University of Cauca under the advice of Dr. Felipe Restrepo David.

Negri, 2000). In this register, equity becomes formal and participation is contingent upon the ability to adapt to previous frameworks, which reinforces hierarchies and sustains structural inequalities. Neoliberalism exacerbates this displacement by naturalizing individual success, depoliticizing daily life, and transferring public responsibilities to individuals and communities. Inclusive rhetoric legitimizes competition for scarce resources without altering the bases of power (Collins, 2015).

Evidence of this phenomenon can be seen in the analysis of international perspectives and their national translation, where inclusion is formulated as a global commitment to "leave no one behind." This commitment is organized in quantifiable goals, cooperation chains, and expansion of sectoral coverage. This technical scaffolding oversees diversity as a management category and prioritizes replicable indicators, with limited acknowledgement of local epistemologies and territorial self-determination. The result is a convergence between rights conceived as goods of individual access and macroeconomic efficiency, which rearticulates differences to market and governance logics, sometimes under legal positivizations that soften and reconfigure the original cultural meanings. In Colombia, the implementation of global frameworks has been instrumental in propelling regulatory and coverage advances since 1991. However, this adoption has concomitantly entailed the reproduction of population segmentations, constrained participation, and regulated integration, thereby perpetuating the entrenched structures of inequality (Puyana, 2023).

This phenomenon is referred to as a technical-theoretical loop of inclusion, which effectively reduces the intricacies of subjects to manageable entities. It is imperative to acknowledge and unravel this cycle to progress towards conceptual frameworks that enable us to perceive plurality not as the mere recipients of policies, but as the active agents of their own realities, needs, capacities, and conflicts. In this sense, bodies, communities, and territories become the true sources of legitimacy, rather than mere recipients of external policies (Porto-Gonçalves, 2009; Jessop, Brenner & Jones, 2008). The common, as an instituting principle, calls for the design of cooperative arrangements that distribute power, protect their own languages, and articulate singularities without absorbing them, expanding the political imagination beyond the paradigm of integration and enabling collective practices with effective autonomy (Dardot & Laval, 2019; Hardt & Negri, 2000). This paradigm shift necessitates a reevaluation of inclusion as a fundamental principle rather than a final destination, thereby acknowledging diversity not as an external force but as an inherent catalyst for social organization (Torres, 2025).

In this framework, the research endeavors to interrogate the naturalized meanings of inclusion, to explore the disputes that configure them, and to make visible the cracks from which other forms of existence are created. The objective of this study is to blur the lines between established certainties and to open a path of critical exploration. This exploration will allow us to trace the folds where the common inhabits in a way that is different from the schemes that have been consecrated as the only legitimate ones. This approach is located in the Colombian case. In alignment with this overarching framework, the guiding inquiry delves into the manifestations, dilemmas, and emergencies of inclusion by juxtaposing presidential speeches in Colombia from the 1991 Constitution to 2025 with the narratives and linguistic expressions of social actors who

embody diversities across the national territory. The present text is focused on the initial phase of the study, and it undertakes a comprehensive analysis of the presidential speeches issued in Colombia between 1991 and 2025. The objective of this analysis is to identify the symbols associated with inclusion that are mobilized in these official interventions and to characterize the profiles of the actors enunciated or summoned in their narratives. The temporal delineation of this period is anchored in the promulgation of the Political Constitution of 1991, a pivotal document that explicitly recognized ethnic, cultural, and political diversity while establishing commitments to fundamental rights and the promotion of inclusion as a national undertaking (Puyana, 2023).

TOOLS AND METHODS

This text presents the analysis of the presidential speeches² issued in Colombia between 1990 and 2025³, in order to identify the symbols of inclusion mobilized in these official interventions and to characterize the profiles of actors enunciated or summoned in their narratives. In correspondence with the central question of the research, this section addresses the manifestations, dilemmas and emergencies of inclusion at the level of the presidential voice, while the study of the narratives of social actors will be developed in the next moment. The analysis is based on the Critical Discourse Analysis approach, which understands language as a social action that produces power, legitimization and symbolic control (Van Dijk cited by Wodak & Meyer, 2003), and is articulated with a hermeneutical method that allows a reading beyond the explicit content, integrating historical, affective and political dimensions. The methodological strategy combines deductive procedures [with categories such as inclusion, otherness, legitimization, exclusion, promise or device] and inductive procedures that facilitate the emergence of new figures, displacements and regularities, enabling an interpretation sensitive to the ambivalences and mechanisms of symbolic stabilization present in presidential narratives.

The methodological design corresponds to a qualitative longitudinal textual analysis, applied to a corpus of 145 presidential speeches delivered in Colombia between 1990 and

² While it is recognized that presidential speeches are not always written directly by the incumbent president, it is assumed that these texts emanate from the presidential voice as the formal representation of the executive branch. In this sense, they express an enunciation invested with democratic legitimacy, regardless of the material authorship, and participate in the symbolic configuration of the national project.

³ The temporal delimitation is based on the Political Constitution of 1991, which meant a shift in the institutional discourse by recognizing ethnic, cultural and political diversity and incorporating inclusion as a national project.

2025⁴. Only open access texts⁵ covering all presidential terms were selected, prioritizing their public nature, textual stability, and institutional relevance, and interviews, informal statements, press conferences, and social media messages were excluded. The exhibition was constructed with criteria that privilege the centrality of the presidential voice and the diversity of enunciation scenarios, following a typification that facilitated the recognition of thematic, rhetorical and symbolic variations according to the event, the context and the audience⁶. For the collection and organization, the speeches were downloaded from open sources, stored in a private cloud by presidential terms and numbered with the exact date of broadcast, which made it possible to build a documentary lifeline in Excel categorized by president, date, type of intervention, title, place and source. This strategy ensured traceability, made it possible to detect gaps or redundancies, and provided a solid basis for longitudinal analysis of official narratives.

Subsequently, for the analysis of presidential speeches, six moments were established, nested in the same line of life and supported by the contributions of Siegfried Jäger, Teun van Dijk, Ruth Wodak, Martin Reisigl and Ron Scollon (cited by Wodak & Meyer, 2003), who conceive of discourse as a social, ideological and situated practice. The first moment, of socio-historical contextualization (Jäger cited by Wodak & Meyer, 2003), made it possible to identify the historical, political, social, and cultural relations that frame each discourse, together with the place of enunciation⁷ and the explicit or implicit interlocutors

⁴ The last government period of interest of this study extends until 2026, however, the results are presented until August 30, 2025, considering the cut-off time of the research.

⁵ Discourses that are publicly available through official and institutional sources are understood to be freely available, without payment restrictions or licenses for private use. In this study, the texts were recovered mainly from state portals such as the Presidency of the Republic and public archives such as the RTVC Señal Memoria Library, which preserves and disseminates historical documents of the country for the purpose of preservation and citizen access.

⁶ The sample of speeches was classified into eight typologies according to their context of emission and their discursive function: possession, which inaugurates the mandate and makes explicit the project of the nation; official commemorations or institutional acts, which inscribe the present in a historical narrative; accountability or government balance, which retrospectively constructs the management story; intervention with multilateral organizations or in international contexts, which defines Colombia's place in the world; before communities or territorial tours, which bring the presidential voice closer to regions and local audiences; of conjunctural situation or crisis, which manage uncertainty and mobilize emotions; sectoral or institutional policy, which legitimize reforms and models of intervention in specific areas; and economic or commercial, which project the development model and the State-market relationship.

⁷ The place of enunciation is not limited to a physical or geographical location, but refers to the symbolic, institutional, ideological and subjective position from which a discourse is produced. In the case of presidential speeches, it involves considering from what role

summoned⁸, in order to understand what is being talked about, from where it is enunciated, and under what conditions the presidential voice is configured. The second moment, of analysis of thematic macrostructures (Van Dijk cited by Wodak and Meyer, 2003), explored the themes and macropropositions and the formats. The third moment, focused on argumentative logic and discursive strategies (Jäger, Wodak, & Reisigl cited by Wodak & Meyer, 2003), examined naming, preaching, use of *topoi*⁹, framing, and intensification or mitigation, to identify how legitimities and hierarchies are distributed in political-institutional language.

The fourth stage, the analysis of microtextuality (Van Dijk 1997, 2008 cited by Wodak & Meyer, 2003), focuses on the lexical, rhetorical, and stylistic resources that activate or disguise power relations at the local level of discourse. Syntactic structures such as the use of passive voice, word order and lexical resources linked to the selection of adjectives and marker terms are analyzed; likewise, rhetorical strategies such as metaphors, hyperboles and euphemisms, and pragmatic operations such as presuppositions,

one speaks (head of state, representative of the people, international interlocutor, etc.), what investiture legitimizes it, what relationship it establishes with its recipients and how these conditions influence what is said, what is omitted and the meaning that the message acquires.

⁸ Within the framework of Critical Discourse Analysis, and particularly according to Siegfried Jäger (cited by Wodak & Meyer, 2003), it should be understood as a discursive construction that can be explicit or implicit, direct or mediated, and that plays a key role in the organization of meaning. The explicit interlocutor is the one who is mentioned or invoked directly in the speech, as when the president addresses the "Congress of the Republic", "the compatriots" or "the mothers who are heads of households"; In these cases, the enunciation establishes a direct link with a named or recognized audience. On the other hand, the implicit interlocutor is the one who is not directly named, but whose presence is presupposed, evoked or constructed through general formulas, strategic silences, symbolic oppositions or indirect appeals; For example, when we talk about the "enemy of the homeland", the "good citizen" or the "other who does not adapt", the discourse is shaping recipients who, although they are not formally identified, organize the semantic field from which the message is produced.

⁹ *Topoi* (plural of *topos*) are culturally and ideologically shared argumentative schemes that allow a "logical" connection to be established between a statement and a conclusion within a discourse. According to Wodak and Reisigl (cited by Wodak and Meyer, 2003), these commonplaces operate as implicit rules of inference that justify certain positions, decisions, or social judgments. For example: "if a situation is dangerous, then it must be controlled" (safety moles); "if something contributes to development, then it must be implemented" (topos de utility); "If a group has been historically excluded, then it must be included" (Topos de Justicia). *Topoi* analysis allows us to trace how the plausibility of an argument is constructed and how ideologies are legitimized in a covert or apparently neutral way.

omissions or ambiguities. This exploration made it possible to identify mechanisms of concealment, misrepresentation, stereotyping or invisibilization in the representation of certain social subjects. The fifth stage, of analysis of ideological veins and interdiscursivity (Wodak and Reisigl cited by Wodak and Meyer, 2003), allowed us to examine the ways in which inclusion is represented discursively, attending to dominant styles, varieties, and narratives, while recognizing semantic shifts that resist or reconfigure hegemonic meanings. The sixth moment, of profiling social actors and mechanisms of symbolic discrimination (Wodak and Reisigl cited by Wodak and Meyer, 2003), identifies how subjects are named, what traits are attributed to them, and what place they occupy in the discursive structure, taking up mechanisms of concealment and partialization along with referential, evaluative, and argumentative representation strategies.

Subsequently, a comparative analysis was carried out that covered all the presidents in each of the six methodological moments described, in order to obtain a longitudinal perspective of the statements on inclusion during the period 1991-2025. This exercise made it possible to contrast, moment by moment, the continuities, ruptures and displacements in symbols, rhetorical strategies and representations of social actors, evidencing how successive administrations have configured, managed or stressed the meanings of inclusion. This text presents the main findings of this comparative analysis, showing how the presidential voice has built, over three decades, a complex network of promises, dilemmas and emergencies around inclusion in Colombia.

RESULTS

In total, one hundred and forty-five presidential speeches issued in Colombia between 1990 and 2025 were analyzed, selected according to the methodological criteria previously exposed. The distribution by periods of government is as follows: ten speeches by César Gaviria Trujillo (1990–1994); thirteen by Ernesto Samper Pizano (1994–1998); thirteen by Andrés Pastrana Arango (1998–2002); twenty of Álvaro Uribe Vélez, corresponding to his two terms (2002–2006 and 2006–2010); nineteen by Juan Manuel Santos Calderón, covering his two terms (2010–2014 and 2014–2018); ten by Iván Duque Márquez (2018–2022); and sixty by Gustavo Petro Urrego (2022–2026). Each corpus includes diverse typologies [such as speeches of possession, accountability, sectoral interventions, speeches at critical junctures, commemorative events, pronouncements before multilateral organizations and meetings with communities], allowing a comparative and longitudinal reading of the statements on inclusion.

Socio-historical contextualization (Jäger cited by Wodak and Meyer, 2003)

The socio-historical contextualization of the presidential speeches between 1990 and 2025 reveals a network of continuities and ruptures that allows us to understand the evolution of the meanings of inclusion in Colombia. Over the course of three decades, the presidential voice has been situated in scenarios of institutional transformations, armed crises, economic reforms and social rearrangements that permanently reconfigure the relationship between the State, citizenship and diversity. In this time frame, processes of political openness, implementation of peace agreements, productive adjustments and redefinitions of the international agenda converge, as well as persistent inequalities and territorial conflicts that condition the legitimacy of governments. From the constitutional transition of the early nineties until the arrival of a leftist government in 2022, official

statements have articulated, with different nuances, promises of peace, modernization and social justice, while preserving mechanisms of order, control and technical centralization. This background shows that, even when the conjunctures change, inclusion remains a strategic category to project the nation, negotiate internal tensions and respond to global expectations.

In the first part of the period, César Gaviria Trujillo (1990–1994) frames his discourse in the constitutional transition, presenting the 1991 Constitution as a "peaceful revolution" and a "new social contract", integrating inclusion and economic openness as a promise of national and international legitimacy. Ernesto Samper Pizano (1994–1998) focuses his narrative on the "Social Leap", with a redistributive turn in the face of neoliberalism, although the denunciations of the 8,000 Process lead him to reorient inclusion towards the defense of governability. Andrés Pastrana Arango (1998–2002) inscribes his mandate in the economic crisis and the search for peace, articulating inclusion to reconciliation and Plan Colombia, but under a security regime that redefines citizenship. Álvaro Uribe Vélez (2002–2010), for his part, projects the doctrine of Democratic Security as the axis of restoration of state order, combining territorial control, economic openness, and international cooperation, in a narrative that strengthens personalist leadership and the legitimacy of the use of force.

In the most recent cycle, Juan Manuel Santos Calderón (2010–2018) inaugurates Democratic Prosperity, with the peace process as the axis of reconciliation and recognition of rights, stressed by events such as the 2016 plebiscite and the agrarian strikes. Iván Duque Márquez (2018–2022) shifts the centrality of peace towards an emphasis on legality, entrepreneurship and order, in the midst of social protests, reconfiguration of violence and the COVID-19 health crisis. Finally, Gustavo Petro Urrego (2022–2026) represents a historic turning point with the arrival of the left to power, situating his narrative on reparation, social and environmental justice, and incorporating historically excluded actors into the central stage of the State. However, this shift also shows tensions between the expectations of change and the demands of governability, his discourse, although disruptive in the face of the traditional elites, sometimes reproduces logics of centralization and hegemonic dispute, and faces political resistance, implementation difficulties and institutional rearrangements that condition the scope of his promises.

Throughout these three decades, the presidential voice in Colombia has occupied stages that combine institutional solemnity, territorial proximity and international projection. In a transversal way, the leaders have articulated their enunciation in three major registers. The first, institutional-foundational, typical of possessions, commemorations and accountability, in which power is legitimized and the project of the nation is reiterated; the second, the territorial-performative, which seeks direct contact with communities and regions, reinforcing closeness and authority; and the third, the global-diplomatic, which inscribes Colombia in multilateral and cooperation agendas. In this triple modulation, inclusion is presented as a republican commitment, a promise of equity and a resource for legitimacy, while at the same time evidencing the persistence of hierarchies that limit its materialization. The continuity of these records shows that, even in the midst of armed crises, economic reforms, and changes in the political orientation of governments,

inclusion remains a discursive axis to negotiate internal tensions and respond to global expectations that demand social cohesion and institutional stability.

In this common framework, singular nuances can be seen in the places where each president enunciates, which account for the conjunctures of each period. César Gaviria Trujillo (1990–1994) presents himself as a technical reformer and guarantor of the democratic order, combining constitutional openness with institutional control and presenting the 1991 Constitution as a "peaceful revolution". Ernesto Samper Pizano (1994–1998) oscillates between a redistributive architect, a defender of legality in the midst of the 8,000 Process, and a spokesman for the global South that claims sovereignty in the face of external pressures. Andrés Pastrana Arango (1998–2002) projects himself as a mediator of peace and international repositioning, articulating state authority and a vocation for consensus, while Álvaro Uribe Vélez (2002–2010) embodies the centralizing authority and the itinerant leader who, through the Community Councils and the narrative of Democratic Security, legitimizes the use of force, fiscal discipline and the attraction of foreign investment. Juan Manuel Santos Calderón (2010–2018) adopts the figure of an international statesman and plural mediator, capable of convening victims, armed actors, social movements and economic elites around the peace process, although his openness is stressed by the 2016 plebiscite and agrarian conflicts.

Iván Duque Márquez (2018–2022) combines a republican enunciation, visible in his solemn speeches, with a tone of control in the face of protests, assassinations of social leaders and security crises, prioritizing institutional stability. Gustavo Petro Urrego (2022–2026) bursts forth with a hybrid voice that alternates institutional scenarios and historically marginalized territories, seeking to inscribe memory and popular demands at the center of the State, although his narrative faces tensions between expectations of change, resistance from elites, and demands for governability. Thus, each president adjusted his place of enunciation to respond to crises of legitimacy, demands for peace or demands for economic development, without abandoning the logics of control that structure state power. These places of enunciation reveal continuities and ruptures that configure a discursive field where inclusion is announced as a promise, administered as a resource of governability and disputed as a horizon of transformation.

Thematic macrostructures and discursive format (Van Dijk cited by Wodak and Meyer, 2003)

In the set of presidential speeches of the last three decades, a shared thematic core is observed that structures the way of talking about inclusion. In the first place, the construction of peace and security appears as a permanent concern, from the pacification promised by Gaviria to the "total peace" proposed by Petro, through Uribe's Democratic Security and Santos' negotiated peace. Secondly, economic modernization and global insertion are presented as conditions for progress and social cohesion, articulating the opening of markets, tax reforms and the attraction of foreign investment. National unity is added as an ethical and political horizon that legitimizes order, invoking patriotic symbols, historical memory and cultural cohesion. Finally, equity and social development are repeatedly enunciated as a State commitment, expressed in policies to reduce poverty, expand services and citizen participation. These major themes form a common

framework that allows presidential variations to be read as modulations of the same repertoire that associates inclusion with stability, growth, and governability.

Within this shared framework, continuities and displacements are noted that account for the conjunctures of each period. During the government of César Gaviria Trujillo (1990–1994), references to institutional reform and the "peaceful revolution" of the 1991 Constitution dominate, linked to security and economic openness. Ernesto Samper Pizano (1994–1998) prioritizes the "Social Leap" as a horizon of redistribution and participation, although his discourse is soon stressed by the 8,000 Process and the demands of legitimacy. Andrés Pastrana Arango (1998–2002) places the peace process with the FARC and Plan Colombia at the center, complemented by the modernization of the State and social cohesion. Álvaro Uribe Vélez (2002–2010) concentrates the narrative on Democratic Security, which subordinates inclusion to pacification and territorial control. Juan Manuel Santos Calderón (2010–2018) introduces Democratic Prosperity and the centrality of victims, articulating peace and development in the key of national unity. Iván Duque Márquez (2018–2022) emphasizes security, legality, and entrepreneurship, resignifying the Peace Agreement in the policy of "Peace with Legality." Finally, Gustavo Petro Urrego (2022–2026) proposes the slogan "Colombia, world power of life", which links total peace, social justice and ecological transition, challenging neoliberal narratives but facing tensions of governability.

Macro-propositions, understood as high-level statements that organize and prioritize government issues (Van Dijk cited by Wodak & Meyer, 2003), show continuities that run through the last three decades of presidential discourse in Colombia. It is repeatedly stated that "peace and security are an indispensable condition for development and social cohesion", placing the end of the conflict or its control as a prerequisite for any form of inclusion. Another cross-cutting macro-proposition argues that "economic growth and global insertion are the legitimate path to prosperity," combining market opening, private investment, and competitiveness with expectations of equity. The idea that "national unity is the foundation of democratic legitimacy" is also repeated, invoking patriotic symbols, historical memory and cultural cohesion to confront fragmentation. Finally, all governments formulate that "equity and the expansion of rights are permanent commitments of the State," although the routes to materialize them differ in emphasis and scope. This common repertoire shows that inclusion is conceived as a project of stability and governability.

However, in order to comply with these cross-cutting premises, each government modulates or particularizes itself with its own interests. César Gaviria Trujillo (1990–1994) reiterates that "the 1991 Constitution inaugurates a new democratic era," that "the strengthening of the State guarantees peace and equity," and that "economic openness is an inevitable path to progress." Ernesto Samper Pizano (1994–1998) states that "development must be people-centered," that "social justice sustains democracy," and that "international cooperation is only valid if it respects national sovereignty." Andrés Pastrana Arango (1998–2002) states that "peace is the foundation of the national project," that "the fight against drugs and institutional strengthening are inseparable,"

and that "competitive development must be inclusive." Álvaro Uribe Vélez (2002–2010) states that "Democratic Security is a premise of freedom and growth", that "private investment is an engine of well-being" and that "citizens must take joint responsibility for policing order".

Juan Manuel Santos Calderón (2010–2018) introduces that "democratic prosperity reduces poverty and expands rights", that "victims are the moral nucleus of the nation" and that "peace is the supreme good that redefines collective identity". Iván Duque Márquez (2018–2022) argues that "legality is the foundation of peace and development", that "security is a collective right that requires state control" and that "equity is achieved through entrepreneurship and individual effort". Gustavo Petro Urrego (2022–2026) proclaims that "Colombia will be a world power of life", that "total peace depends on overcoming the structural causes of violence" and that "social justice and the energy transition are the cornerstones of a new popular democracy". All the macro-proposals reflect both the persistence of peace, equity, development and unity as pillars of legitimacy, as well as the ideological shifts that have reconfigured the meaning of inclusion in each government.

The presidential macro-proposals are presented as unquestionable consensuses and, although inclusion appears as a central issue, the analysis shows that it mainly serves as a governance technology adjusted to the interests of each mandate. Its persistence in three decades shows that it is formulated to guarantee institutional stability, absorb social demands and reinforce economic and territorial hierarchies. The macro-propositions that structure each period configure a framework that normalizes difference, administering it under the logic of market, security and control, and that reduces the possibility of effective pluralism. By subordinating the recognition of diversity to the state objectives of the day, the horizons of transformation and the recognition of other legitimate systems are restricted, while affirming the need to integrate the nation into the schemes of power and global order. In this way, inclusion proclaimed as universal becomes a device that manages diversity and redistributes it in terms of local and global absorption.

The comparative analysis of the discursive formats shows a structural continuity that runs through the last three decades of presidential discourse in Colombia. In all governments, three dominant registers are identified. First, the programmatic-institutional one, used in possessions, accountability and management balances, which combines diagnosis, formulation of principles and commitment to action; secondly, the ceremonial-mobilizing, typical of commemorations and high-impact announcements, which is based on patriotic symbols, historical memory and calls for unity; and, thirdly, the reactive-testimonial, activated in the face of crises, peace milestones or emergencies, which dramatizes the urgency and reinforces the president's leadership as a guarantor of cohesion. These formats are intertwined with resources of technical argumentation, systematic use of figures, heroic metaphors and appeals to a shared national identity, producing a narrative of inclusion that is presented as natural and necessary to sustain order. Therefore, there is evidence of a dominant matrix of enunciation in which governments recognize themselves as promoters of diversity and at the same time position the need for changes that only they can manage and stabilize.

Within this common matrix, each president printed specific modulations to respond to the tensions of his term and legitimize his project. César Gaviria favored a rational and expository structure that minimized antagonism, inscribing the 1991 Constitution as a guarantee of predictability and modernization. Ernesto Samper adopted a tripartite scheme [critical diagnosis of the previous model, concrete commitments and citizen call] that combined institutional solemnity with social pedagogy, reinforcing the ethical character of the "Social Leap". Andrés Pastrana articulated narration and testimony, incorporating foundational episodes and victims' voices to give moral density to the peace process and Plan Colombia. Álvaro Uribe integrated a solemn programmatic format with reactive interventions in the face of crises and a diplomatic record, accentuating the friend/enemy dichotomy and exalting Democratic Security as a patriotic crusade. Despite the modulations, the interest in using formats to reinforce authority, absorb conflict and sustain the continuity of the state order is confirmed.

In the following decade, Juan Manuel Santos diversified the presidential grammar with short and emotional speeches for peace milestones, long and pedagogical speeches to explain the negotiations and confessional speeches for acts of reparation, projecting inclusion as an ethical act and national pact. Iván Duque combined solemn and technical registrations with mobilizing and moralizing moments, prioritizing legality, entrepreneurship and a symbolic cohesion that sought to contain the protest and manage the pandemic crisis. Gustavo Petro alternates highly symbolic ceremonial formats with conceptual exhibitions, protest narratives and testimonies that inscribe popular memories in the central scene of the State and project international leadership around climate and social justice. These modulations mark a shift from the first governments, which took presidential legitimacy for granted, as now the presidents face a more critical citizenry and persistent polarization. In this context, the use of pedagogical and testimonial formats becomes a strategy to explain, persuade and negotiate meaning, incorporating social voices that, without losing control of the story, expand the repertoire of legitimization. Thus, the presidency maintains its privileged place in the definition of the common, but it does so through an argument that seeks to nuance tensions and renew confidence in a scenario of public dispute.

Argumentative logic and discursive strategies (Jäger, Wodak, & Reisigl cited by Wodak & Meyer, 2003)

The comparative analysis of argumentative structures reveals a common pattern in the last three decades of presidential discourse in Colombia. All governments combine, with different weights, technical rationality, moral dimension and emotional register to legitimize their government projects. The technical argument is based on diagnoses, figures and indicators that seek to present policies as inevitable and efficient decisions. The moral dimension enunciates values of peace, justice, unity and legality, giving an ethical character to state actions. The emotional register mobilizes pride, pain or hope to unite citizens, especially in situations of conflict, peace agreements or disasters. To this tripod are added pragmatic resources that justify urgent and political measures that differentiate the government from the opposition, reinforcing presidential authority.

These logics produce a framework of legitimization that presents inclusion as a rational and morally unquestionable project, while displacing structural conflicts to a technical or moral plane, controlled by the State.

In the stage of constitutional openness and democratic rearrangement, César Gaviria Trujillo (1990–1994) favored a technical-pragmatic argument that justified reforms and consolidated the authority of the new order, reinforced by a moral register that invoked peace, plurality, and coexistence without naming antagonisms. Ernesto Samper Pizano (1994–1998) incorporated a more explicit moral dimension, placing equity as an ethical imperative and social justice as the basis of democracy, complementing it with emotional argumentation towards victims and excluded sectors and with technical support that showed the viability of his "Social Leap". Andrés Pastrana Arango (1998–2002) articulated a moral and emotional repertoire focused on peace, accompanied by a pragmatism that legitimized Plan Colombia and the negotiations with the FARC, together with a technical base that reinforced his image as a responsible manager. In this first cycle, technical rationality and moral appeal predominated as resources to strengthen the State, while the emotional register appeared as strategic support in moments of crisis or mobilization for peace.

With the turn towards the twenty-first century, argumentative structures were reconfigured in the face of new challenges of security, polarization and governability. Álvaro Uribe Vélez (2002–2010) consolidated a causal logic that subordinated inclusion to Democratic Security, linking security, investment, and employment in a logical chain reinforced by a moral argument that exalted discipline, sacrifice, and homeland, and by an intense emotionality that deactivated dissent. Juan Manuel Santos Calderón (2010–2018) combined morals, technique, and emotion to present peace as an ethical and historical imperative, with victims as the core of legitimacy and pragmatism as proof of realistic leadership. Iván Duque Márquez (2018–2022) appealed to legality as a moral and legal foundation, balancing technical and mobilizing registers to face protests, pandemic, and migration, while Gustavo Petro Urrego (2022–2026) focuses his argument on an ethical mandate for change, nourished by historical genealogies of exclusion, political differentiation from elites, and emotional appeals to life and social justice. These latter governments intensify the moral and pedagogical component to gain legitimacy in a scenario of greater public dispute, reaffirming that, even when voices are amplified and resources are diversified, the presidency maintains final control over the horizons of transformation.

The comparison of nomination strategies reveals a persistent pattern in the construction of protagonists and antagonists in the Colombian presidential discourse. In all governments, the State is appointed as the leading agent ["Government", "Presidency", "institutions" or "peacebuilder"] to reinforce its role as guarantor of rights and sole mediator of change. The majority of citizens appear as a homogeneous collective ["Colombians", "working people", "heirs of the libertarian deed"], which dilutes differences but defines a model of legitimate citizen based on the idea of the country mobilized by each mandate. Economic allies legitimize themselves as ["development partners," "job creators," or "investors"], while enemies condense themselves into threat labels that put the nation's project at risk ["terrorists," "drug traffickers," "criminal

structures," or "those who fear change"], which justifies control and security. When women, victims, peasants or ethnic communities are included, they are presented as "builders of democracy" or "seeds of peace", that is, as symbols that confirm state cohesion, although their autonomy is recognized within the limits of the state apparatus. This nomination matrix sustains presidential centrality and turns inclusion into a device that recognizes only those differences that the State can manage and reorder.

César Gaviria Trujillo (1990–1994) positions "the new Charter" and "the State" as rational protagonists, while making invisible dissent with the abstract figure of "Colombians" and marking "drug trafficking" as an absolute enemy. Ernesto Samper Pizano (1994–1998) broadens the popular subject with expressions such as "protagonists of the Social Leap", "youth hope" and "women builders of democracy", although violent actors are fixed as "merchants of death". Andrés Pastrana Arango (1998–2002) exalts "peace" as a "common treasure" and oscillates in the denomination of the FARC between "interlocutors of the homeland" and "terrorists," depending on the moment of the process. Álvaro Uribe Vélez (2002–2010) reinforces the friend/enemy dichotomy with "heroes of the homeland" for the security forces and "wild beasts" for the insurgency, extending suspicion to NGOs and critics of the security model. Juan Manuel Santos Calderón (2010–2018) introduces twists that turn the FARC from "terrorists" into "former adversaries" and the victims into "moral seed of the nation," while preserving the heroism of the Armed Forces.

Iván Duque Márquez (2018–2022) consolidates the exaltation of the Public Force as "guardians" and presents his agenda under almost sacred marks ["Pact for Colombia" and "Pact for Equity"] that moralize government policies. Gustavo Petro Urrego (2022–2026) resignifies the nomination of the State as "government of the people" and expands the social subject with "excluded majority", "young people", "peasants" and "mother earth", while contrasting "those at the top" with "those who fear change". Despite these variations, all the presidents reaffirm the presidential power to confer name and meaning on the social actors. Nominations that incorporate subaltern voices do so under previously defined frameworks, reinforcing the state's capacity to absorb differences and rewrite identities according to its objectives. Thus, the apparent openness in the denominations ends up ensuring the continuity of a discursive matrix that turns recognition into an instrument of control and administration of diversity.

Likewise, preaching strategies show how adjectivation and the attribution of qualities function as mechanisms of power in the Colombian presidential discourse. Over the course of three decades, the state has been consistently described as "firm," "modern," "protective," or "peacemaker," qualities that position it as the unquestionable guarantor of order and the capacity for change. Citizens are characterized as "hardworking", "resilient", "hopeful" or "co-responsible", traits that present them as virtuous and obedient subjects, reducing their real diversity to an ideal image of cohesion. The economic sectors appear as "dynamic", "strategic" and "job generators", extolling their contribution to progress and validating the market model. Adversaries, on the other hand, are described as "terrorists", "enemies of life" or "saboteurs", labels that strip

political legitimacy from differences and justify their neutralization. When women, victims, peasants or ethnic peoples are referred to, they are attributed with being "weavers of democracy", "seeds of peace" or "moral force", virtues that make them emblems of reconciliation and limit their recognition as actors with full autonomy. This matrix of qualifiers establishes hierarchies, exalts those who embody order and delegitimizes those who can question it, turning inclusion into a practice of governance that selects the differences that the State is willing to recognize and manage.

In César Gaviria Trujillo (1990–1994) a technical and modernizing adjective predominates where the State is categorized as "efficient", "pluralistic" and "visionary", businessmen "strategic" and citizens "participatory", while drug traffickers and armed groups are "implacable" and "enemies of order", simplifying the causes of violence. Ernesto Samper Pizano (1994–1998) reinforces a moral lexicon that describes the State as a "guarantor of social justice" and the government as "committed", with "cooperative" businessmen and "brave" Armed Forces, in the face of "enemies of the nation" presented as irrational or traitors; in Process 8,000 he preaches himself as "honest" and "victim of unjust attacks". Andrés Pastrana Arango (1998–2002) elevates peace to a supreme value ["sacred," "inalienable," "historic goal"], while the FARC transitions from "interlocutors" to "terrorists," and the security forces and citizens are exalted as "honorable" and "resilient." Álvaro Uribe Vélez (2002–2010) intensifies polarization with an epic adjective, as he establishes the State as "protective" and "transparent," the president "tireless" and "austere," businessmen "builders of the homeland," in the face of insurgents and critics turned into "monsters," "cowards," or "saboteurs of progress," transforming dissent into a threat.

Juan Manuel Santos Calderón (2010–2018) uses attributes that allow him to make articulations between the moral and the technical, the government is "effective" and "manager of transformation", the Armed Forces "professional" and "national pride", the victims "pillars of the process" and the FARC go from "criminals" to "legitimate interlocutors", framing reconciliation as a "seed of transformation". Iván Duque Márquez (2018–2022) combines solemnity and pragmatism, defining himself as "coherent" and "builder of opportunities", extolling the Public Force as "heroic" and the citizenry "resilient", while delegitimizing the protest as contrary to patriotism. Gustavo Petro Urrego (2022–2026) emphasizes the moral rupture, presenting his government as "of the people" and "of life," the people as a "dignified majority," and nature as "mother earth," while characterizing the elites as "corrupt," "parasitic," or "fearful of change." These variations confirm that presidential preaching, even when it expands the repertoire of virtues and recognizes popular memories, maintains the central place of the State as a creator of attributes that exalts or minimizes subjects according to the objectives of each mandate.

Regarding argumentative strategies, the analysis reveals a common architecture that runs through the last three decades of the presidential discourse in Colombia. In all governments, *topoi* are reiterated as "the historical need for change", "peace and/or security as a condition for development" and "national unity as a moral duty and legality as the foundation of coexistence", which function as principles of legitimization of state decisions. On this shared basis, the governments of César Gaviria, Ernesto Samper,

Andrés Pastrana and Álvaro Uribe strengthened the state's centrality and presented inclusion as the result of order, discipline and modernization, displacing social conflict towards the sphere of institutional control. In the second half of the period analyzed, Juan Manuel Santos, Iván Duque and Gustavo Petro introduce modulations without altering the primacy of the state in the definition of change, because although they broaden the perspectives of recognition, in all cases inclusion is proposed as a company directed, regulated and enabled by the State, which channels social demands and defines the scenarios for their fulfillment.

As for the particularities, César Gaviria combined the *topos* of historical necessity with that of institutional functionality, presenting the 1991 Constitution and economic liberalization as inevitable reforms to ensure modernization and order. Ernesto Samper reformulated the economic axis in terms of social justice and moral duty, but ended up appealing to democratic legality to sustain his legitimacy in the midst of the 8,000 Process. Andrés Pastrana turned peace into a historic obligation and shared responsibility, reinforcing international co-responsibility through Plan Colombia, while maintaining that security was the basis of reconciliation. Álvaro Uribe reconfigured the argumentative field with the *topos* of fear and patriotic sacrifice, subordinating the social debate to the fight against terrorism and justifying Democratic Security as a national mandate. Juan Manuel Santos articulated the *topos* of historical responsibility with that of transformative effectiveness, inscribing the Peace Agreement as a foundational rupture and mobilizing the suffering of the victims as a moral and political argument. Iván Duque reversed the emphasis on negotiation, reinforced legality and national unity as the foundations of governability and activated the *topos* of heroism to legitimize the control of public order during the pandemic and the protests. Finally, Gustavo Petro projects the *topos* of social justice and total peace towards a horizon of climate justice and productive transformation, while invoking the people as a historical subject to dispute meanings of sovereignty and redistribution.

With respect to framing strategies, all governments delimit the problems, the actors and the solutions from frameworks that reinforce the primacy of the State. A framework that presents peace and security as an unavoidable requirement for coexistence and development is reiterated; another that places change on an upward trajectory of modernization and growth, where reforms are inevitable; and a framework of national unity that dilutes the conflict in the idea of a cohesive community. These frameworks configure inclusion as a regulated goal, dependent on the capacity of the State to manage difference, turn it into consensus and postpone structural tensions under the promise of a future of stability and prosperity. Although each period introduces nuances, the underlying structure remains, ensuring that the definition of problems and their legitimate solutions remains under the control of the central power.

As for the particularities, each president activated his own frameworks without breaking the common matrix. César Gaviria focused inclusion on constitutional reform and administrative efficiency, while subordinating exclusion to a technical problem of institutional design. Ernesto Samper established the "Social Leap" as a national pact,

resignifying economic openness in a redistributive key and appealing to sovereignty in the face of external pressures. Andres Pastrana presented peace as the supreme horizon, articulating negotiation and security with international co-responsibility. Álvaro Uribe installed Democratic Security as an essential democratic value and turned "otherness" into an absolute threat, closing dissent. Juan Manuel Santos framed peace as a civilizational project and the victims as the moral center, reinforcing the sense of unity. Iván Duque framed legality and citizen heroism as axes of cohesion, while transforming violence and dissent into moral degradation. Finally, Gustavo Petro deploys a set of moral, productive, environmental, social and dichotomous frameworks that present change as an ethical imperative that cannot be postponed, link social justice and total peace with an economic and climate transition, and position and idealize subaltern communities as a sovereign subject vis-à-vis the elites; although it expands the recognitions, it maintains polarization and the presidential centrality in defining the limits of change.

In all governments, intensification strategies are resorted to that turn government decisions into transcendental and urgent acts, supported by superlatives, hyperbole and emphatic repetitions such as "historic", "irreversible", "unwavering commitment", "it is now or never" or "total peace". César Gaviria presented the 1991 Constitution as a "peaceful revolution" and a "new social contract"; Ernesto Samper erected the "Social Leap" as an "imperative that cannot be postponed" and an "act of historical dignity"; Andres Pastrana spoke of an "irreversible path" and "historic responsibility" to legitimize negotiations and Plan Colombia; Álvaro Uribe dramatized the danger with formulas such as "the homeland cannot withstand any more delay" and "necessary sacrifices", projecting Democratic Security as a patriotic crusade; Juan Manuel Santos celebrated the Peace Agreement as "the victory of life over death"; Iván Duque reinforced "legality", "citizen heroism" and "Colombia does not stop" as axes of cohesion; and Gustavo Petro combines anaphoras such as "the people" or "all of them" with hyperbole such as "200 years of solitude" and metaphors of life in the face of destruction, which dramatize the historical urgency of change. This intensifying architecture mobilizes emotions, sets redemptive horizons and shields the presidential centrality as an engine of transformations that cannot be postponed.

At the same time, all leaders activate mitigation strategies that soften tensions, hide failures or reinscribe conflicts in a narrative of overcoming. Gaviria reduced social gaps to "lags" or "development challenges", depoliticizing inequalities; Samper downgraded the crisis of Process 8,000 to "presumptions" or "attempts at destabilization," presenting himself as the victim of unjust attacks; Pastrana explained setbacks as "inevitable tests" of peace; Uribe justified social costs with expressions such as "necessary sacrifices" or "painful but fair reforms" and appealed to "national unity" to defuse dissent; Santos, after the 2016 plebiscite, appealed to "listen to all voices" and recognized the result to maintain legitimacy; Duque spoke of "persistent challenges" and "difficulties inherent to democracy" to minimize inequalities and protests; while Petro, even in his epic tone, introduces controlled self-criticism and calls for dialogue that soften the confrontation between the people and elites without disarming his narrative of change. These mitigation strategies reframe crises as transitory stages and preserve the authority of the State, ensuring that the promise of inclusion remains under presidential leadership.

Microtextual strategies (Van Dijk cited by Wodak and Meyer, 2003)

In the microtextual strategies of Colombian presidential speeches, a persistent lexical matrix is observed that reinforces the authority of the State and the idea of governed change. Over the course of three decades, legal-administrative terms such as "institutionality", "reform", "legality", "governability" or "order" have been repeated, projecting technical rationality and stability. Terms of cohesion and morality such as "unity", "homeland", "democracy", "solidarity", "hope" and "reconciliation" are added, which make national belonging an ethical foundation. Expressions of progress and modernization such as "competitiveness," "development," "growth," and "innovation" present inclusion as a result of economic efficiency [in some cases as necessary for redistribution]. The allusion to the social sectors is concentrated in integrating labels such as "citizens", "working people", "builders of the future" or "heirs of the libertarian feat". In contrast, antagonists are encapsulated in delegitimizing categories such as "terrorists," "enemies of democracy," "criminal structures," or "drug traffickers," which deny their political dimension. This common repertoire sustains the centrality of state power, turns reforms into an inevitable destiny, and translates social tensions into management problems, reinforcing a narrative of order, cohesion, and managed progress.

In the governments of César Gaviria, Ernesto Samper, Andrés Pastrana and Álvaro Uribe, the lexicon reinforces the centrality of the state and the conception of inclusion as an administered order. Gaviria privileged legal-administrative terms such as "new democratic era", "peaceful revolution" or "new social contract", presenting the 1991 Constitution as the origin of an unquestionable modernization and reducing exclusion to "backwardness" or "development challenges". Samper incorporated an ethical and conciliatory vocabulary with expressions such as "equity", "solidarity", "dignity" and "trust", extolling his project as a moral crusade, while neutralizing the crisis of Process 8,000 with expressions such as "presumptions" or "attempts at destabilization". Pastrana articulated a lexicon of peace and family as a "common treasure," "collective hope" and "historical commitment" along with metaphors of disease and cure such as "cancer of drug trafficking," which dramatized the threat and justified Plan Colombia. Uribe, for his part, intensified the moral dichotomy with words such as "democratic security," "authority," "homeland," "terrorism" or "co-responsibility," exalting "exemplary citizens" and "heroes" while disqualifying opponents as "accomplices of terrorism" or "enemies of the homeland," reinforcing a narrative of patriotic obedience and irreversible order.

Juan Manuel Santos combined moral and patriotic terms such as "reconciliation," "dignity," and "heirs of the libertarian feat" with a technical lexicon such as "jurisdiction," "ZIDRES," and "road map," and foundational expressions such as "end of the horrible night," which legitimize peace as a historical rupture. Duque accentuates a vocabulary of faith and heroism with words such as "God", "blessing", "verraquera", "heroes" and "equity" that merges the spiritual with the patriotic, while naming inequalities as "persistent challenges" that minimize their structural dimension. Petro introduces a moral

and environmental lexicon with words such as "social justice", "dignity", "biodiversity" and "world power of life" along with historical and productive categories such as "agrarian revolution" or "emancipation", which place change as an ethical and civilizing mandate. It reiterates mantras such as "the people", "all and all", "children first", uses hyperbole such as "peasant genocide" and confrontational metaphors such as "fossil barbarism" and "volcanic force", intensifying the epic of change, although it preserves the presidential centrality in the conduct of the transformative process.

In the face of syntactic organization, a common pattern of density and control is shown. In all presidents, long sentences predominate, with multiple subordinates and causal or consecutive connectors that chain diagnoses and solutions, projecting the State as a rational and planning actor. The passive voice and impersonal constructions ["progress has been made" or "reforms were implemented"] displace agency and present decisions as technical processes, protecting the presidential figure from confrontation. Nominalization ["modernization," "strengthening," "reorganization"] turns actions into nouns, reifying processes and depoliticizing disputes. The sentence order often places the government in an initial position, relegating the social actors to secondary places. In addition, the repeated use of copulative particles ["and", "in addition", "also"] tends to accumulate achievements and avoids disjunctions, creating an effect of continuity and stability.

In particularities, César Gaviria combined extensive statements, passive voices, and nominalizations to present the 1991 Constitution as a "peaceful revolution," erasing collective subjects. Ernesto Samper reinforced causality with connectors that imprint inevitability on each decision and used passives to attenuate tensions of Process 8,000. Andrés Pastrana articulated sentences linked in problem-solution logic, adding rhetorical questions and triads such as "peace, democracy and development" that simplify the conflict. Álvaro Uribe alternated prolonged reasoning with short and exclamatory phrases ["We will not give up!"] and parallelisms that set slogans of authority ["Security for investment, investment for equity, equity for peace"]. Juan Manuel Santos balanced dense sentences with anaphoras and antitheses that dramatize the passage from war to peace. Iván Duque used extensive subordinates, enumerations, and solemn pauses to emphasize unity and legality ["We are all Colombia, we must all protect legality, we will all build equity"], reinforcing a ceremonial tone. Gustavo Petro combined analytical phrases with repetitions and direct appeals ["All of us"] and intense metaphors that give the rhythm of harangue ["break the chains of 200 years of solitude"], seeking the adhesion of popular sectors and challenging hegemonically dominant sectors.

Ideological veins and interdiscursivity (Wodak and Reisigl cited by Wodak and Meyer, 2003)

All governments combine references to liberal constitutionalism, modernizing developmentalism, and security as a guarantee of coexistence, legitimizing state primacy and presenting inclusion as an effect of order, growth, and legality. On this shared substrate, modulations specific to each period are deployed. César Gaviria articulated institutional modernization, economic openness and security as convergent veins of a neoliberal rationality; Ernesto Samper added a social reformism that, without breaking

the framework of openness, subordinated equity to governability; Andres Pastrana privileged a pacifist humanism that made peace a supreme value, complemented by a multilateral pragmatics; Álvaro Uribe installed a vein of moralizing security that absolutized state authority and Democratic Security; Juan Manuel Santos combined liberal-democratic, historical and reconciliatory streaks, inscribing peace as a foundational rupture; Iván Duque reinforced moral, patriotic and institutional legality streaks, which presented equity as continuity of order; and Gustavo Petro projects popular, redistributive and environmental veins that link social justice, popular sovereignty and climate transition, although they maintain the presidential centrality in defining the limits of change.

Although the discursive hegemony of each presidency-maintained state primacy, in all cases cracks emerged that introduce languages of justice, recognition or plurality without configuring a solid counter-narrative. César Gaviria opened symbolic spaces by recognizing "ethnic and cultural plurality" and "citizen participation," but subordinated them to the institutional design of the 1991 Constitution. Ernesto Samper incorporated references to decentralization, regional equity and social solidarity, although encapsulated in the logic of governability and growth. Andres Pastrana acknowledged fears of negotiation and foreign interference, but reabsorbed them into the ethics of peace as the supreme good. Álvaro Uribe admitted criticism of the reelection, the fiscal reforms and the effects of Democratic Security, but neutralized them with appeals to popular mandate, sovereignty and patriotic necessity. Juan Manuel Santos made room for humanist streaks, forgiveness and political plurality, but framed them in a peace of consensus that avoided questioning the economic model. Iván Duque mentioned equity and territorial development, but without differentiating actors or recognizing historical inequalities, while presenting the protest as a threat to order. Finally, Gustavo Petro made visible business resistance, agrarian elites and fossil powers, but reduced them to a people/elite antagonism that, although mobilizing, limits dialogue and maintains presidential centrality. The marginal veins show that the presidential discourse cannot do without languages of recognition and reconfigures itself to preserve its hegemony.

In the face of emerging veins, the comparative analysis shows important silences and omissions, since in most governments the structural causes of inequality are made invisible, with different nuances, [land domination, ignorance of diverse territorial practices, job insecurity and urban-rural gaps] and social movements are reduced to recipients of policies, ignoring in many cases their real demands. autonomy and agency. The issue of gender and sexual diversities appear in a fragmentary way, since women tend to appear as victims, guardians of life or symbols of hope, without problematizing differentiated violence or their role as political actors. Similarly, indigenous, Afro-descendant, and Raizal communities are integrated as "people" or "Colombians" without addressing their territorial disputes, intra-ethnic conflicts, or claims for self-determination. Issues such as the right to protest, comprehensive transitional justice, the redistribution of wealth, the environmental impacts of extractivism, interregional tensions or the effects of the digital and urban economy are left out of an in-depth debate, even though their social relevance has grown in recent periods. These absences reveal

that, beyond the discursive turns, the inclusion proclaimed by presidents maintains narrow limits, since it recognizes identities and demands only to the extent that they do not question centrality and the state project, leaving open veins of conflict that continue to feed the contemporary public agenda.

Profiling of actors, attributes and mechanisms of enunciation

Faced with the profiling of actors, attributes and mechanisms of enunciation, the comparative analysis shows a common pattern of hierarchy and control. In all governments, citizens are abstractly addressed as "Colombians", "society" or "people", with attributes of responsibility, sacrifice and commitment that make them a homogeneous subject, presupposing their adherence to the national project, while those who dissent are placed in external categories. In most periods, the Public Force occupies a privileged place, exalted as the guarantor of democracy and life, while businessmen, Congress and international organizations are presented as strategic allies and co-authors of the reforms. The victims appear as repositories of dignity and memory, often idealized or clothed with an almost sacred aura that elevates them to emblems of reconciliation. At the opposite pole, guerrillas, drug trafficking and organized crime are profiled as "enemies of the homeland", "terrorists" or "merchants of death", categories that close off all political legitimacy. In this way, inclusion is defined by its functionality to the central project of each government, recognizing subjects and attributing qualities to them to the extent that they reinforce the institutional order.

César Gaviria highlighted the adult citizens as guarantors of the new constitutional pact and the constituents, businessmen and international organizations as promoters of modernization. Ernesto Samper placed working citizens, businessmen as generators of progress and international allies who supported his peace and development agenda in the foreground. Andres Pastrana exalted the citizenry as the moral depository of reconciliation, the Armed Forces as heroes of democracy, the demobilized as multipliers of peace, and the international community as the guarantor of Plan Colombia. Álvaro Uribe placed the Public Force as the backbone of the nation and businessmen as engines of investor confidence, along with the good citizenry as disciplined and patriotic subjects. Juan Manuel Santos projected the victims as the moral epicenter, recognized the opposition as a legitimate interlocutor and added Congress, businessmen and multilateral organizations as allies of the Peace Agreement. Iván Duque highlighted resilient and supportive citizens, the Public Force as contemporary heroes, migrants as welcomed brothers and businessmen as agents of productive equity. Gustavo Petro, for his part, places the popular and working people, peasants, women, ethnic communities and youth at the center as protagonists of the transformation, and incorporates nature as a subject of rights, while calling on the international community of the Global South as an ally in the face of the climate crisis.

In contrast, negative profiles are evident, César Gaviria named the armed groups as "the violent" or "enemies of democracy", making the social causes of the conflict invisible and relegating women, young people and indigenous and Afro-descendant peoples to purely symbolic mentions. Ernesto Samper, despite his emphasis on equity, reduced social movements, ethnic communities and women to recipients of programs, and presented

drug traffickers as the only structural threat, erasing tensions of class and territory. Andrés Pastrana depoliticized peasants and victims, treated the FARC as legitimate interlocutors only initially and then as terrorists, and omitted the social and environmental impacts of Plan Colombia. Álvaro Uribe delegitimized guerrillas, paramilitaries, and drug traffickers as "terrorists," associated the opposition, unions, and social organizations with violent complicity, and silenced the victims of state crimes. Juan Manuel Santos, although he expanded recognition, kept gender, ethnic and territorial inequalities invisible and treated the FARC in an oscillating way, between adversaries and reintegrated actors. Iván Duque reduced social protests to problems of order, omitted a differential approach towards women, indigenous people and Afro-descendants and dehumanized armed groups as "criminals" or "enemies of life". Finally, Gustavo Petro, even when he exalts popular sectors, homogenizes ethnic communities, peasants and sexual dissidents in the people, simplifying their diversity, and profiles economic elites, landowners and fossil corporations as antagonists responsible for exclusion, without nuanced their internal differences.

Inclusion in the voices of power

The analysis of presidential voices reveals that inclusion has functioned mainly as a strategy to legitimize power. César Gaviria configured a horizon of regulated inclusion that presented plurality as a national value, but administered it to privilege cohesion, consensus and unity. Under the rhetoric of "peaceful revolution" and the 1991 Constitution, it expanded formal rights and participation, although it subordinated social demands to the imperative of economic openness and institutional restructuring. Ernesto Samper, in the midst of a legitimacy crisis, projected an inclusion that combined the promise of social justice with the need to shield the institutionality. His discourse integrated those who supported the stability of the system and marginalized those who stressed it, placing the border between inside and outside in democratic loyalty. The narrative was based on international frameworks of rights and diversity, but remained anchored to the logic of economic openness, producing a hybrid order that mixed redistributive aspirations with the reproduction of the bases of exclusion.

At the turn of the century, Andrés Pastrana articulated a tutelary and technocratic inclusion, where peasants, youth, women and victims were conceived as passive beneficiaries of assistance programs, while Plan Colombia subordinated development to the logic of security and geopolitical alignment. Álvaro Uribe deepened this tendency through a model of authoritarian and conditional inclusion, which reduced citizenship to a homogeneous body subordinated to the military, economic and moral order, establishing membership in loyalty to Democratic Security and dismissing the structural causes of the conflict. Juan Manuel Santos expanded the field of recognition with a discourse of peace and reconciliation that incorporated victims, opposition and the international community, but without questioning the structures of accumulation or historical inequalities. Its inclusion, although broader, remained within the margins of an institutional consensus that filtered out dissonant voices and moralized the ideal of peace.

In the most recent cycle, Iván Duque formulated inclusion as an ethical and religious duty, exalting victims, migrants, and entrepreneurs, while constructing absolute enemies ["terrorists," "criminals," and "agitators"] to legitimize an order centered on security and moral cohesion. Finally, Gustavo Petro proposes an inclusion of ethical and planetary scope that exalts the people [peasants, indigenous peoples, Afro-descendants, women and youth] as a historical subject of transformation and incorporates nature as a political actor. However, his narrative organizes politics into life/death and people/elite oppositions, idealizes subaltern groups and maintains the centrality of the presidential voice as a guarantor of recognition. The trajectory of these presidencies shows that, despite the nuances and expansions, inclusion continues to be a device of power that regulates social participation, establishes hierarchies of recognition and preserves the structures of inequality under new languages of legitimization.

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

A comparative analysis of presidential speeches in Colombia shows that inclusion has not been consolidated as a structural project of transformation, but as a rhetorical resource shaped by government interests. Although it is invoked as a principle of cohesion and justice, in practice it operates to reinforce presidential authority, reorder power alliances and neutralize social demands. This plasticity turns inclusion into a floating signifier that accommodates specific conjunctures without altering the historical structures of exclusion. The result is a rhetoric of openness that, instead of enabling profound changes, tends to legitimize continuities. In the course of the presidencies analyzed, inclusion is mobilized in a selective and hierarchical manner, exalting certain sectors such as victims of the conflict, young people, entrepreneurs, the Public Forces or peasants, as they are functional to the official narrative. At the same time, groups such as organized women, sexual dissidents, impoverished urban communities, informal workers or people with disabilities are reduced to superficial mentions or directly omitted. Inclusion functions as a strategic mechanism of visibility, capable of granting symbolic recognition to certain groups, while neglecting those who question the current horizon of power.

A cross-cutting feature is the tendency to moralize the notion of inclusion, placing it on an ethical and patriotic terrain that shifts the debate on structural inequalities towards abstract values such as unity, life or social justice. By turning inclusion into a moral mandate, criticism is presented as a threat to the nation and democratic deliberation is inhibited. Citizenship is questioned not as a subject of rights, but as a repository of virtues that must be guarded by the presidential voice. This resource reinforces personalist leadership and reduces politics to a dilemma between symbolic adhesion and exclusion. At the same time, inclusion is proposed as a mechanism of homogenization. Presidential speeches appeal to broad categories such as "people," "Colombians," "youth," or "citizens," which produce the illusion of a cohesive community, but erase internal differences of class, gender, ethnicity, and territory. By presenting diverse groups as homogeneous blocks, the official narrative makes social conflicts invisible and relegates tensions specific to each group. In this way, diversity is reduced to a decorative element that legitimizes the idea of a unitary and harmonious nation.

The place of exclusion in presidential speeches confirms that inclusion is configured as a symbolic border [not as a guarantee of rights]. Governments delineate enemies ["terrorists", "vandals", "corrupt elites" or "enemies of change"] that remain outside the national "we" and lose political legitimacy. This strategy defines belonging in terms of loyalty to the presidential narrative and naturalizes polarization. Consequently, inclusion ceases to be projected as an emancipatory horizon and becomes a device of narrative control that reinforces the centrality of executive power. At the same time, it preserves polarities that sustain the established order, reproducing a dynamic of confrontation functional to the status quo. The 1991 Constitution opened a normative horizon that recognized ethnic, cultural and regional diversity as the foundation of the nation, inaugurating a grammar of inclusion that promised pluralism and participation. However, legal openness coexisted with structural inequalities that limited its effectiveness. Since then, each presidency has resignified inclusion according to its ideological project and the conjunctures of governability, transferring the constitutional ideal to a discursive resource aimed at ensuring political adhesion rather than effective rights.

All the leaders have made inclusion a resource of power linked to the centrality of their own voice, which opens the way to analyze how this position of authority is configured. The positioning approach proposed by Davies and Harré (cited by Cisneros & Arango, 2000; Cisneros, 2007) It allows us to understand the discursive production of identities as a dynamic process in which speakers place themselves in certain "positions" while defining rights, duties and momentary identities. The position is relational and is negotiated in interaction, generating configurations of power that grant or restrict the ability to act. In this perspective, language not only describes the social world, but also produces it, by delimiting what can be said and what is legitimate. In the case of Colombia, presidents position themselves as authorized subjects to define the meaning of the nation, placing citizens according to the conditions they set for their recognition. This performativity turns inclusion into a device of power, since the president not only names the social actors, but also places them in a hierarchical framework of belonging and exclusion. In this way, the presidential figure is consolidated as a legitimate powerful man, invested with moral, technical or historical authority, who attributes to himself the right to grant visibility and to close dissent.(Cisneros, 2007)

The modalities of presidential positioning vary according to the situation and the style of government, but in all cases, they reinforce the centrality of the president as an authorized interpreter of inclusion. The research identifies four recurring figures: the architect of progress, the mediator of conflicts, the protective father and the authoritative moral voice. Each one reorganizes the social field in a particular way, but they all share the ability to present inclusion as a presidential grace and not as a right derived from horizontal democratic institutions. The architect of progress is enunciated from a technocratic and modernizing rationality that privileges efficiency, competitiveness and insertion in the global economy. Presidents such as César Gaviria and Andrés Pastrana embodied this discursive place by narrating modernization as an inevitable destiny and by situating inclusion in a framework of subordinate access. The ideal citizen was represented as adaptable, enterprising and innovative, while those who did not fit into the logic of the market were made invisible. In terms of Davies and Harré (cited by Cisneros, 2007), the president positioned himself as the designer of a national project

that distributes rights according to their usefulness for modernization, thus reinforcing historical hierarchies under a language of progress.

The positioning as a mediator of conflicts is based on a presidential voice that presents itself as a guarantor of agreements and articulator of opposing interests, projecting an image of neutrality that concentrates the power to define the limits of dialogue. Juan Manuel Santos is the paradigmatic case, since in his narrative of peace he summoned the victims as protagonists and multiple sectors as valid interlocutors, while reserving for himself the power to establish the terms of reconciliation. Inclusion appeared as conditional recognition, dependent on the acceptance of the institutional framework that he himself outlined. This figure broadens the field of dialogue but maintains intact the presidential centrality in the definition of what can be said and what is legitimate. On the other hand, the positioning as a protective parent combines moral protection, emotional authority and defense of order. Iván Duque, by insisting on the triad "legality, entrepreneurship and equity", reinforced a paternal bond in which citizens were questioned as obedient children. Those who accepted state care were included as "good citizens," while social protest was criminalized as vandalism. This dynamic translates presidential power into a relationship of protection and punishment that conditions recognition to compliance with order and reproduces a vertical logic that depoliticizes difference.

The authoritative moral voice is configured on a supposed ethical superiority that enables the president to speak in the name of the common good and to define unquestionable principles. Álvaro Uribe Vélez and Gustavo Petro, although from opposite ideologies, share this position. Uribe built his legitimacy around patriotic duty and the defense of legality, while Petro anchors it in the mandate of historical justice and in "life as the supreme principle." In both cases, inclusion is presented as an act of grace emanating from a higher conscience and not as an autonomous right. As Davies and Harré (cited by Cisneros, 2007) warn, this position does not open room for deliberation, but rather defines in advance the founding values, so that dissent appears as a betrayal of essential principles. By establishing who deserves recognition and under what conditions, each president delimits the perimeter of the national and organizes hierarchies of legitimacy. This dynamic coincides with the production of "momentary identities" described by Davies and Harré (cited by Cisneros, 2007), which can be resignified or denied at any time. In the case of Colombia, presidents have used this flexibility to recategorize social movements, opponents or critical groups, moving them from positions of legitimate dialogue to positions of moral threat, without substantive transformations in their political action.

Through this lens, inclusion is shown as a government practice focused on the performativity of presidential power, where the president, as a "legitimate powerful man," exercises and recreates his authority in discourse, assuming himself as an interpreter of the popular will. In this framework, citizens find themselves in an asymmetrical relationship, since their recognition depends on accepting the president's narrative script, while dissent is reconfigured as an anomaly or threat. This perspective allows us to understand how, even in governments that proclaim the expansion of rights, inclusion can become a technology of control that concentrates power in a single voice. From the theory of positioning, each president is not only configured as a central voice but also builds a cartography of actors to sustain his national project. This mapping, elaborated through discourse, defines who is recognized, who remains on the periphery and who is

classified as an enemy, thus delimiting the contours of possible citizenship. From this approach, it is necessary to analyze how the actors that make up these cartographies reproduce, dispute or tension the logics of power, and whether their interventions facilitate structural transformations or rather reinforce the current order. To this end, the contributions of intersectionality are taken up (Crenshaw, 1989; Collins, 1986; 2015) and the wheel of power, privilege and access for Latin America proposed by Albarrán (2020), which allows the simultaneous identification of places of voice and absence in presidential narratives.

The comparative analysis of presidential cartographies, in light of Albarrán's (2020) wheel of power, privilege and access, shows that each president distributes recognition according to his political project, placing the actors in positions of high, medium or no access and legitimacy. In the period of César Gaviria, adult citizens, Congress, constituents, businessmen and the Public Force were privileged, while women, young people and ethnic communities were left in the symbolic periphery. Ernesto Samper reinforced the core of privilege with Congress, businessmen, the security forces and international allies, generically integrating peasants and victims and expelling guerrillas and drug trafficking as absolute threats. Andrés Pastrana kept Congress, productive sectors and international cooperation at the center, granted the FARC conditional recognition that later led to exclusion, and relegated women, young people and impoverished rural sectors to invisibility. Álvaro Uribe consolidated a model of authoritarian inclusion, in which the Armed Forces, businessmen and external partners occupied maximum access, while the opposition, unions and victims of state violence were placed in the exclusion zones.

In the following decade, Juan Manuel Santos partially expanded the map by placing the victims at the core of legitimacy and giving greater visibility to ethnic communities, childhood and early childhood, although without going beyond the circuits of economic and political privilege. Iván Duque reconfigured inclusion around the triad of "legality, entrepreneurship and equity", placing the Public Force, entrepreneurs, "brother" migrants and victims in high-access positions, while dehumanizing illegal armed groups and keeping organized women, young people and informal workers invisible. For his part, Gustavo Petro expanded in an unprecedented way by summoning the people [peasants, ethnic communities, women and youth] and nature as a subject of rights, but he homogenized internal tensions and placed economic elites and fossil powers at the opposite end of the wheel. These configurations show that presidential inclusion, even when it is proclaimed as an expansion of rights, operates as selective recognition, which distributes voice and power according to the political utility of each actor and reproduces the same system of operation that is strained according to each government project.

A tour of presidential cartographies shows that inclusion functions as a resource of legitimacy concentrated in the voice of the president, but it also gives a glimpse of the fissures that this centrality produces. Citizenship, in its diversity, is not a passive actor, but rather negotiates, tensions and reconfigures the borders of the national "we", generating fields of dispute in which power is played beyond the official discourse. These tensions express a constituent capacity that challenges the hierarchies of recognition and the forms of organization of collective life. In this scenario, the struggle for recognition emerges, understood from intersectionality as the dispute to be seen and valued in the

complex web of differences that citizens go through. Presidential cartographies confirm that citizenship enunciated en bloc under formulas such as "people", "nation" or "compatriots" is in fact profoundly heterogeneous, and that most of its members are located at the ends of Albarrán's (2020) wheel of power, privilege and access, where opportunities for advocacy are limited. There hierarchies of gender, race, class, age and territory intersect, which explains why the demand for inclusion takes multiple forms, from territorial demands to struggles of gender, ethnicity, generation and socioeconomic condition. This configuration reveals structural flaws in the way citizens are organized and power is distributed, requiring a rethinking of institutions and matrices of privilege that sustain the social order.(Crenshaw, 1989)

At this point, Albarrán's (2020) proposal on the spectrum of awareness of change is key, which states that positionality is not fixed and that people can adopt different attitudes towards hierarchies of privilege, with the capacity to transform power structures. According to this author, attitudes of resistance or curiosity can be assumed, although those who remain in them usually benefit from the system and do not promote structural changes. In contrast, attitudes of understanding and proactivity open up the possibility of profoundly mobilizing power, privilege, and access, recognizing that each subject moves dynamically between these positions according to their history, their resources, and perceived opportunities. However, this framework requires critical reading, since resistance and curiosity are not only sustained by those who concentrate privileges, but also by those who, even at a disadvantage, reproduce the authority of the system due to fears, cultural inheritance or economic dependence. Likewise, even the attitudes of understanding and proactivity, designed to transform the wheel, operate within the same device, so that changes translate into new forms of access or power without altering the underlying architecture. This double limitation suggests that the spectrum acutely describes the dynamics of mobility but does not guarantee the rupture of the structural order that organizes inequality.

If the positions within the wheel can move without altering its structure, it is necessary to attend to the practices that go beyond this framework, since the subjects questioned negotiate and reconfigure the meanings of inclusion, showing that the borders of the national "we" are unstable. This tension announces the presence of trans-positioning, processes in which social actors are constituted as producers of their own legitimacy, creating repertoires that not only seek access, but also go beyond the very design of the system of privilege. Trans-positioning suggests the existence of discursive practices through which collectives resist, reconfigure or overflow the places assigned to them by power, instituting other ways of enunciating themselves. On this level, language ceases to be an instrument of response and becomes a means of political creation. Mobilizations, strategic litigation, artistic narratives, digital discourses or community repertoires destabilize the alleged presidential neutrality, showing that citizens are not passive objects of inclusion, but producers of their own legitimacy. These actions make it possible to weave alternative orders of recognition that expand the possibilities of thinking about common life beyond official grammar and the limits of mobility inscribed in the wheel of power, privilege and access.

From this perspective, trans-positions are not limited to reacting to power, since doing so would mean recognizing its centrality and aspiring to be included in its logic. On the contrary, they unravel themselves from that expectation and deploy repertoires that expand the field of the sayable and reorganize collective belonging from its very nature. In this context, it is worth recognizing that some forms of resistance, even when they seem challenging, end up legitimizing the wheel of privilege by reproducing its logics of recognition and exclusion. At the same time, there are other plural, situated, diverse and friendly practices, which function effectively on their own terms and do not seek to be incorporated into a consolidated hierarchical system. These experiences announce the terrain of the continuity of this research, dedicated to the voices of the actors, with the purpose of investigating whether their struggles and practices are inserted in the wheel of power or if, instead, they suggest the creation of other social schemes capable of overflowing this device.

CONCLUSIONS

Inclusion has functioned primarily as a presidential legitimization technology that reinforces the existing order. Over three decades, governments in Colombia have used the language of rights and diversity to absorb social demands, expand symbols of participation, and project an image of democratic openness. However, these gestures have not substantially modified the economic, territorial and political hierarchies that sustain inequality. The promises of equity are translated into administrative reforms, subsidies or sectoral programs that, although they generate partial relief, do not transform the structures of accumulation or the patterns of exclusion. In this way, inclusion becomes a device that gives legitimacy to presidential power, reinforcing its ability to arbitrate social conflict.

In the course of the presidential speeches, a common matrix is identified that articulates peace or security, economic modernization, national unity and social equity. This combination, reiterated in all governments, operates as a consensus grammar that presents inclusion as a requirement for stability and progress. The technical and moral registers that sustain it [figures, efficiency diagnoses, appeals to the homeland or to life] manage the difference, displacing structural conflicts to a plane of state management. Thus, inequalities of class, gender, ethnicity and territory become technical or moral problems that the State promises to solve gradually, without opening the political debate on the root causes. This matrix, which adapts to different ideologies and situations, allows each presidency to legitimize its project as continuity of order, guaranteeing that inclusion remains a regulated goal.

The performativity of the "legitimate powerful man" constitutes another nucleus of continuity in the presidential discourse. Each president positions himself as an interpreter of the popular will and cartography, from his voice, who has access to recognition, who remains on the periphery and who is singled out as an enemy. Citizenship is questioned under broad categories ["people", "compatriots", "good Colombians"] that represent it as a homogeneous and morally cohesive subject. This strategy turns inclusion into a government practice where loyalty to the official narrative becomes a condition for participation. They are dissolved into abstract formulas and dissident voices are redefined

as anomaly or threat. In this way, the presidential power attributes to itself the power to define the limits of the national and to reorganize the boundaries of social recognition. The reading of the cartographies of power in the light of the wheel of power, privilege and access proposed by Albarrán (2020) confirms that the mobility of the actors occurs within a device that remains intact. Presidents can relocate subjects [elevate victims to the center, incorporate nature as an actor of rights, temporarily make young people or entrepreneurs visible], but the structure is not altered. Emphasizes, names and symbols change, certain rights are expanded or new memories are recognized, without this implying a substantive redistribution of power or the recognition of practices outside the structure. This dynamic shows that inclusion, even when it adopts rhetorical turns or creates new centralities, continues to be inscribed in a hierarchical architecture that defines in advance the margins of possible citizenship. Instead of dismantling the wheel, governments reconfigure it to maintain its functionality and ensure state order.

The research projection is oriented to the recognition of the other voices [popular, contrary or different] that configure daily practices that are indispensable for the functioning of the social system. In territories, community networks, grassroots organizations and digital spaces in which trans-positions emerge that are not limited to claiming access to the state center or the privileges it administers. On the contrary, they create their own orders of legitimacy, articulating local knowledge, particular economies, their own languages and devices that reconfigure the sense of the common. These experiences not only stress official cartographies but also open up the possibility of disputing the very grammar of inclusion, questioning the idea that recognition should go through the institutional system. Analyzing these practices will allow us to identify forms of organization that can go beyond the logic of control and state centrality, illuminating horizons of citizenship with effective and plural functions, without romanticizing their scope or ignoring their internal tensions.

References

1. Albarrán, D. (2020). Tarjetas de concientización sobre posicionalidad e interseccionalidad. Diseño Gráfico: Bee Fourie. Waipapa Taumata Rau University of Auckland.
2. Booth, T., & Ainscow, M. (2011). The Index for Inclusion: Developing Learning and Participation in Schools (3rd ed.). Bristol, United Kingdom: Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education (CSIE).
3. Cisneros, C. A. (2007). Presentación de "Posicionamiento: La producción discursiva de la identidad" de Bronwyn Davies y Rom Harré. *Athenea Digital*, (12), 240–241. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. <http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=53701212>
4. Collins PH. (2015). Dilemas definitorios de la interseccionalidad. *Revista Anual de Sociología*. 41:1–20. doi: 10.1146/annurev-soc-073014-112142.
5. Crenshaw, Kimberle (1989) Desmarginación de la intersección de raza y sexo: Una crítica feminista negra de la doctrina antidiscriminatoria, la teoría feminista y la política antirracista, *Foro Legal de la Universidad de Chicago* : Vol. 1989, Artículo 8. Disponible en: <https://chicagounbound.uchicago.edu/uclf/vol1989/iss1/8>
6. Dardot, Pierre y Laval, Christian. 2019. "La institución de lo común: ¿un principio revolucionario para el siglo XXI? Entrevista a Pierre Dardot y Christian Laval". Por Patrick Cingolani y Anders Fjeld. *Revista de Estudios Sociales*70: 65-77.

7. Hardt, M., & Negri, A. (2000). Empire. Harvard University Press.
8. Jessop, B., Brenner, N., & Jones, M. (2008). Theorizing socio-spatial relations. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 26(3), 389–401. <https://doi.org/10.1068/d9107>
9. Portal @prender-Entre Ríos. (2022, abril 1). ¿Qué es la diversidad cultural? [Video]. YouTube. .
10. Porto-Gonçalves, C. W. (2009). De saberes y territorios: Diversidad y emancipación a partir de la experiencia latinoamericana. *Polis, Revista de la Universidad Bolivariana*, 8(22), 121-136.
11. Puyana Mejía, B. I. (2023). Diversidad e inclusión: una mirada sociojurídica (Generación de contenidos impresos N.º 60). Bogotá, Colombia: Ediciones Universidad Cooperativa de Colombia.
12. Ramírez, W. (2017). La inclusión en Colombia: avances y desafíos. *Revista Colombiana de Educación*, 73(2), 135-150.
13. Skliar, C. (2008). ¿Incluir las diferencias? Sobre un problema mal planteado y una realidad insoportable. *Orientación y Sociedad*, 8. La Plata, Argentina: Universidad Nacional de La Plata.
14. Torres, J. (2025). Inclusión: Manifestaciones y dilemas en el contexto colombiano. Material en desarrollo en calidad de tesis doctoral. Universidad del Cauca.
15. Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Comps.). (2003). *Métodos de análisis crítico del discurso* (T. Fernández Aúz & B. Eguibar, Trads.). Gedisa. (Obra original publicada en 2001).