

Original Paper

On delicacy in clinical practice, or when the strange enchantsRenata Monteiro Buelau &
Eliane Dias de CastroWCPRR 2017: 1-11. © 2017 WACP
ISSN: 1932-6270

She wanted to draw houses. Twenty, thirty or so at each encounter. There were hundreds of them. Paper, lead pencil and nothing more. She wanted no other materials and said nothing, save for a few disconnected phrases, scarcely accessible to me. A triangle sitting on a rectangle, door, window and that was it. She would finish her drawing in five minutes, get up, leaving me alone in the room. I used to observe that strange presence with a mixture of amazement and enchantment. No word or thought could add anything more regarding those encounters.

CHALLENGES: DIFFERENCE AND HEALTHCARE

This text is a part of my master's dissertation "**Art Platform, Clinical Station: boundaries between art and life**" (Buelau, 2013) carried out between 2011 and 2013 in the Inter-units Program in Aesthetics and Art History at the University of São Paulo, Brazil¹). The wish to think about this subject arose for the most part after four years working as an Occupational Therapist in Centers for Psychosocial Attention (known as CAPS) on the outskirts of São Paulo city.

CAPS are municipal facilities in Brazil's public health system – SUS – which since 1987 have offered daily and multi-professional services in mental health to the population through actions that take into account people's social, relational and family context. They were installed in the ambit of Brazilian Psychiatric Reform, which began at the end of the 1970s, and engendered an extensive movement of discussions, debates and restructuring of assistential public policies in the field of mental health, which gradually opted for the model of Psychosocial Rehabilitation as the guide for actions and interventions carried out by the mental health services set up. Nowadays, the movement towards deinstitutionalization in Brazil is active in organizing and strengthening the network that replaces psychiatric hospitals in the country, favoring the widening of possibilities for the circulation, expression and participation of the individual with intense psychic suffering in the community, in addition to the resignification of their place in society (Brasil, 2004).

Years after Psychiatric Reform, however, there still remains the challenge of the invention and maintenance of inter and trans-disciplinary strategies of care that are not designed according to the dominant policies of subjectivization, hegemonic concepts of health or assistential motivations. In other

Correspondence to: Renata Monteiro Buelau, Occupational Therapist at Occupational Course at University of São Paulo (USP) – Brazil, researcher of "Laboratório de Estudos e Pesquisa Arte, Corpo e Terapia Ocupacional (USP)", Master in Aesthetic and Art History (USP).
mailto: renatabuelau@usp.br

words, strategies those go beyond all the apparent need to neutralize alterity and differences, so that an encounter or even a relationship of care can take place.

It is not rare, for example, to observe moments when, even in anti-asylum practices, the motto of inclusion is converted into a new norm, masked by a “politically correct” curtain. Though in a non-intentional form, the “everyone has a right to home, health and education”, subsumed by the aegis of equality, frequently gives rise to coercive actions. The other is adapted and included – placed in a disempowered position – in a predetermined space in a predetermined way, using values hegemonically deliberated by others. The innovative character of anti-asylum proposals is almost imperceptibly transformed as justification for a severe exercise in power over the other in day-to-day practices in health. And, even more so, beyond them. That which should be a gesture of empowerment ends up reproducing logic of domination.

The following reflection, with no intention of supplying answers, mobilizes concepts of philosophy to explore the hypothesis that sustaining the estrangement provoked by the encounter with what is different – in this case, populations attended in the field of mental health and the events resulting from these approximations – can be an interesting ethical position for the work of the therapist. A kind of sympathy for the arts and poetry contributed to the creation of certain deviations in thought that favor a shift in absolute, automatized and authoritarian understanding of health and life, helping to understand them as a process, or rather, in a permanent constitution resulting from encounters. The text will also be punctuated by brief scenes from sessions carried out in CAPS with a woman in a vulnerable situation as a result of serious psychic suffering and socio-economic disadvantages, and of observations of other people who frequented the CAPS, or even of any other people at all. These scenes are, in fact, narratives of encounters between foreigners of the same nationality, experiencing approximations and distancing, and occasionally, discovering others in themselves.

WHAT HEALTH WOULD BE SUFFICIENT?

Walter Mignolo (1998), from Argentina and professor at Duke University in the United States, is developing a study, which investigates the relation between geographical location and the subordination of knowledge. For him, subordination is an effect of the relations of power that occurs in a variety of ways, in which imperial and colonial expansion cannot be discarded as determining factors in the construction of a notion of difference that takes European, and later North American, culture as an ideal and prevalent parameter. The other, the foreigner from the point of view of westernizing civilizations, is seen as an inferior, barbaric and uncivilized being.

Relations of dominance, however, do not need to be presented exclusively from the point of view of distinct peoples. Foucault (2010) had already spoken, in his course at the Collège de France (1974-1975), about the different forms of the colonization of life – of power over life – that occur from the emergence, in modern society, of the techniques of normalization, operated by the disciplines and/or the bio-power of the population. In both cases, the difference always formulated from the processes of homogenization is taken as a sign of threat or inferiority, for, unless one fits the list of expected or prescribed characteristics, one disturbs the established order.

This form of relation that barely supports the absence of immediate responses and pre-established parameters seems to prevail because the scientific rationality that controls the way we learn about the world trains us to look obstinately for the sovereign truth that would rule, explain and determine the functioning of everything and everyone, even covering the most molecular dimensions of the body and life. This procedure begins from the premise that the world is made up of ready, stable forms that are there, at our disposal, to be revealed by the intelligence of man through the unquestionable laws of science.

Much has been said about how these dominant policies of subjectivization determine how much a mode of subjectivization favors or limits the processuality of life. This dogmatic way of perceiving the world and the other, with its machines of information, communication and moralization, operates directly on subjectivity, colonizing it and reproducing it as a form-mold. If all that exists are finished forms, it would be no different with man.

Certainly arriving too quickly at the question, this means saying that the individual, that figure as we know it, is the ready, stable form resulting from the historical and social investments to make the body docile. But the individual is not equivalent to the multiplicity that composes life. Life needs to go beyond the individual. That is why it is possible to say that after the investments of biopower, “man is sick with man” – this impotent form that wants to be eternal. It is necessary, therefore, to free oneself of man to liberate life, refusing his individualistic versions that have been imposed for centuries (Pelbart, 2000).

This refusal can come about from the affirmation that life is made up of heterogeneous elements, in permanent disordered activity which, in its encounters, shocks and compositions, provoke **processes** of individuation. Thinking about processes means understanding that nothing is given *a priori*, which opens up possibilities for the current form-man to be undone and embark on a becoming-minoritarian – becoming-animal, becoming-child, becoming-mad (Pelbart, 2000). In other words, the subject tends to go outside him/herself. He/she suffers at the same time the action of forces of territorialization and deterritorialization. The power of creation is that which deterritorializes him/her. Lines that flee without stopping, and create new modes of existence. The power of resistance for its part is the one which fights so that the new forms created are affirmed, delineating a minimum outline for life to happen. It is the constant game between these two powers that composes existential territory and makes viable the continuity of life (ROLNIK, 2010).

Turning to the question of colonization, the domination of a people or any group occurs therefore through the occupation of territories of existence. On occupying territories of existence, a flow is blocked and everything that is singular to the other is expropriated – knowledge, religion, language, customs, culture, art, relation with the body, life places.

In this procedure, locally produced knowledge and culture, or the productions of the mad, the disabled, the marginalized – like foreigners inside a ‘civilization of normal people’ – only spark interest as exotic subjects of study, and not for the validation of multiplicity of knowledge and ways of inhabiting the world that talk about the life of everyone. Going forward in his reflections, Mignolo (2010) says that the main struggle in the 21st century is no longer that evident dispute for concrete lands (though these are still to be seen). The dispute now is for the control of knowledge. Everyone wants to own the truth.

Today’s attention to health preserves elements of this scenario above all in what it points to as the only way to be healthy. Any manifestation that differs from what is expected – the socially constructed ideal – is held as deviant and pathological and should therefore be adjusted. Inside this panorama, health institutions and professionals can function as cogs in these powerful machines, even when driven by the apparently well-intentioned desire to help, heal, normalize, include, teach. These humanitarian motivations, as previously mentioned, often paint over alterity and cover operations that subject the life of others to the imposition a way of life, pre-fabricated out of the systems of judgement that operate as an important vehicle for the reproduction of capitalist semiotics. There is a kind of permanent babble that impedes the creation of “little gaps of solitude and silence” (Deleuze, 1995, p. 129), just to have something to say, after all.

Considering this conjuncture before we continue reproducing ingenuously or carelessly mechanisms of deintensification of the existence and capitalization of life, it is necessary to ask ourselves “what health would be sufficient to liberate life wherever it is imprisoned by and within man” (Deleuze, 1997, p.3). It is fitting to emphasize that this question must not be unilateral, or rather, directed only to the individuals attended. On the contrary, it is fundamental that it is also attentive to the effects of these processes on the body of the professionals themselves, who are not exempt from the investments of power over life. It is always very difficult to bear the strange in the other, be it outside or within us.

WIPING THE CANVAS CLEAN

The painter does not paint on an empty canvas, and neither does the writer write on a blank page; but the page or canvas is already so covered with pre-existing, pre-established clichés that it is first necessary to erase, to clean, to flatten, even to shred, so as to let in a breath of air from the chaos that brings us the vision. (Deleuze and Guattari, 1994, p.204).

Talking about the vampirization practiced by this dominant form of subjectivization is, therefore, pungent and necessary. Despite the gravity embedded in this situation, however, it becomes equally relevant to underline that these expropriated lives do not become completely submitted to the investments of power. Thinking this way would be to run the risk of disqualifying the strength of each one. In the words of Peter Pelbart,

...we should not let ourselves be wrapped up in determinism as apocalyptic as it is complacent. Paraphrasing Benjamin, it would be necessary to brush this present against the grain, and examine the new possibilities for vital reversal that announce themselves in this context. For nothing of what was evoked above can be imposed unilaterally from the top down, since this vampirized subjectivity, these expropriated networks of meaning, these commercialized territories of existence, these targeted forms of life do not constitute an inert, passive mass at the mercy of capital, but a living set of strategies (Pelbart, 2003, p.21).

On verifying the brutality of the hegemonic truths and in an attempt to value **minor** knowledge, it is understandable that one imagines that the latter can only be developed outside the relations of power, which leads to a desire to neutralize them. Not that this is not desirable, but it happens that the relations of power are always present. It is not possible to suspend them. Knowledge and power maintain a strict relation: “(...) power produces knowledge (...); there is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time, power relations (Foucault 1977, p. 27).

Inferring this intrinsic relation between knowledge and power dilutes the dualities that are always placed at opposite and clearly identifiable poles, attracts paradoxes and favours the eruption of life moments distant from the paradigmatic and identity oppositions that weaken it. For Barthes (2003, p.265) this would be a possible key to face certain current conflicts: “conflicts: minor, marginal, obviously accepted, spark off, not to ‘win’, ‘be triumphant’, but to ‘manifest’”. Manifest or show is not the same as define or explain.

For Deleuze and Guattari (2003 [1975], p.17), the concept “minor” mentioned above is profoundly political, in as much as it reconfigures the field of the possible within power games, and not

somewhere outside them. They are happenings that unhook themselves from imperious proposals and highlight the disagreements, interrogations, paradoxes and different point of view that correspond to the games of the forces of social relations. These moments, when managed in their complexity, unravel the differences by means of a look not dispossessed of zeal. What lives is

[...] aporia as creation, which is to say, by the practice (...) that doesn't break the aporia but floats it as a speech that tangles itself in the other (the public) lovingly (...) without arrogance. (Barthes, 2003, p.142).

A detailed space of "sophistication of difference", as Rirkrit Tiravanija said in his interview with Hans Ulrich Obrist (Obrist, 2002), is created: a field of *anexact* science (Deleuze and Guattari, 2005 [1987], p. 367) which requires the invention of new machines for seeing and feeling, through which it is no longer possible to group series of happenings into any kind of generalizable category, for all one sees is a "whatever-singularity" (Agamben, 1993): incomparable, unclassifiable. This is the place of ethics.

In one way or another, the intention here is not to deny that at certain moments clinical states are configured, where the opening is too big to be borne or, inversely, it becomes chained to one sole identity, "welded together into nondecomposable blocks" (Deleuze, 1997, p.21). Every process of subjectivation presents different degrees of opening for this undoing of one's own bonds. Some dissolve almost completely but in general they end up having difficulty finding gentler encounters that help them to give some thickness to the skin, protecting them from excessive vertigo.

A young woman in her twenties. A big girl with a glazed expression provokes fear in anyone who approaches her and is afraid of injections. She holds on to her things and remains seated for as long as it takes. She has invisible monsters for company, which come out of the cupboard, the fridge and the wall. She fights with some, becomes very angry, and throws punches in the air. With others she shares secrets. She chuckles and pretends she wasn't saying anything when someone asks. She sings and dances "Thriller" at karaokes. She wants to work, get married, have children.

A handsome young man- a talker and very funny. Sometimes he stops in the middle of the way, obstructs passage and doesn't take his eyes off his watch. His time has stopped. He can't walk any more. He remains paralyzed in total silence, alienated from the afflicted attempts at contact by those around him. He puts his chair on the table, turns out all the lights, and throws trash on the floor. He helps to write stories for a fanzine.

A woman with strange hair. She chain smokes. Her fingers are burned. Sometimes she can't come to the group because "they" are watching her house. Nobody knows who they are. She can't give details. When she comes to the group she shouts out loud to the invisible. Her mother is dead, but she says that everything is fine because "they" had told her that she would be going away. She asks for help to stop smoking, because a voice told her that if she continues to smoke, she won't be able to come back in time to save people.

A person who talks, talks incessantly. Loud. What he says can only be understood in an exhaustive work of gathering and patching together disperse fragments. Even so, the certainty is insecure. He goes to the center of the circle at the meeting and sings out of tune. He looks for the monitor to say that he's messed his pants. Sometimes he is completely doped and cries, asking for help.

Others, probably more seen, are usually the opposite. They have earned the label of normal, but they suffer by not being able to experience life in its intensity. They have unlearned how to dream and that is why they hold on, scared, to a form that no longer serves a purpose.

The alarm goes off. He gets up, has breakfast, and brushes his teeth. Tie, suit, cologne. He goes down to the garage, gets his car, goes to work. The security guard watches him going out onto the road. Fifteen minutes stopped at the same traffic light. He looks at his watch. The traffic moves. Forty-five minutes, it wasn't so bad after all. He enters the office garage, takes the elevator. He looks at his watch. Computer, telephone, papers. He has a quick lunch so as to get back to work. He goes home in the evening. From garage to garage. He gets home, kisses his wife and goes to sleep, content because nothing's happened.

The alarm goes off. He gets up, has breakfast, and brushes his teeth. Tie, suit, cologne. He goes down to the garage, gets his car, and goes to work. The security guard watches him going out onto the road. Accident on the way. He takes a five-block detour. He looks at his watch. The traffic at a standstill. One hour, twenty minutes. Late. He enters the office garage, takes the elevator. He looks at his watch. Computer, telephone, papers. No time for lunch. He goes home in the evening. From garage to garage. He gets home, his wife is already asleep. He goes to bed, tired.

The alarm goes off. He gets up, has breakfast, and brushes his teeth. Suit, tie, cologne. He goes down to the garage, gets his car, and goes to work. The security guard watches him go out onto the road. It's raining outside but he doesn't mind. He's not going outside. Twenty minutes stopped at the same traffic light. He looks at his watch. The traffic moves. Fifty minutes. He enters the office garage, takes the elevator. Computer, telephone, papers. He has lunch with a colleague. They talk about work. Computer, telephone, papers. He goes home. From garage to garage. He arrives a little earlier than normal. He turns on the TV. He sleeps on the sofa.

The point is that contact with those others – schizo subjectivities, dirty bodies, intense, fleeting looks – often provokes a disquieting estrangement. It is a mixture of enchantment in the face of alterity and of astonishment that mobilizes useless efforts to place such singular movements inside well-established boxes, “...so great is the need to locate that which cannot be located” (Blanchot, 2003, p.18). But the astonishment in the face of these strange foreigners should not lead us to look for the easiest answer. The ethical rigor to be adopted invokes a disposition to wipe the canvas clean, alluding to the words of Deleuze and Guattari (1994, p.204). To slow down. To cut the clichés that surround our attention to then install new happenings and encounters.

WHEN THE STRANGE ENCHANTS

Guattari, in his book “The Three Ecologies” (2000 [1989]), was already announcing that the possibility of resistance would no longer be sustained in a frontal opposition to capitalist power as if it were in some place outside us. If a repressive power exists it is because it is also present in the particular modes of sociabilization, habitation, and construction of thought. If subjectivity is constantly being produced and producing from a common field of multiplicities, tensions, forces and intensities, it is fundamental that we ask what devices for the production of subjectivity are being engendered through our daily actions, our relations of proximity, our professional practices. Are we in fact contributing to the invention of breathing spaces which, although perishable, escape constituted and dominant knowledge? Or are we refeeding a system that increasingly limits the singular production of existence? What uses are we making of techno-scientific means? (Which in themselves do not bring anything negative; on the contrary, they carry a very rich potential to invent new networks, new connections, new sharing). At the service of what are we putting them to function? What would “cultivating *dissensus*” be, as Guattari (2000 [1989], p.50) suggested to us?

Nothing of this is easy to answer. However, sustaining these questionings seems fundamental. And at the same time, inventing devices that favor the experience of silence, of the grasping of subtleties,

of that which passes like a gentle breeze, almost impalpable, but makes us breathe; this seems like a useful hint in times of constant attacks on life. An useful hint for the construction of critical clinical practice, which moves from a function of control and locates itself side by side with life and its affirmation as the power of differentiation.

Speaking of protecting delicacies, in his essays on living together, Barthes (2013, p.6) imagines “something like solitude interrupted with regular intervals: the paradox, the contradiction, the aporia of a conjoining of distances” – ethics of distances, to which he gives the name ‘idiorhythm’. In this way of living together, there would be no enforced gregariousness, which comes from the uniformization under heterogeneous rhythms. It would be something similar to what Nietzsche called “pathos of distance”, which preserves a separation between the multiplicity of types, protecting the difference (and even the tensions provoked by it) in the procedures of homogenization (Nietzsche, 1998, p.53).

It is in this direction that this reflection on clinical practice intends to travel. In the face of a heavy armament coming from professional training itself, added to that machinery of the production of subjectivity-molds found in every corner, how can we open cracks so that encounters between what is different can occur without one being superimposed on the other? How can we create the conditions so that marginal, minor subjectivities can exist with their “fragile health”? How can we install in the right measure, processes of unlearning that can alleviate contact with the alterity of phantasmic or all-powerful anticipations? How can we give space to the constitution of more horizontal, supportive forms of co-existence? What spaces, languages, arts, gestures, experiments, sounds, smells, paths, journeys... help each one to invent happenings which escape from what is instituted? That subtract themselves from any need to feed opinions? What would these devices be?

She wanted to draw houses. I, from the outset, wanted to be a good therapist. I had a great affection for her. I wanted to help her alleviate some of her suffering, perhaps. But how could I do this? Or rather, would it really be my responsibility in that circumstance? It was hard to understand what she was going through. On the one hand there was something in her gesture that seemed simply beautiful to me. On the other hand, however, an apparent anxiety to produce nothing other than those drawings...But, what did I expect her to produce? A work of art? An interpretation? A cure? An acknowledgement?

Would prioritizing any of these “successes” not be imposing a truth on experience? A form? A mold? Would that not be restricting and imprisoning the happening, taking away its index of mystery and opacity? Would it not be precisely in the sustaining of estrangement, which stretches differences to their limits and intends to appease nothing, that the possibility that encounters and unfolds other happenings ad infinitum? It is on this plane perhaps that the possibility of experimentation would be designed, which intensifies the power of being differentiated from oneself and which can create a period – often brief – of relief in suffering and in the automated repetitions that belittle existence. The relevance of spaces of experimentation being engendered – as a search for experiences – is justified in the observation that, nowadays

[...] experiences are determined, circumscribed in a universe of a finitude of analogical and impoverished combinations. It is not a position of ignorance, poverty in relation to experience happens through excess, through the blocking which technique and the truculences it will permit will provoke, obstructing the flow, making transmissions and passages inviable (Inforsato, 2010, p.59).

The great Brazilian poet Manoel de Barros (2010, p.146), once wrote:

*Things that have no claims
Such as for instance:
stones that smell
the water, men who go through periods as trees,
are good for poetry²)*

She wanted to draw houses, and so I kept her company so that she could draw her houses. She did not do them anywhere else. Fleeting encounters, angry presence. Quick gestures, not one word, no exchange of glances. Some incomprehensible mutterings. She would converse only with the invisible. "...Whose house is this?" Where is it? Do you want to paint? Do you want to use this other material?". Nothing. Five minutes. She would get up and leave. And I would feel like a fraud. Insignificant faced with such a foreign world; anchored in the need to be irrecusable.

First, I took a quick look, not too close. I found it strange even though there was not really time to be affected. The need for an answer impeded the simple desire to be present. And then, I spent some time dwelling on it. And I was able to be captivated. And also enchanted. Very much so. I began to adore those remarkable encounters, perhaps for their contrast with a world so irritatingly arranged from which I could not manage to disentangle myself. And now? Were we there just because I wanted it? Would it be right to stop the treatment? Who was accompanying whom?

The two of us were accompanying each other, in a silent agreement.

One day I was browsing through the books in the library. She came close. "Let's read a book, shall we? Let's. Do you know how to read? No. I can read for you, then. Which one would you like? This one. It's in English, are you sure you really want this one? Yes I'm sure". I read and she seemed enchanted by the sound of the words. She laughed, her eyes attentive and her head propped up by her hands. She didn't want me to stop. "Now let me read". I handed her the book. "Einstron tilonis uaila smatrugis³)...". Strange language.

In the middle of the repetitions, small-big novelties were taking place. And we continued with our mismatches.

After some time the houses didn't appear any longer. She began to do even more enigmatic drawings – little circles, circles, circles, little squares, squares, squares and names, many names. Hers in particular. Many times. She stopped. She wanted to crochet. Everything she did was interminable lines, which materialized in colors and meters the duration of our encounters. Interrupted contact, cut line. I, with no vocation for non-functionality, dwelt on this. Everything that fell into her hands became poetry.

To quote Roland Barthes,

[...] what comes to me from a very foreign (very strange) language whose basic principles elude me [...] still manages to touch me, interest me, enchant me (yet I'm in no position to check the translation, even from a distance) (Barthes, 2011, p.24).

SEEKING THE RIGHT MEASURE OF DELICACY

To speak of these happenings without the skill of a poet runs the risk of conferring upon them a spectacular or purely gracious tone that would be wholly undesirable. Delicacy, so as not to become preciousness (an imperative of delicacy that quickly becomes a fetish: a naive, imposed or blind proliferation of ornamental refinements that border on the monotonous, if not the burlesque), has to manage the useless with attention to detail, treating that which appears the same as infinitely different, radically foreign: “refined practice of difference”, detailed management of life that sees its stopping point when it is on the edge of a mortifying asepsis. Some dirt is necessary to be alive – a problem of “aesthetic of conducts” that juxtaposes clinical practice and the craft of the artist (Barthes, 2003, p.73).

Encounters such as those above do not occur only in harmony or linearities. Searching for a relation that receives the mystery is not equivalent to finding a harmonious, idyllic point of conciliation and defending it for its own sake. On the contrary, for the act of sustaining estrangement, necessarily involves the refusal of any utterance which passes for the absolute, and immediate in the face of happenings. However, in the line of Agamben (2007), which follows here, through the act of narrating and thinking, are what remains of experience – un-lived parcel of the lived that has the strength to create new layers of enunciation. They are forces of transformation that are engendered in the encounter with alterity, “two becoming interlink and perform relays in a circulation of intensities pushing the deterritorialization even further” (Deleuze and Guattari, 2005 [1987], p.10).

In the scene presented, we were like mediators⁴ for each other – “sorts of separate melodic lines in constant interplay” (Deleuze, 1995, p.125). She, unrestrained. I, regimented. Two mismatched presences, two different sufferings which, however, on meeting forgot themselves for some instants of their molded or amorphous subjectivities and became others, with more heterogeneous airs. Another creature, another poet, another artist, another stranger. Stranger to oneself. Foreigner in the world. And a foreign world was invented episodically. We could breathe...

Guattari (2015) recalls the very beautiful Schopenhauerian parable on the movements of hedgehogs that come close together and draw away until they find the ideal distance-proximity to keep each other warm without hurting one another with their spines. Something of this matches the already mentioned idiorhythm of Barthes, or Nietzsche’s pathos of distance. In this aesthetic of conducts, which here could be thought of as a clinical procedure (which could also be of the artist, although the desire is to find it in life, divested of circumscriptions), the right measure of delicacy is sought, as “admirable consideration for others” (Barthes, 2003, p.75). It is really about a search exercised daily, **which never ceases not to find**. If it arrived at some culminating point, the principle of delicacy would be violated. It approaches a little, and draws back a little. Spaces, suspensions are opened. Close approximations are established by light lines, almost such as “*folie a deux*” (Barthes, 2013, p.68). Or three, or four, or, who knows, communities, multitudes...

Agamben (1993) calls “the coming community” not that which would be a future project, but that incomprehensible index of the un-lived from where lines can be traced to strengthen life in its power of creation – of itself and of a coming community, for to invent a singular space-time is also to invent a collective subjectivity, seeing that we are not indivisible, isolated people, but multiplicities in connection, in a complex and vital composition, even though we often forget this. Enchantment-happenings with nothing in the language or in science that can translate them, which, from this foreign condition, disturb those who are very certain, and occasionally open cracks which allow the entry of new air currents. To give a chance to new openings is a way of thinking of the relations of power – a “subtle art” (Baltazar Gracián as cited in Agamben, 2009, p.18), which requires attention, availability, hesitation, silence, delicacy. Affinities with poetry; sympathy for the shadow of a meaning that escapes. Instead of the effort to discover a truth that would regulate and explain everything and everyone, clinical

practices should strive to look for horizontal encounters that manage to temporarily leave the rules of the game, those rules with which we are already saturated. Those under which we already walk around pale and exhausted. We should work to make small indisciplines that escape civilizing control and sustain a fabling, political power, to invent a new community. This is less about fidelity to an idea and more about the “**persistence of a practice**” (Barthes, 2003, p.335).

To think with this perspective and act setting out from this place is to propose a political, global option (Mignolo, 1998), which talks about the relations between people, the economy, art, museums, clinical practice, relations of friendship and so on. It means perceiving that on promoting the decolonization of expropriated lives, what is conquered is the liberation of life as a whole, through the invention of common spaces, even if episodic, of other convivialities.

NOTES

1. The text was written in Portuguese by the authors and translated into English by Lynne Margaret Reay Pereira.
2. Extract from the poetry “Matéria de Poesia”.
3. She invented her own language.
4. Concept worked on by Deleuze in the book *Negotiations*, in the chapter entitled *Mediators*. “So, to the established fictions that are always rooted in a colonist’s discourse, we oppose a minority discourse with mediators [...] Creation’s all about mediators [...] real or imaginary, animate or inanimate, you have to form your mediators.” (Deleuze, 1995, p.125).

REFERENCES

- Agamben, G. *Ninfas*. (trad. Renato Ambrosio). São Paulo: Hedra (Coleção Bienal), 78, 2012
- Agamben, G. *O que é o Contemporâneo? e outros ensaios*. (trad. Vinícius Nicastro Honesko). 2aed. Chapecó: Argos, p 92, 2009
- Agamben, G. *Profanações*. (trad. Selvino J. Assmann). São Paulo: Boitempo, 2007
- Agamben, G. *The Coming Community*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 1993
- Barros, M. *Poesia Completa – Manoel de Barros*. São Paulo: Leya, p 146, 2010
- Barthes, R. *How to Live Together*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2013
- Barthes, R. *O Neutro: anotações de aulas e seminários ministrados no Collège de France. 1977-1978* (trad. Ivone Castilho Benedetti). São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2003
- Barthes, R. *The Preparation of the Novel: Lecture Courses and Seminars at the Collège de France (1978-1979 and 1979-1980)*. Translated by Kate Briggs. New York: Columbia University Press, 2011
- Blanchot, M. *The Book to Come*. Translated by Charlotte Mandell. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003
- Brasil. M. Secretaria de Atenção à Saúde. Departamento de Ações Programáticas Estratégicas. *Saúde Mental no SUS: os Centros de Atenção Psicossocial*. (Série F: comunicação e educação em saúde). Brasília, DF, 2004
- Buelau, R. M. *Plataforma Arte, Estação Clínica – fronteiras entre arte e vida*. Dissertação (Mestrado) Programa Interunidades de Pós-Graduação em Estética e História da Arte, Linha de Pesquisa Teoria e Crítica de Arte, Universidade de São Paulo – PGEHA USP. São Paulo, 2013
- Deleuze, G. *Essays Critical and Clinical*. Translated by Daniel W. Smith and Michael A. Greco. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, p 221, 1997
- Deleuze, G. *Negotiations [1972-1990]*. Translated by Martin Joughin. New York, Chichester and West Sussex: Columbia University Press, p 183, 1995
- Deleuze, G.; Guattari, F. *A Thousand Plateaus: capitalism and schizophrenia*. Translated by Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 11, 2005 [1987]
- Deleuze, G.; Guattari, F. *Kafka – toward a minor literature* (Theory and History of Literature, v.30). Translation by Dana Polan and Foreword by Réda Bensmaï’a. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 7, 2003 [1975]

- Deleuze, G.; Guattari, F. *What is Philosophy?* Translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Graham Burchell. New York, Chichester and West Sussex: Columbia University Press, p 253, 1994
- Foucault, M. *Discipline and Punish*. Translated by Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage Books, 1977
- Foucault, M. *Os Anormais. Cursos no Collège da France (1974-1975)*. (trad. Eduardo Brandão). São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2010
- Guattari, F. *Psychoanalysis and Transversality*. Translated by Ames Hodges and Rosemary Sheed. Semiotexte/Smartart, 2015
- Guattari, F. *The Three Ecologies*. (translated by Ian Pindar and Paul Sutton). London and New Brunswick, NJ: The Athlone Press, p 174, 2000 [1989]
- Inforsato, E. A. *Desobramento: constelações clínicas e políticas do comum*. Tese (Doutorado – Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação. Área de Concentração: Filosofia e Educação). Faculdade de Educação da Universidade de São Paulo. São Paulo: s.n., p 217, 2010
- Mignolo, W. *Espacios geográficos y localizaciones epistemológicas o la ratio entre la localización geográfica y la subalternización de conocimientos*. *Estúdios: Revista de Investigaciones Literárias y Culturales*, Caracas. 6, 1998
- Mignolo, W. *Estéticas Decoloniales*. 2010. Video retrieved from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mqtqRj5vDA>
- Nietzsche, F. *Twilight of the Idols*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998
- Obrist, H. U.. *Tiravanija, Rirkrit*. Mexico City, 2002. Retrieved from http://jdwalsh.com/hunter/obrist_rirkrit.pdf
- Pelbart, P. P. *A vertigem por um fio: políticas da subjetividade contemporânea*. São Paulo: Iluminuras, p 222, 2000
- Pelbart, P. P. Poder Sobre a Vida, Potências da Vida. In: *Vida Capital – ensaios de biopolítica*. São Paulo: Iluminuras, 2003
- Rolnik, Suely. *Fale com ele ou como tratar o corpo vibrátil em coma*. Retrieved from <http://www.pucsp.br/nucleodesubjetividade/Textos/SUELY/falecomele.pdf>