Contributions of Schizoanalysis to Critical Psychology in Brazil

Domenico Uhng Hur
Setor Universitário, Goiás, Brasil

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to discuss a Critical Psychology from schizoanalytic focus, presenting different concepts and forms of thinking political and psychosocial phenomena. We carry out a bibliographical review on the literature related to the work of G. Deleuze and F. Guattari and the schizoanalytic production in Brazil. Schizoanalysis started to influence the Brazilian psychology in the mental health and clinical psychology, carrying a radical criticism to the instituted practices and policies. Currently this influence has increased in many fields, as public health, politics, arts, social and clinical intervention, sexuality, social movements, etc. We discuss the contributions of Schizoanalysis to the psychosocial analysis quoting as example our doctoral thesis about the discourses of former-guerrilla fighters concerning the transition from the armed struggle to the neoliberal democracy. To reflect about this phenomenon we elaborated the concepts of Stratumpolitics, Technopolitics and Nomadpolitics.

Key words: Schizoanalysis; Schizodrama; Political Psychology; Critical Psychology; politics.

Introduction

Psychology in Brazil is a field of knowledge that is distinguished by heterogeneity and fragmentation; by several theoretical streams, all with different approaches, methodologies, and political standings, ranging from the traditional conservatism of the field to transformative and critical standpoints. We understand this theoretical heterogeneity, which is also an epistemological issue, as resulting primarily from the status of a country that was academically colonized; which was not only economically and politically plundered and dominated for five centuries, but which academic thinking was formed by implementing models used in the United States and Europe, especially in France and England.

Thus, we are left with an ambiguous situation: we have access to a plurality of streams of thought, but due to our effort to "only" understand them, we have difficulties in producing something of our own, something unique: a Brazilian Critical Psychology. Most of the times, our academic production is satisfied to only comment on works by European and American thinkers. There are indeed great scholars here, but potential and creative thinkers such as Paulo Freire (1967) and his work *Pedagogy of Liberation* have less visibility than thinkers from the Northern hemisphere; that is, we still maintain an academic underdevelopment, a subjectivity of the colonized, in which we prefer foreign models rather than models developed locally.

No wonder then that psychology in Brazil, in its hegemonic form, has been a field of knowledge for dominant social groups, for those among the colonized that colonized their peers and continued the domination of some over others. Before the official establishment of

Psychology as a subject in the country, psychological knowledge, which had not yet been scientific, not only portrayed the dominant subjectivity, but also contributed to the catechism and indoctrination of the Indians by the Portuguese Jesuits (Pessotti, 1988). By the time of the establishment of the first universities in the nineteenth century psychological knowledge focused on normalization and social adaptation, including the justification of repressive political actions from government. For example, the famous Brazilian physician Nina Rodrigues (1937), who described the social movement called Canudos, a community that independently organized itself against the State in North-Eastern Brazil, as a movement resulting from a leadership with serious psychological disturbances; thus, disqualifying its political and community potential (Macedo & Maestri, 2004). Such "scientific" standing was used to legitimize the extermination made by repressive forces of the State on the Canudos community, including the murdering of women, children, and seniors. In the twentieth century, after the creation of psychology courses in 1957 and the subsequent regulation of professional psychology, Brazilian psychology remained elitist and assumed the scientistic and positivist pattern imported from the United States, with strong normalizing and adaptive traits. For example, one of the principal functions of a psychologist, established by the Law that regulates the profession, Law 4119, Article 13 item d (Brazil, 1962), is to "solve adjustment problems".

Carvalho and Dunker (2006) point out that during the period of military dictatorship, which lasted from 1964 to 1985, a Critical Psychology emerged in Brazil. We consider this statement to be inaccurate, as we believe that the prospects of Critical Psychology emerged in Brazil only at the end of this period of extreme violence from the State, from the transition period up to democracy, when social movements started reappearing in national settings (Sader, 1988); that is, the late seventies and the eighties.

During this period, Community Social Psychology (Montero, 2004), the Psychology of Liberation (Martín-Baró, 1998) and Socio-Historical Psychology (Lane; Codo, 1986) emerged, with strong Marxist influences, to becoming significant examples of critical approaches in Brazilian Social Psychology. In this paper we will not discuss these developments, since other colleagues are carrying out this task. Therefore, our goal is to discuss another critical approach in Brazilian Psychology: Schizoanalysis, a field of knowledge that promotes the creation of a modality of Critical Psychology. We will pose the following questions: What is the specificity of this field? What is the concept of politics and which form of social critique is brought about by this approach? What is being produced from this perspective in the Brazilian psychology?

We argue that Schizoanalysis has promoted a modality of Critical Psychology in the country, though it is still secondary, outsider, and underdeveloped. Thus, our goals for this paper include presenting and discussing this developing field in Brazil: schizoanalysis as Critical Psychology. We will present the different concepts and principles that guide us in conducting new analyses of political and social phenomena. Thus, we have organized this paper to address three topics. First, schizoanalytic conceptions of political phenomena and the nature of the social are reviewed. Second, the development of this perspective in Brazilian psychology is discussed. Third, an example of research from this perspective is presented. We intend, with this article, to present a brief presentation and discussion, with no intention to exhaust the subject, as we are aware that there is a number of issues that deserve further and more careful discussion.

Schizoanalysis and Politics

Schizoanalysis is a field of knowledge created by the philosopher Gilles Deleuze and by psychoanalyst-militant Félix Guattari after the events that took place in May 1968 in France. Also, it was considered by Antonio Negri (1995) as the theoretical manifestation of this insurgent social event. Schizoanalysis, together with its micro-political analysis of assemblages, of desiring and power relationships, suggests a reading of political, social, institutional, and clinical relationships no longer in terms of the relationship between family and neurosis, as was usual in psychoanalysis, but in terms of the relationship between capitalism and schizophrenia, incorporating also a wide range of other concepts, conceptions, and practices, which go beyond Freudian-Marxism. This new relationship leads to a new conception of the unconscious as intensive mill rather than as representative theatre, and of desire as production and not as need. It also introduces new concepts such as micropolitics, the rhizome, the body without organs, the war machine, the apparatus of capture, the transversality, the lines of flight, etc…, and a new paradigm: the ethico-aesthetic and the political.

Politics is a major theme in the schizoanalytic production, widely explored by Deleuze and Guattari and by their successors. However, unlike traditional and classical sociological analyses, guided by Marxism, Schizoanalysis develops another perspective, which seeks to grasp the inter-relatedness of political and psychic phenomena. To this end Guattari develops the notion of micropolitics, which does not refer to the political in a reduced or micro setting, but to the analysis of desiring assemblages in the social field, whether in large or small sets.[1] Thus, working with micropolitics is to bring together desire and social field, that is, psychology and politics. From this approach, we understand politics as the relationship of forces and desiring that establishes itself in different spheres of the social field, going to work in the setting of established powers, resulting in life management and in the production of subjectivities, and having different levels of organization.

From this perspective there is launched a critique of stratified life forms, established social settings, the bureaucratic political practices of communist parties and unions, castration, repression, and the overcoding of desire. These phenomena may correspond, from the point of view of the psychological subject, to the functioning of a conservative psychic structure, found in his paranoid pole (Deleuze & Guattari, 1972), which is characterized by a stereotype of psychosocial processes and a yearning for the establishment and maintenance of power, showing a type of autocratic investment.

Thus, the social and political critique by Deleuze and Guattari rescinds from the usual analysis of the traditional Left party, which gives the party the role of a privileged instrument of revolution that promotes social change, choosing molecular revolutions in all spheres of everyday life, reporting autocratic and fascist investments which political left party segments may act on. In such cases, Deleuze and Guattari (1972) understand that there is a dissociation between conscious discourse and libidinal investment, stating that the mechanism of interest, which corresponds to preconscious functions, can be clearly distinguished from the desiring machine, which corresponds to the unconscious desires. Such statement shows that it is not only the explicit political interest of the subject that matters, since such interest may mask its unconscious desires. For example, the individual with a revolutionary emancipating discourse and an interest in destroying the structure of the State as it is constituted, does not necessarily

---

[1] Guattari, influenced by his studies in pharmacy, name these sets as molar and molecular.

have his interest linked to a revolutionary and desirable unconscious machine, and may be directly connected to fascist, dominant, and capturing psychic structures. This can be clearly seen in some political militants, who once they oppose the party, adopt sharp criticism of the current regime, guided by revolutionary, solidary, and horizontalized discourses. However, when they take over the power, they reproduce the same verticalized and hierarchical logic that they criticized before, reproducing the same practices of domination and exclusion, denoting a psychic performance in the paranoid pole, of conservative and fascist nature, rather than what Deleuze and Guattari called schizoid and revolutionary poles. For example, Stalin's totalitarian machine homogenized behaviours, destroyed memory and annihilated thousands of people who might have become part of any type of "opposition" (Arendt, 1989). According to reflections made by Deleuze and Guattari (1972, 1980), we can affirm that this paranoid pole of domination is the common assemblage of the Apparatus of State Capture, in which there is a rejection of differences and a desire to eliminate any opposing manifestation. Thus, there is not much difference in this assemblage between Left and Right political parties when they take the power, as the psychic structure commonly adopted refers to the investment in the paranoid-fascist pole. Thus, the discourses defended and ideals given by the Left party conflict with the desirable and revolutionary investment, using it only as a tool to achieve and keep the power.

Given this review concerning the obsession for power, and corresponding psychic functioning, which is not found only in politics but in many social institutions, such as in companies, schools, families, couples, etc.., Deleuze and Guattari (1972) specify three critical tasks for the Schizoanalysis, aimed at the deterritorialization of such assemblage; the first, negative, and the other two, positive. The first task is to scrape the coercive and Oedipal structures, the layers that block desire and keep the collective subjected to certain rules. The second task is to grab the functioning of machines of any nature, for example, social and psychic ones. The third, also positive, is to connect libidinal investments to social machines. Such tasks show a critical stance to established structures, defending movement, flows, difference; opposing structures and the static. This conception is found in every philosophical work of Deleuze, showing great emphasis on flows and on multiplicities (e.g., Deleuze, 1965); thus, moving closer to a direct policy of self-management, instead of the traditional models of an institutionalized policy, which works by prioritising representation. Therefore, much of the work of the schizoanalytic Critical Psychology developed in Brazil share this critical conception concerning the aspects established of social structures and support the promotion of self-analysis, of generalized self-management, and of deterritorialization processes in social groups.

Because of this favouring of multiplicities, processes of deterritorialization, and its alternative reading of capitalism, Schizoanalysis, even though it has been directly influenced by Marxism, no longer works with some of the central ideas of this tradition, such as conflict of social classes, ideology, and the dialectic. Below we briefly present some of the differentiations from traditional Marxism.

Deleuze and Guattari (1972) argue that in the axiomatic of capital, there is no social class struggle as the driver of history. There is today the constitution of only one universal class: the bourgeoisie. The authors begin with the assumption that the traditional totalized dichotomy does not exist, which marked many Marxist analyses in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, as the ruling class is no longer quite differentiated from the dominated class and there are no clear boundaries of differentiation between one class and another. Thus, class struggle is no longer the determining process of history, but the capitalistic processes.

Deleuze and Guattari propose the axiom that capital over-encodes all political, social, and psychological processes, decodes institutions, values, old fights and ideals, and assembles everyone into this mentality. Thus, in all social strata, from the worker to the wealthy entrepreneur, even with their financial and material differences, all have the same goal: working towards the reproduction of Capital. Therefore, in this economic-political-social-psychological assemblage, in which the bourgeoisie is regarded as the universal class, there is no longer a master, as we all become slaves and prisoners of this axiom, in which the class struggle loses priority to the fight to accumulate capital.

> (…) the bourgeois field of immanence – as delimited by the conjunction of the decoded flows, the negation of any transcendence or exterior limit, and the effusion of antiproduction inside production itself-institutes an unrivalled slavery, an unprecedented subjugation: there are no longer even any masters, but only slaves commanding other slaves; there is no longer any need to burden the animal from the outside, it shoulders its own burden. Not that man is ever the slave of technical machines; he is rather the slave of the social machine. The bourgeois sets the example, he absorbs surplus value for ends that, taken as a whole, have nothing to do with his own enjoyment: more utterly enslaved than the lowest of slaves, he is the first servant of the ravenous machine, the beast of the reproduction of capital, internalization of the infinite debt. "I too am a slave" – these are the new words spoken by the master. (Deleuze & Guattari, 1972, p. 254)

The Marxist conception of ideology as a fake set of ideas and representations, which purpose is to conjure up reality so as to keep relations of domination in place, is also abandoned. Deleuze and Guattari are against the idea that there is a set of representations that covers an essence, a false statement to cover up the truth, the reality. In his work, there is a refusal to dualisms, to grasp an essence that differs from an appearance. For Deleuze (1953, 1968), because there is no transcendent truth and no differentiated internality underneath the surface, there could not be an ideology that masks a reality, but instead a set of representations and discourses with performative effects, which produces reality and produces power relations. That is, the approach used is guided by the positivity of the phenomena and not by negativity, which favours a pragmatic reading of social phenomena rather than a semantic reading. Phenomena related to those traditionally covered by ideology are nevertheless found, in a different way, in Schizoanalysis; notably, in what Deleuze (1968) discusses as the image of thought, when there are images assumed and formed that convey a type of doxa which block thought itself, thereby reproducing the same image, formatting and standardizing subjectivity and thought. However, for the philosopher, to think would be otherwise, it would be the collapse, the disarray, the thinking without images.

The issue of positivity and negativity is crucial to understand the Deleuzian critique to dialectics. Deleuze (1962) states that it is an error in the dialectical procedure to position one term as positivity (thesis), another as negativity (antithesis), and a third to overcome them, because the differential element (considered as the antithesis) is not necessarily the opposite or the negative of the thesis, and a third element does not necessarily arise and "exceed" the previous two. For Deleuze (1968), the thought of negativity refers to one of the greatest injustices found in the history of Philosophy, which was to position difference, in the form of opposition and antithesis, as negativity. For the philosopher, difference is by no means the denial of a term, but appears as an element that differs itself by its uniqueness, in which it should not carry the negativity trait but of positivity; that is, difference appears as an affirmation of singularities and not as a denial of an element; the difference does not oppose while negativity to a certain term. In Deleuze's understanding, the dialectic operation recovers the negative figure, and reduces the multiplicity of elements in the game to a dualism of two

opposing poles. Thus, instead of using dialectics, Deleuze and Guattari prefer to discuss the phenomenon in terms of the notion of assemblages, in a perspective that embraces a network of multiple connections that goes beyond a dichotomy and alleged synthesis.

Schizoanalysis in Brazil

With the launch of the first volume of the work Capitalism and Schizophrenia, *Anti-Oedipus*, Schizoanalysis caused a controversy in French thought by radically criticizing the Structuralism that was in vogue and its "incarnation" in French psychoanalysis: Lacanian psychoanalysis. Still, such controversy and public interest did not last long and was not repeated with the launch of the second volume, *A Thousand Plateaus*, which did not achieve the visibility and impact desired by its authors (Dosse, 2010). Thirty years have passed by and it is interesting to note that the Schizoanalysis has had much less influence on French Social Psychology, compared to the Social Psychology of other countries such as Brazil. Some thinkers attribute this to the hybrid character of Brazilian culture, which comes from the bricolage of different characters from different cultures, the great responsiveness to the thinking of multiplicity by Deleuze and Guattari, which was not only widespread, but also created new fruits.

Schizoanalysis started to influence Brazilian psychology in the late seventies and in the eighties, first in the fields of mental health and clinical care (Rodrigues, 2007), carrying a radical critique on practices and policies established. Among many "smugglers" who brought this knowledge originated in France to Brazil, we can mention the psychologist Suely Rolnik, who worked with Deleuze and Guattari in Paris, and the Argentine psychiatrist Gregorio Baremblitt, who, facing the violence generated by the Argentine dictatorship chose to migrate to its neighbouring country, Brazil.

Rolnik shows important works with reference to Schizoanalysis published in the eighties and she was also the person who hosted Guattari sometimes in the country, organizing his lectures, conferences, and interviews with a number of social and popular movements and with renowned Brazilian scholars. This range of activities resulted in the joint publication of a book titled *Micropolitics: Cartographies of desire* (1986), and *Guattari interviews Lula* (1982), in which the schizoanalyst interviewed the greatest working class leader in Brazil, later on president of the country (2003 - 2010), calling him, at the time, the power of a revolutionary war machine. Rolnik also translated and published the book *Molecular revolution* (Guattari, 1987), and she is one of the coordinators of a major research group that approaches Psychology from the perspective of Schizoanalysis, giving it a critical approach: the Core of Subjectivity of PUC-SP – Catholic University of São Paulo State.

Baremblitt has a broad background as a critical thinker and militant in Psychology, psychoanalysis, mental health, and institutional analysis. When he was a candidate-member of APA – Argentine Psychoanalytic Association – along with his group, Plataforma, he began to question established and elitist practices of the psychoanalytic association. Within the orthodox scope of formation and transmission of the psychoanalytic thought, members of Plataforma began to introduce "subversive literature" into the institution, Marxist texts and left party literature, and they would criticize the conservative attitude of APA. Such criticism and conflict were so intense that Plataforma had to leave the Association, and this was the first division of a psychoanalysis society triggered by political matters (Langer et al., 1973). Years after this division and already in Brazil, Baremblitt progressively replaced his psychoanalytic references by schizoanalytic ones, by readings of political, social, and clinical

phenomena. Baremblitt, after propagating the Schizoanalysis through a series of courses and workshops in the cities of Sao Paulo and Rio de Janeiro, got settled in the State of Minas Gerais and created a centre for training and clinical intervention, named Instituto Felix Guattari, more recently renamed the Gregório Baremblitt Foundation.

Three decades after arriving in Brazil, the influence of Schizoanalysis on Brazilian psychology has multiplied, with a wide network of productions. Below we mention, among many works, some authors and their plural production on several fields of knowledge.

Rolnik (1989) still stands in a substantial place, producing and advising several research topics such as clinical, aesthetics, art, and urban interventions (Borges, 2006). Also, in the Core of Subjectivity at PUC-SP, the philosopher Peter Pál Pelbart (2003) makes reflexions on politics, biopolitics, time, madness, etc.

In the State of Rio de Janeiro, there is a number of researchers who use and are influenced by this approach, such as Virginia Kastrup and Eduardo Passos, with studies on subjectivity (Kastrup, Tedesco & Passos, 2008) and research and methodologies (Passos, Kastrup & Escóssia, 2009), Regina Benevides e Barros (2007) regarding the psychology of groups and institutions, Heliana Conde Rodrigues (2002) on history and narrative, Cristina Rauter et al. (2002) on politics, human rights, state and police violence, etc.

In mental and collective health, Magda Dimenstein (2009) produces and advises a series of works at UFRN – Federal University of Rio Grande do Norte – based on this theoretical approach. She also advised a doctoral thesis on social movements about the organization and friendship in the biggest Latin America rural social movement, the MTST – Landless Workers' Movement (Leite, 2008).

In discussions about psychology and gender, Schizoanalysis is also perceived to have a great influence, as we can mention the work on transvestites by William Peres (2005), professor at UNESP – State University of São Paulo.

However, the most creative contribution about the relationship between Schizoanalysis and Psychology comes from the State of Minas Gerais: the Schizodrama. Gregorio Baremblitt (2003), based on concepts worked and invented in Schizoanalysis, created a field of application and social intervention and *klinical* (from klinamen, which means deviation) called Schizodrama. The book "What is Philosophy?" by Deleuze and Guattari (1992) states that philosophy is the art of creating new concepts, so for Baremblitt, Schizodrama is the art of creating new devices for intervention, klinical or social, which dramatize the concepts of Schizoanalysis. For the author, schizodrama works as a heterogeneous set of strategies, tactics, and techniques based on this theoretical framework and seeks to act on subjective, social, semiotic, and technological aspects of its mechanisms to provide experiences of deterritorialization of assemblages established, to give circulation and passage to the flows (psychic, body, group, social) encoded, to promote creative and aesthetic processes; thus, carrying out events, new regimes of signs and processes of singularization. Baremblitt (2003) states that schizodrama words in an ethico-aesthetic-political paradigm and secondarily in the scientific paradigm, understanding this paradigm as dramatic, to dramatize an art, to dramatize life and philosophical concepts.

One of the schizodrama goals is the role of its recipients, of its participants, which in these processes of affection, to affect and to be affected, intensifying the assemblages and their

meetings to deterritorialize identities and stratified social roles, so the singularities can be connected and work as collective, connecting desire to social and social to desiring processes, that is, updating the three tasks of Schizoanalysis. For Baremblitt (2003), the purpose of schizodrama is to enhance, in the participants, the Dionysian actions and creators of thought and affection. Similar to the institutional analysis (Baremblitt, 2002), the principles related to Schizodrama are to promote self-analysis and self-management processes.

The great and diversified production from this theoretical approach leads us to consider the emergence of a new modality of Critical Psychology in Brazil, quite heterogeneous, but that comes from a common ground. In the next section I will present some passages of my work as an example of research conducted from a schizoanalytically based Critical Psychology.

Political assemblages: Stratumpolitics, Technopolitics, and Nomadpolitics

In my doctoral thesis (Hur, 2009), I investigated a recent phenomenon in the political history of Brazil, which was the arrival of former-guerrilla fighters to State's power. In 2002, the Workers' Party (PT), a traditional left party won the elections for country's presidency through the historical leader Luis Inácio Lula da Silva. Thus, there was an expectation for many social changes in Brazil, once his Government was composed of social groups that have historically fought for the transformation of the country, such as leadership of social movements and former-guerrilla fighters in the sixties and seventies, who used weapons to fight against the State's authoritarianism and violence during the military dictatorship that lasted over twenty years. However, something went wrong; the social changes expected did not take place, raising the possibility that the Left had been changed by State power. Some analyses, such one from the political scientist Robert Michels (1914), would argue that such leaderships became "Bourgeoisied", thus getting closer to the ruling class than to the proletariat, thereby betraying Left principles and social transformation, as we currently have former-guerrilla fighters in State's power, who did not change its structure and reproduce the same "neoliberal" logic.

The analysis of political practices and beliefs from the perspective of a supposed bourgeoisification (Michels, 1914), or of a co-optation to the dominant ideology, seemed to be a reduction of the phenomenon, which did not satisfactorily elucidate my research problem. Thus, my purpose was to investigate the transition of political practices of former-guerrillas fighters during military dictatorship in Brazil to the current period, considering that such social players adopted the most radical action for social change: the armed struggle. Thus, I interviewed four former-guerrilla fighters who now held different social positions, namely: Congressman, Economist, Journalist, and Photographer, to deepen my analysis of the phenomenon.

The interviews showed that the consolidation of democracy after the military regime was the main discursive element that justified the transition of political practices carried out by our players in the armed struggle period to current neoliberalism days, of consolidation of a democracy that opposed dictatorship and armed struggle. However, it is understood that "democracy" is a polysemic term; it is a portmanteau word (Deleuze, 1969), a meaning that holds many meanings. Moreover, not only the democratic assemblage may have different features, different uses and meanings depending on the subject, as inside its own speech of a single subject, the democratic assemblage hold different democratic traits. Thus, according to the emerging differences in the discursive assemblages of our social actors, and Deleuze and

Guattari's reflections, I elaborated-mapped three types of political assemblages: stratumpolitics, technopolitics, and nomadpolitics

First, I need to what an assemblage is. To analyze social and psychic phenomena, Deleuze and Guattari prefer to use the concept of assemblage rather than notions such as inter- and trans-subjectivity, dialectics, etc. The assemblage is a provision that interconnects heterogeneous elements, making them work together, like a machine that combines different parts. According to Foucault, Deleuze (1989) states that the assemblage articulates power lines, knowledge lines, and subjectivity lines; but in "A Thousand Plateaus", it they create a more complex theory, suggesting that the assemblage has four meanings (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980), which roughly consists of discursive provisions (collective assemblages of enunciation), body and spatial provisions (body-machinic assemblages), identity provisions (territorial sides), and provisions that lead to transformations (peaks of deterritorialization).

Based on this perspective, I developed the notion of political assemblages (Hur, 2009), which are singular modalities of operation (machining) that combine political practices, discourses, memory, and psychic configuration. Such processes are different and heterogeneous, that is, we do not work a reduction as there is a common and coherent core, which organizes and homogenizes these different processes of different materiality, but that co-work in a common way articulated by a particular assemblage. For example, the discourse has a materiality different from the subject's psychism and its political practices; however, this different materiality can be articulated by the same assemblage, a machine that connects the heterogeneous elements together and make them co-operate together. Then, we assume that the experiential machinery of the subject, his transcendental field (Deleuze, 1969), is shaped according to its relationship to these different processes. Thus, instead of having an ideology overcoding political practices of our social actors, we use this notion of political assemblages to find out how the different mechanisms and assemblages work in regard to their political practices.

I argued that these three developed assemblages, stratumpolitics, technopolitics, and nomadpolitics, are the forms of political thought, of acting, and of political manifestation found in discourses of our social actors, being part of the subject's psychic configuration and of his political attitudes, according to an understanding about the experiential field created between subject and world (Deleuze, 1969). Thus, I understand discourses as not simply individual, they are impersonal, and they transversalize subjects, once they are created from different socio-historical positions, from different positions of enunciation. Each of the proposed assemblages adopts different perspectives on political action, being a scheme of operation and being present in the speech of all interviewees, from how one conceives the democratic political practice, that is, each social actor has not only one of these assemblages in his speech, possible having even the three assemblages in his narrative, in how they structure their thinking and policy making. I realized that instead of an exclusivity relationship of a modality of assemblage for each player, there is a higher frequency trend of a certain political assemblage for each one. For example, the Economist organizes his experience mostly from the technopolitical assemblage, but there are also sections in his speech that are organized through the other two assemblages, so such discourses are intertwined.

Stratumpolitics is the political assemblage that gives priority to institutionalization processes. It is a political procedure based on structures, on strata, on places and positions taken within this framework, in a practice that values more the established and the stratum than the flow

and the movement; values more the results than the process; and that accounts more to logic of being than to the logic of becoming. I characterized stratumpolitics as politics that values the Institution, which values the taking and occupation of positions, the movements of fixation. It is the one in which major flows of the Left have been historically involved, which is in the constitution of a revolutionary or reformist party, of a small collection of vanguards that will make the revolution, or the election victory, in order to take and hold State power. The speech of the Congressman is mostly articulated by the stratumpolitical assemblage, the political and desiring practice of which is organized by determinations of the strata, the institutions, and the State to promote social change.

The interviews showed a second type of assemblage that no longer corresponds to the fixation of movement in the strata; no longer corresponds to the primacy of occupying certain institutional positions in the structure. In this other assemblage, rather than the strategic role of occupying social positions to carry out political practices, it focuses on the development of knowledge, of techniques that promote more effective social governance. Finally, there is a whole development of a technology of politics, of governance, which shapes other logic of political process concerning stratumpolitical practices, which I named technopolitics. The technopolitical speech is the assemblage used to justify the transit of armed struggle for democracy and appears throughout the Economist's speech, and also in some parts of the Photographer's speech. Our reflection comes from Michel Foucault's postulations (1979; 2008) on the logic of governmentality, which shifts the focus of the issue of who occupies or not the State's stratum, to the issue of how the knowledge developed and applied by technicians and social thinkers generate governance. And as the issue today regarding any government refers primarily to the management of financial flows, to the machining on the capital axiom, it is understood that the development of a government management technology and of economic flows, a technopolitics, gets stronger facing stratumpolitics. Thus, we understand technopolitics as the political assemblage grounded in knowledge and arrangements developed by the social institutions toward better management of economy, government, and at last, society. Thus, there is no longer the priority of certain forms of power and of traditional social institutions in politics, but in the knowledge developed by the institutions and social groups that can promote a more effective management of life, regardless of political ideologies adopted by a certain government. Thus, it is developed from the rationalization of social processes, of social management, and especially of management of financial flows, axiomatized by Capital. What matters is no longer a political practice guided by certain ideological repertoires, but by a "pragmatic" policy that leads to the development of better tools composing the set of social technology, and that are operated by social technologists, by political technologists, and by technopolitcs. A political decision therefore will not only be guided by values and ideological and political issues, but especially by social effectiveness rates measured and predicted by the technology of politics. Therefore, on the opinion of advisors, ideologists, or traditional political figures, what matters the most is the result of a certain statistical measure, the assessment of a social impact of a specific public policy, the result of a certain survey, finally, the technopolitics is based around a body of knowledge and technical devices, which create formulas and axioms to social management actions get more effective, that is, instead of following a logic of the verb "to be", feature of stratumpolitics, technopolitics has the primacy of the verb "to know".

Besides stratumpolitics and technopolitics, I found another assemblage that does not adapt itself to the first two, in an operating mode that does not aim to fixate in social positions, or in institutional strata, or in the development of a political technology. I came across an evasive, fluid, inconstant assemblage, which acts on the primacy of movements and displacement in a

more independent, molecular, and fluid attitude. Concerning political practices, the experience is passed on from the movements, from power relations, from paths and affects, without prioritizing the strata (according to stratumpolitics) or to knowledge (according to technopolitics). I found this assemblage in excerpts of the Journalist and Photographer's speech. Considering it similar to nomadic shifts, I chose to call this third assemblage nomadpolitics. It is like a view from the outside, from a foreign place, of an alliance with a detachment, which tells the story of flows and movements in a magmatic-rhizomatic logic.

The nomadpolitics proceeds by the edges, by the movement of crowds, endowed with an excitement and movement related to what Guattari (1987) calls molecular dimension. Once it is based on the movement, we understand that it is closer to the flows than to the strata, closer to the logic of becoming than to the logic of being, closer to what is instituent than to what is established, closer to the deterritorialization than to (re)territorialization, closer to the logic of nomads than to sedentary logic. Finally, it finds itself closer to lines of flight than to rigid segmented lines; a nomad politics. The nomadpolitics is committed to the movement and to the active utopia, not with breakpoints and fixation to the power. The nomadpolitical issue corresponds to deterritorialization movements, to run the flows, according to Deleuze and Guattari (1977): "As Kafka says, the problem is not freedom, but of a way out. The issue of the father is not how to become free of himself (Oedipal issue), but as a way to find a path precisely where he did not find one" (p. 16); that is, the issue of freedom refers to a logic of strata, to be free from the oppressive strata, while inventing a exit refers to a registration of deterritorialization, of becoming something else, like the Kafkian "hero" Gregor Samsa, who reinvents himself as an insect, as he metamorphoses into a cockroach becoming an animal. In nomadpolitcs, the "revolutionary hero" is no longer represented by the classic figure of Goethe's Faust, a working class symbol (Deleuze & Guattari; 1977, p.79) who makes a pact with the devil, Mephisto, causing evil to objectify good, and a stratumpolitical emblematic figure of the politician making a pact with the Leviathan, but of an impersonal and anonymous hero like Gregor Samsa that undergoes metamorphosis, transformation, who flees. According to Deleuze, who argues that the fugue is neither passive nor an escape from life:

> But to flee is not to renounce action: nothing is more active than a flight (…) It is also to put to flight – not necessarily others, but to put something to flight, to put a system to flight as one bursts a tube. George Jackson wrote from prison: "It may be that I am fleeing, but throughout my flight, I'm searching for a weapon" (…) To fly is to trace a line, lines a whole cartography (Deleuze & Parnet, 1987, p. 36). To flee is to produce real, to create life, to find a weapon (Deleuze & Parnet, 1987, p. 49)

Once the proposed assemblages refer to mechanisms of operation, of functioning, they are not simply ideologies. Stratumpolitics, technopolitics, and nomadpolitics are not simply ideologies of communism, of social democracy, and of anarchy, respectively. Although, in theory, it may present related elements, one cannot be directly linked to the other, as for example, a social democrat can work under a stratumpolitical manner, grabbing and giving priority to the conquered institutional positions; a communist may work in a nomadpolitical way, not undergoing the party's orthodoxy and hierarchy; an anarchist under a technopolitical way in which his actions are shown through an accumulation of knowledge, and not by following certain ideology of his group, etc. Likewise, W. Reich (1988) discusses the coexistence of revolutionary and conservative investments, either in the bourgeoisie or proletariat. We believe that these three assemblages coexist regardless of the political system and ideology, for example, we find these assemblages in both Left and Right parties.

Thinking according to communist, social-democrat, and anarchist regimes gives more emphasis to ideologies and sets of ideas, while thinking according to the assemblages that we have proposed, stratumpolitics, technopolitics, and nomadpolitics, raises the issue in the analysis of concrete practices functioning; thus, assuming a pragmatic perspective.

Thus, we take away, from political ideologies, the protagonist role usually assumed in social analysis. Ideologies can even connect to the assemblages, but they still assume secondary importance, once many times political actions of a manager can be quite distinct from its political and ideological platform. The determining factor for political practices is therefore the type of operating assemblage modality and not the system of political ideas, which is constantly transgressed. The ideologies are sets of ideas that work as political reference, but that are inefficient if not connected to an assemblage that materialize their ideas. The philosopher M. Foucault provides an excellent example when saying that socialism does not have a governmental reason, an autonomous governmentality, which materializes its ideals; there is not a socialist governmentality "hidden" in its statements, so it is still necessary to create it. Thus, historically, it connected to a management mode, to a liberal logic of government (2008, p. 125). And what is determinant in this connection, the set of ideals or practices undertaken? In my opinion, the liberal practices of management which regulate the State are more determinant and efficient than the ideologies proposed; the practices produce greater impacts than the ideal; the assemblages have priority over ideologies. Therefore, I chose to place the issue under the terms assemblage, practices and enunciation position, because working from the functioning of action schemes, of thinking and desiring investment, may be more elucidative than working from different semantic regimes. It is as if I had worked more with the logic of "verb" than "substantive", "dynamic" rather than a "static".

My research (Hur, 2009) concludes in accordance with the reflections of Deleuze and Guattari that the Left in Government finds themselves in a fixation with the State-Institution, more committed to the occupation of positions in the institutional structure than to use politics as transformation; that is, it acts mostly in a stratumpolitical rather than nomadpolitical manner. Thus, to remain in power they establish political alliances of which shall reproduce capitalist practices. I found that technopolitics is increasingly important in the management of life, in which political ideologies lose ground to the technical discourse of better management of social, being an assemblage attached to the axiomatic of capital. The incidence of the nomadpolitical speech in the interviews was less than the others, but it is not less important for this reason, or it can be neglected, as it shows a vanishing line in the institutionalized political practices, and thus it can welcome new possibilities of life. Therefore, the political practices adopted by the Left in the country's Government are not transforming, not only because they identify with the ruling class or has an ideological adherence to the Capital, but due to the development of political assemblages, independent to Left ideals, which work in compliance to the neoliberal logic.

Final consideration

I discussed in this article how Schizoanalysis has influenced the emergence of Critical Psychology in Brazil. First, I presented some conceptual operators that allowed me to further analyze political phenomena, in which I discussed the relationship between political processes and psychism and the review on traditional concepts of Marxism, as ideology, class conflict, and dialectic. Then, I presented how this approach was developed in the country, emphasizing the invention of Schizodrama, by G. Baremblitt. And to conclude, I showed an example of a research about this critical approach, in which we discussed a contemporary political event in

Brazil in which I developed the concepts of stratumpolitics, technopolitics, and nomadpolitics, according to the concept of assemblage by Deleuze and Guattari.

I considered the production, which I called the Critical Psychology of schizoanalytic approach in Brazil, breaks with traditional concepts in the Brazilian Critical Psychology, of Marxism, and also of psychoanalysis, by adopting a more pragmatic than semantic perspective in readings of psychosocial processes, favouring the functioning rather than a supposed "substance" of a particular event. Such aspect is noted in the mentioned study, in which political practices are seized in the functioning of assemblages and not in the compliance to certain ideology or set of ideas.

Another positivity of this approach is the articulation between social and psychic processes, in which there is no determinacy of the social structure for the constitution of the subject, such as in the most sociological approaches, but there is no determinacy of the psychic, such as psychoanalysis implies. I claim that the political assemblages proposed are found in this interface between psychic and social, taking in account desiring investments and political processes, without falling into psychologism of the social, or into a sociologism of the psychic. By considering such relationship between desiring and political investments, such approach works not as an adaptation to the norms and major standards, but in the territory of the instituent, of transgression, of insubordination, of insurrection, finally, of creation.

However, this area is still under development, and its researchers are found throughout the country, without a significant exchange of knowledge production, from the collective point of view.

References

Arendt, H. (1989). *Origens do totalitarismo*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras.

Baremblitt, G.F. (2002). *Compêndio de Análise Institucional e outras práticas: Teoria e prática*. Belo Horizonte: Instituto Félix Guattari.

Baremblitt, G.F. (2003). *Diez proposiciones descartables acerca del esquizodrama*. (mimeog.).

Barros, R. D. B. (2007). *Grupo: a Afirmação de um Simulacro*. Porto Alegre, RS: Sulina/Ed UFGRS.

Borges, F.M. (2006). *Domínios do demasiado*. Dissertação de mestrado, Programa de Psicologia Clínica, PUC-SP, São Paulo/SP.

Brasil. Lei 4119 de 27 de agosto de 1962.

Carvalho, J.E.C. de, & Dunker, C.I.L. (2006). Critical psychological approaches in Brazil: When, where, why. *Annual Review of Critical Psychology, 5*, 305-312.

Deleuze (1953/2001). *Empirismo e Subjetividade: Ensaio sobre a natureza humana segundo Hume*. São Paulo: Ed. 34.

Deleuze (1962/1976). *Nietzsche e a filosofia*. Rio de Janeiro: Rio – Sociedade Cultural.

Deleuze, G. (1965/1999). *O bergsonismo*. São Paulo: Ed. 34.

Deleuze, G. (1968/2006). *Diferença e Repetição*. São Paulo: Brasiliense.

Deleuze, G. (1969/2003). *Lógica do Sentido*. São Paulo: Perspectiva.

Deleuze, G. (1989). Qu'est-ce qu'un disposif? In *Michel Foucault philosophe*. Rencontre internationale. Paris 9, 10, 11 janvier 1988. Paris, Seuil.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1972/1977). *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. New York: Viking Press.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1977). *Kafka: por uma literatura menor*. Rio de Janeiro: Imago.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1980/1995). *Mil Platôs: Capitalismo e Esquizofrenia*, Vol. 1 a 5. São Paulo, 34.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1992). *O que é a Filosofia?* São Paulo: Ed. 34.

Deleuze, G., & Parnet, C. (1987). *Dialogues*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Dimenstein, M. (Org.). (2009). *Produção do conhecimento, agenciamentos e implicação no fazer pesquisa em Psicologia*. Natal/RN: EDUFRN.

Dosse, F. (2010). *Gilles Deleuze & Félix Guattari: Biografia cruzada*. Porto Alegre: Artes médicas.

Foucault, M. (1979). *Microfísica do Poder*. Rio de Janeiro: Graal.

Foucault M. (2008). *Nascimento da Biopolítica*: Curso dado no Collège de France (1978-1979). São Paulo: Martins Fontes.

Freire, P. (1967). *Educação como prática de liberdade*. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.

Guattari, F. (1982). *Félix Guattari entrevista Lula*. São Paulo: Brasiliense.

Guattari, F. (1987). *A Revolução Molecular*. São Paulo: Brasiliense.

Guattari, F., & Rolnik, S. (1986). *Micropolítica: Cartografias do Desejo*. Rio de Janeiro: Vozes.

Hur, D.U. (2009). *Discursos do trânsito da Guerrilha ao Estado Neoliberal: Estratopolítica, Tecnopolítica e Nomadopolítica*. São Paulo, 423 p. Tese de doutorado. Programa de Psicologia Social, Instituto de Psicologia, Universidade de São Paulo. Disponível em: http://www.teses.usp.br/teses/disponiveis/47/47134/tde-27112009-103453/pt-br.php

Kastrup, V., Tedesco, S., & Passos, E. (2008). *Políticas da cognição*. Porto Alegre: Ed. Sulina.

Lane, S.T.M., & Codo, W. (Orgs.). (1986). *Psicologia Social: o Homem em Movimento*. São Paulo: Brasiliense.

Langer, M. et al. (1973). *Questionamos a psicanálise e suas instituições*. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes.

Leite, J.F. (2008) *A Militância em movimento: amizade e maquinação de modos de existência no MST*. Tese de doutorado, Programa de Psicologia, UFRN, Natal/RN.

Macedo, J.R., & Maestri, M. (2004). *Belo Monte: Uma história da guerra de canudos*. São Paulo: Expressão Popular.

Martín-Baró, I. (1998). *Psicología de la liberación*. Madrid: Ed. Trotta.

Michels, R. (1914/1982). *Sociologia dos Partidos Políticos*. Brasília: Ed. UNB.

Montero, M. (2004). *Introducción a la Psicología Comunitaria: Desarrollo, conceptos y procesos*. Buenos Aires: Paidós.

Negri, A. (1995). Prefácio. Em G. Deleuze & F. Guattari, *Mil Platôs: Capitalismo e Esquizofrenia*, Vol. 2. São Paulo: 34.

Passos, E., Kastrup, V., & Escossia, L. (2009). *Pistas do método da cartografia*. Porto Alegre: Sulina.

Pelbart, P.P. (2003). *Vida capital: Ensaios de biopolítica.* São Paulo: Iluminuras.

Peres. W.S. (2005). *Subjetividade das travestis brasileiras: da vulnerabilidade da estigmatização à construção da cidadania*. Tese de doutorado, Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Instituto de Medicina Social.

Pessotti, I. (1988). Notas para uma História da Psicologia no Brasil. Psicologia. Em CONSELHO FEDERAL DE PSICOLOGIA. *Quem é o psicólogo brasileiro?* São Paulo: Edicon.

Rauter, C., Passos, E., & Benevides, R. (2002). *Clínica e Política*. Rio de Janeiro: Te Corá.

Reich, W. (1988). *Psicologia de massas do fascismo*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes.

Rodrigues, R.N. (1939). A Loucura epidêmica de Canudos. Em *As Colletividades anormaes*. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira.

Rodrigues, H.B.C. (2002). *No rastro dos "cavalos do diabo" - Memória e história para uma reinvenção de percursos do paradigma do grupalismo-institucionalismo no Brasil*. Tese de doutorado, Programa de Psicologia Escolar e do desenvolvimento humano, USP

Rodrigues, H.B.C. (2007). Sejamos realistas, tentemos o impossível! Desencaminhando a Psicologia através da Análise Institucional. Em A.M. Jacó-Vilela, A.A.L Ferreira, & F. Portugal (Org.), *História da Psicologia: rumos e percursos* (2 ed., pp. 515-563). Rio de Janeiro: Nau.

Rolnik, S. (1989). *Cartografia sentimental: transformações contemporâneas do desejo*. São Paulo: Estação Liberdade.

Sader, E. (1988). *Quando novos personagens entram em cena: experiências, falas e lutas dos trabalhadores da Grande São Paulo (1970-80)*. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.

Contact details:
Domenico Uhng Hur, Professor
Federal University of Goiás - UFG, Brazil.
FACULDADE DE EDUCAÇÃO,
UFG – R. 235, sn - Setor Universitário,
Goiânia - Goiás - Brasil CEP: 74605-050
E-mail: domenicoh@usp.br