

Knowledge production and everyday life: challenges for research in the affirmation of life¹

*Produção de conhecimento e cotidiano:
desafios para a pesquisa na afirmação da vida*

*Producción de conocimiento y cotidiano:
desafíos para la investigación en la afirmación de la vida*

Ana Karenina de Melo Arraes Amorim² 

Maria Teresa Lisboa Nobre Pereira³ 

Abstract: In considering the contemporary biopolitical context, the article seeks to discuss the production of everyday knowledge together with “precarious” lives, based on a research-intervention experience with street people and users of the psychosocial care network. The research had as objective to know the daily life of these people, its relationship with the health and social assistance networks, fomenting autonomy and political participation, through the art-city relationship. Based on the perspective of the Institutional Analysis, collective actions and spaces were proposed involving thought, artistic expression and political formation, through workshops, debates and conversation circles. The findings indicate that the intercession between politics, art and city in meeting with these lives calls into question the established ways of living and researching, challenging the production of new forms of knowledge effectively committed to the affirmation of all lives.

Keywords: Participative Research. Human Rights. Vulnerable Populations.

Resumo: Ao considerar o contexto biopolítico contemporâneo, o artigo procura discutir a produção de conhecimentos no cotidiano junto às vidas “precarizadas”, a partir de uma experiência de pesquisa-intervenção com pessoas em situação de rua e usuários da rede de atenção psicossocial. A pesquisa teve como objetivo conhecer o cotidiano dessas pessoas, sua relação com as redes de saúde e de assistência social, fomentando autonomia e participação política, através da relação arte-cidade. Com base na perspectiva da Análise Institucional, foram propostas ações e espaços coletivos envolvendo pensamento, expressão artística e formação política, através da realização de oficinas, debates e rodas de conversa. Os achados indicam que a intercessão entre política, arte e cidade no encontro com essas vidas colocam em questão as formas instituídas de viver e pesquisar, desafiando a produção de novas formas de conhecimentos efetivamente comprometidos com a afirmação de todas as vidas.

Palavras-chave: Pesquisa participativa. Direitos Humanos. Populações Vulneráveis.

Resumen: Al considerar el contexto biopolítico contemporáneo, el artículo busca discutir la producción de conocimientos en el cotidiano junto a las vidas “precarizadas”, a partir de una experiencia de investigación-intervención con personas en situación de calle y usuarios de la red de atención psicossocial. La investigación buscó conocer el cotidiano de esas personas, su relación con las redes de salud y de trabajo social, instando autonomía y participación política, a través de la relación arte-ciudad. Con base en la perspectiva del Análisis Institucional, fueron propuestas acciones y espacios colectivos de pensamiento, expresión artística y formación política, a través de talleres, debates y ruedas de conversación. Los hallazgos indican la intercesión entre política, arte y ciudad en el encuentro con las vidas poniendo en cuestión las formas instituidas de vivir y investigar, desafiando la producción de nuevas formas de conocimientos efectivamente comprometidos con la afirmación de las vidas.

Palabras clave: Investigación participativa. Derechos Humanos. Poblaciones Vulnerables.

¹ **Submitted:** 20 Dec. 2019 - **Accepted:** 15 July 2019 - **Published:** 23 Nov. 2019

² Federal University of Rio Grande do Norte (UFRN) – Email: akarraes@gmail.com

³ Federal University of Rio Grande do Norte (UFRN) – Email: tlnobre7@gmail.com

Introduction

Nowadays we are daily called to look upon the most diverse social problems that ravage humanity, among which we point out: the increasing rates of social and economic inequality; hunger and the return of some countries to the hunger map (which is the case of Brazil) that indicate the increase of extreme poverty; the high rates of mother-child mortality in poor countries; the increase of homeless populations and unemployment; big internal migratory processes and of intercountry migration that produces an extraordinary lot of refugees, as a result of religious fundamentalisms, wars, hunger and other violence; the increase in the number of violations of human rights of children and teenagers, women, aged people, black people, people deprived of liberty, LGBTT people, among others; increase in the worldly abuse of prescribed drugs in large scale and ‘proscribed’ or illicit, with the intensification of the criminalization of drug users with serious problems related to abuse of those substances. In parallel, the solutions produced have shown inefficient and/or produce practices that represent new violations, as the imprisoning of migrants or homeless people with xenophobe, racist and/or hygienist goals; the high levels of medicalization that enriches the pharmaceutical industry and promote new diseases and chronicity, in a perverse cycle; the progressive investment in centralizing solutions, life control and liberty restrictions, rather than the investment in practices social and community support for the solution of problems.

That worldwide scenario is intensified despite the proposition and advance of social policies that try to present ways for the reversion of that scenario, since structurally, the advance of neoliberal capitalism increases the inequalities and all that kind of problems, taking the civilizing process to the lower limits, especially in the context of the poorer, which is the case of the countries of south hemisphere. Arise from there the antidemocratic governmental proposals and those that promote extermination policies, ever intensifying the scenario presented. Those extermination policies involve what contemporary scholars - such as Foucault and Butler, among others, which we will discuss later – formulate as biopolitical or extermination policies of “certain” lives.

In that context and always, life as public category deserves our attention, since today life has become the main target of “capital” and itself has become a capital “which everyone disposes, virtually, with political consequences yet to be determined” (PELBART, 2003, p. 13). Foucault (1993) called that relationship of life as an object of power as biopower or “power over the life”, that has been instituted since the 18th century in the so-called disciplinary societies and concerns to the power the institutions exert upon the vital processes (sexuality, reproduction, etc), in the sense of modifying and govern them. And was up to scholar as Lazzarato, inspired in Deleuze, the proposition that to the power upon life (biopower) should correspond the life power (biopotence), expanding the notion of life that stops given centrality to the biological processes and starts including a kind of collective synergy, social and subjective cooperation in the context of contemporary material and immaterial production. That is, life means intelligence, affection, cooperation, desire, as Pelbart explains (2003).

Considering life a political category, Butler (2015) affirms that we see the emergence of what she considers as “precarious lives” or the non-acknowledgment of lives as “living”.

She says, “If certain lives do not qualify as lives or are, from the start, not conceivable as lives within certain epistemological frames, then those lives are never lived nor lost in the full sense” (BUTLER, 2015, p. 13). In that sense, the scholar points out how in the contemporary scenarios of violence a few lives are not passible of mourning meaning that they lost their quality of living within the normative schemes that disqualify them in front of broader power operations (BUTLER, 2015). From the perspective of fight for rights and the acknowledgment of violations that must be faced, would be necessary, first of all, to acknowledge the precariousness of certain lives, what implies to think of them as “living”:

To say that a life is precarious requires not only that a life be apprehended as a life, but also that precariousness be an aspect of what is apprehended in what is living. [...] To say that a life can be injurable, for instance, or that it can be lost destroyed, or systematically neglected to the point of death, is to underscore not only the finitude of life (that death is certain), but also its precariousness (that life requires various social and economic conditions to be met in order to be sustained as a life). Precariousness implies living socially, that is, the fact that one's life is always in some sense in the hands of the other (BUTLER, 2009, p. 13-14).

Thus, life as a privileged category and its affirmation as fundamental ethics requires an acknowledgement of that logic of the relationship knowledge-power that affirm or destitute certain lives of value in social life. But, how have we taken the task of thinking this biopower and production biopotence? Which concrete devices, small of large, we have to change in daily life the power upon life into life potency? Would not the sensible knowledge production be one of those devices?

It is about those questions that this paper will discuss, taking as analysis field an experiment of intervention research carried out in the city of Natal, Rio Grande do Norte, Brazil, with homeless people and users of Psychosocial Attention Network of the city (RAPS), mediated by the Homeless People Movement (MNPR/RN) and by Potiguar Plural Association². Alternating research and extension action, it aimed at: getting to know the daily life of those people and their relationship with the health and socio-care services, stimulate their protagonism and autonomy and using the relation politics-art-city as a potent tool for the care in freedom.

Description of the experience and ways of doing research

1st Scenario – High walls, iron railing, lockers in the gates. A few people walk in the come and go of halls, corridors and backyards. They wander lost, doped, impregnated with drugs stronger than themselves that take them off the ground, take off their thoughts, their desire and their willing. They wander, with trembling legs, slurred speech, empty eyes. Others only wander, with no destination, with no meaning. A few play domino, cards, do one or another activity, chat a little with their pairs, and spend the time in some musical workshop, handicraft, painting, a few make friends. Others sleep in a deep and decontrolled sleep. But everyone, somehow, is waiting: for food, for a visit, for an appointment, for the time to leave, for the returning to their homes, for the moment they could finally reach to the city. Closed doors signal that there are people working in there: busy staff, tired, sometimes sadden and

sicken, other times hardened by a routine that does not make sense for them, obeying bureaucratic rules and norms, without time or energy to create some that give them some satisfaction in an inhospitable environment. This is the daily life of many services so-called substitutive for psychiatric hospitals. The unmistakable and unforgettable strong smell of the old times asylums, which impregnated bodies and walls, do not exist anymore. Nevertheless, the asylums are not a reality of the past. The “mental asylums”³ remain (PELBART, 1990), in the form of “capscômios”⁴ - from the *Centros de Atenção Psicossocial* (CAPS). (VASCONCELOS; MENDONÇA FILHO, 2009). The tortures and the punishments in the “cemeteries for the living” haven been officially abolished. Undoubtable advances, “no more asylums!” at last⁵. However, lives continue to be imprisoned, without autonomy, having their memories disrespected, and is very rare, though it is possible, to find inside the wall experiences of production of life and health.

2nd Scenario – Wandering is a “profession” of men and women that make the streets their space for existence producing. Some without harborage and destiny devise trajectories and routes daily. Others, less wandering, repeat gestures, paths, and create routines. Everyone needs, however, to walk to find provisory shelters, where they can unroll their cardboards and turn a backpack into a pillow, or devise a home with remains of urban trash. Fighting for food, for a sleeping place, for meeting the basic needs such as taking a shower, drinking potable water, doing the laundry, resting a while. Drugs is also a part of their ways of living: due to them some ended up in the streets, others started making use of them to handle the stride of a painful daily life. Working at the traffic lights, watching over parked cars, gathering recycling materials, doing small jobs, doing art to sell in the streets, and begging: that is how it is possible to “make money”, even for those that have a profession or master a craft (and they are many!). Squares without trees, benches without seats, taps without water, narrow sidewalks, dirty and “privatized” streets are the hostilities the city offer them: a city not made for the “others”, hostile to the different, the deviant, the insane and the migrant people (VENTURINI, 2009).

Both scenarios talk about imprisoning, disposable lives, precariousness, closed in physical and/or symbolical walls, which confiscate liberties and institute the death in life. That reality, which we were confronted during a few years in works linked to the Human Rights Reference Center of Federal University of Rio Grande do Norte (*Centro de Referência em Direitos Humanos da Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte - CRDH/UFRN*) stimulated in us the uneasiness about the task of the researcher and the scholar today. Which are the requirements to do research in social and human sciences, having as goal the investigation of the “others’ lives”? Which methods are required for the knowledge production capable of making real transformation in those scenarios?

The seriousness of the problems that demanded intervention of CRDH/UFRN were so many that we could not segment the actions between diagnosis, planning and acting in different stages or between the actions of research and extension. The complexity and urgency which we faced continuously demanded practices where the construction of knowledge and the insertion/intervention in reality were simultaneous and interchangeable. We chose, then, the intervention research, taking into consideration its fundamentals and presuppositions, according to which it is needed to intervene to get to know at the same time we get to know intervening

(COIMBRA, 2004). That movement is indissociable from the knowledge production that denies the neutrality of the researcher in face of his object of investigation and that refuses the place of expert in knowledge production, putting into analysis the power relationships the role of researcher comprises, according to the theoretical-methodological framework of institutional analysis (LOURAU, 1993).

Knowing intervening means to create a tension field between the problematization that denaturalizes given facts, events and situations (instituted) and the establishing of conditions for new productions and practices (instituting). That movement requires a permanent process of creating devices that continuously allow for the emergence of new questions about the self and about the world and the construction of a common plan, from singular experiences (LOPES; DIEHL, 2012).

Thus, the work of investigation proposed intended to effectively contribute in the benefit of the lives at stake in the reality being studied, making us to adopt methodological strategies that always took into consideration the possibility for the researcher to “contribute effective to the [solution] of problems of a researched collective, that is, its ability to dispose of theoretical-methodological devices in benefit of the objectives existent in the group upon which the action will have effect”⁶ (PAULON, 2005, p. 20).

The first challenge put to us as teachers, researchers and supervisors of students in activities of research, extension or internship, consisted in “denaturalize” the practices observed in the scenarios described above, that include violence as a constituting element. The image of the insane person as dangerous and incapable and of the homeless person as lazy and vagabond justifies, in the social imaginary, for example – including for the staff of services they are offered -, that the former be constrained and bounded when they “disobey” and the latter to be dislodged from the places they occupy and be beaten by the police, in function of their duty to maintain the public order. As the first action of research we felt called to denaturalize and deconstruct those images.

Denaturalizing is a task that contains itself three strands: methodological, epistemological and historical, according to Prado Filho (2012). The first one consists in the ethical and political attitude of suspecting, distrusting and estranging the naturalness of facts, objects, relationships and ways of being, doubting what seems obvious and undoubtable; the second one means separating the genesis of the objects and beings from their natural condition, refusing the practice of the thought of returning to the origins and the “naturalizing” logic, and the third one, consists in acknowledging that “human nature” has no essence or substance; “it is not a thing, but an enunciate and a founding logic of modern thought” (PRADO FILHO, 2012, p. 5).

The denaturalization has as its core the estrangement as indignation, that calls us to an unease practice, which by questioning, seeks ways of overcoming. Therefore, understating those facts we judge common place and trivial as products of historical, social, economic and cultural conditions is the effect of the exercise of denaturalization that implies a practice of getting unaccustomed with the costumes. This is also the function of ethic and professional way of doing research we seek continuously to practice together with the students in different

activities articulated to research, extension and internship under our supervision, from 2013 to 2018.

Here we can highlight an action undertaken in 2016, entitled *(In)Visíveis e loucos pela cidade: fortalecendo os Direitos Humanos e a saúde mental em contextos de vulnerabilidade*⁷, that articulated the fields of research, extension and curricular internship of students from the 4th and 5th terms of undergrad Psychology Course, consolidating an unity between those three dimension that constitute the fundamental tripod of Brazilian public university. The project was addressed to homeless people and users of the psychosocial attention network in the city of Natal and sought to intervene in the healthcare of those people, articulating their psychosocial demands and the political claims of social movements and the collectives that include the fight for their rights in their agenda.

Based on the theoretical-methodological framework of Institutional Analysis, we have bid on the development of strategies of approach and promotion of artistic expression that integrate the cultural plurality, promoting the social and political insertion of people in psychic suffering resulting of vulnerabilities and right violations. Thus, we proposed the construction of collective spaces involving thought, artistic expression and collective political training, by means of workshops, debates and talking with those publics, as well as with the staff that serve them.

Therefore, the field of the extension project became the field of the intervention research fostering the production of knowledge in theoretical and methodological terms and interventions ruled by ethical-political implication, supported by the analysis of the implications of the diverse subject involved, from the academic practice and knowledge, as well as those that traditionally do not participate in the process of knowledge construction, such as users and their relatives, members or non-members of social movements.

The field work was carried this way:

1 - Invitation and active search for people interested in participating of the experience of the psychosocial care network, by means of the Municipal Health Secretary and together with the teams of street clinics and substitutive servers of the health regions which those teams work at;

2 - Weekly participation at the meeting of social movements, especially MNPR/RN and Potiguar Plural Association, seeking the articulation of users and interested social movements;

3 - Weekly realization of workshops for artistic communication and expression (reading circles, writing of journals and fanzines) and of theater workshops that consisted of performance activity, body expression and theater language, both having worked with the collective agenda related to the construction of citizenship and granting of human rights;

4 - The actualization of Therapeutic Accompaniment (Ats) of the participant users in their individual demands, that played an important role of support to some users for the participation in the collective spaces of the workshops and the Potiguar Plural Association;

5 - The organization of “conversations circles” for the discussion of the participant users of services in the existent institutional spaces (forums, assemblies, social movements meeting,

associations etc) about the organization of the activities of the project. That methodology sought to address the report of the experiences and perceptions of the life conditions and the human rights violations they are victims of and ways of coping by means of the strengthening of political participation of those actors.

The intention was that this experience allowed for breaking the physical and symbolical wall of the scenarios described above. So, the offering of the workshops and other actions were made “outside” the services of the psychosocial care network. It took place in the spaces of the University and in other cultural spaces associated and that possessed infrastructure for such, as the State Pinacoteca, located at the historical center of the city, in front of a square, where lots of homeless people stay along the day. For the organization of the theater and fanzine writing workshops, the teams in charge for those activities headed to the services of RAPS and of the sanitary district closer to downtown and also to the public psychiatric hospital to invite the users of staff of the services. The meeting point was at a CAPS, from where everybody walked to the place of the workshops. This contact with the streets where they walked through those routes allowed those people to find the life of the city, with its airs, sounds, lights, colors and smells, with other wanderers and characters. It was an opportunity for experimenting their bodies in new relationships, by means of sensations and perceptions estrange to their institutional daily routine. In the route and especially in the square in front the Pinacoteca building, homeless people were invited to gather the group, so that in each week, new people showed up to participate and some returned, turning this an “ambulant group” always different.

The workshops took place weekly with the duration of four hours every Tuesday, during 10 months. They would start with body and vocal activities that helping on warm up the group and prepare the work of researching the biographic and poetical repertoire, and the scenic performance. Each week the participant brought material and document related to their themes of interest (texts, images, memories, personal stuff, photographs, talking in social media, excerpts from journals and magazines, etc.) that were turned into scenes, from the methodology of Documentary Theater (SOLER, 2010). The Documentary Theater consists in an aesthetics of scenic arts configured as a type of political theater in which the process of scenic research and creation is made by means of data extracted from reality and that are presented assumedly this way. The documentary research and literature review promote an authorial experience for each member putting them into the dramaturgic composition, exploring the confessional dimension by means of the production of testimonies in their process, aiming at turning the spectator into a witness (SOLER, 2010). Thus, the base for the documentary theater workshops were the narratives that talked about sexuality, loneliness and abandonment, family and friendship, life trajectories institutionalized in the insane asylums and the precariousness of the life in the streets. The experience slowly allowed for the permeability between that cultural space, the individual and collective subjectivities and the public spaces of the city, blurring the separating between the inside and the outside of the physical and symbolical wall that surrounded them, promoting new experimentation of himself and of the city. By the end of each meeting, a conversation circle was organized in order to listen to the experiences of that day, evaluating them together and planning the next meeting. All the workshops were recorded in video, along with recording in field journal. The theater workshops gave rise to a scenic

collective formed by members of the Potiguar Plural Association, allowing for the biographies of the participants to be reinvented at each meeting and, therefore, to be subjectively changed (ARRAES AMORIM *et al.* 2019).

The workshops and the other activities arranged (meetings, forums, therapeutic accompaniment, etc.) allowed for the processes of dialogue, discussion of themes and development of research, were bound to the very demands and realities of the participants. The discussion about human rights and citizenship promotion, always adoption the format of conversation circles, could proceed in a spontaneous form, free of factors that could interfere on communication, in order to potentialize reflections upon a culture of promotion and defense of human rights.

The findings of the intervention research and its effects

In each of the actions developed, were produced lines of thought and analysis from what we consider small and subtle micropolitical “effects” or displacement of the subjectivities and institutions in question, in an articulated way.

Concerning the actions addressed to the social movements (MNPR/RN and Potiguar Plural Association), was possible to support the meetings of the collectives and the participation of different members through of the actions of political training in which were discussed their rights in the different public policies and in the city. Beyond the political training were promoted debates and events in which their agenda and vindications were seen and heard by public power in a formal and informal way. The vector of analysis and thought focused on the construction of a new place for those so called “crazy” and “dangerous” people, acknowledging their speeches as legitimate and their lives as affirmative forces.

Throughout this process, we observed the deconstruction of the place of passivity and submission of many people and the insurgence in speeches in the preparation meetings for the event Anti-Asylum Fight Day, promoted by both collectives, as they following testimonies show: “We cannot start that meeting without talking about the prison that the asylum is. Many times we leave there, but we continue inside it. When our thoughts, our speeches are disrespected, our ideas are thrown away” (RAPS’s user); “I also don’t want that asylum for me. Also I don’t want to be barred in the door of the dormitory simply because I couldn’t stop drinking that day. I want to be heard and respected as a person that need to sleep and work to survive!” (homeless person member of MNPR).

In the speeches of the participants of the research, the fight for human rights in a broad sense is affirmed in the meeting of agenda of both social movements and takes shape in the micropolitics of meetings, as Merhy (2004, p. 2) lead us to think:

In possession of that idea, of the micropolitics of meetings, I have try to look, again, at all the scenes. No more under the perspective that the present was hard and that the future would be harder. I tried to see them as “places”, where territories-subjects are found or relate to each other, in happenings and happening. And, there, all those scenes begin to express other possibilities: there, existed subjects, territorialized and in deterritorialization, finding themselves in their difficulties, in their commensalities,

in their possibilities, in their fights; what allowed me to look at the meetings, of territories-subjects in movement and try to create new categories to look at them and to think about what was happening, or could happen, in that micropolitics of meetings.

The potency of the affirmation of life is activated in the meetings of the social movements promoted by the project in the events and workshops, in which the different territories-subjects reach the scene of the city and of the public space. But the construction of those spaces had the mediation and the “intercession”, in the sense proposed by Deleuze and Parnet (1977; 1998), of an important tool: art.

In the observations and field diaries were recorded several testimonies about the importance of that space as of how art had been a support for life: “Art saved me. I gained self-esteem!” (homeless person, participant of the theater workshop); “How would say someday I would become an actor! Right me, who have passed through so much was doped, tied, interned. Now I’m like a bird learning to fly!” (RAPS’s user, member of Potiguar Plural Association and participant of the theater workshop); “When I tell my story here in the theater, I know I’m a representative of so many people that died earlier and could not be here!” (RAPS’s user, participant of the theater workshop).

We observed *in vivo* the resonance of the intercession of those aesthetic tools in the meeting with the individual and collective pain, putting into work a machinery of the subjectivation that displaces the instituted modes of subjectivity in daily life and at the same time intervene in the culture by explicating the histories and the testimonies of the violation of rights in public scene. That happened, for example, in the Works Show resulting from the workshops, an action that sought to undo the crystalized orders to create new “fictions of life, other lives” (PELBART, 1993, p. 12). At each theater scene and fanzine constructed with the testimonies, drawings, poetry, narratives, gestures, gags, new territories were built with possibilities for recreation and questioning that which is repeated as natural and impossibilities, limits, inabilities, abnormality, pointing out deviations to the construction of other possibilities, other capacities, other normality. This also involved the constitution, by means of the experimentation with art, of other sensibilities, other skins capable of experimenting the differences and affirming the meetings.

Researchers, students, interns, healthcare staff, finding radical differences in “someone else’s” bodies, in the forms of be in the world of the insane, drunken, drug addicts, those who live in the streets. Meetings that in the end produced certain “indistinct distinction” by the transformations, approximations and detachments that were able in the experiments to “fiction other life”.

For such, we needed to “think, act and look at the daily as a foreigner would: estranging and be enchanted with each new revelation” (LIMA, 2004, p. 46). The look cast as a researcher could not be that of detachment from the subject investigated. There are interweaved “clinic and politics, research and action, the word intervention join the research, not to replace the action, but for producing another relationship between theory and practice, as well as between subject and object” (PASSOS; BARROS, 2000, p. 73).

We needed to go through different research territories, of the clinic and political action

at the same time and in a transversal way. Because the spaces of meetings and workshops gave place to other clinical works of accompaniment of the lives in the city, in their urgencies and insurgencies, in their acute and chronic suffering, in the medicalizations, constraints and silencing to which almost everyone were subjected, remains and symptoms of the different violations explicit in the people's speeches and bodies.

In that context took place the therapeutic accompaniment (AT) of the participant people and relatives in the spaces in order to create some refuge and continence of the acuter suffering and the clear access difficulties to the spaces and public services which they related to and which, not rarely, they needed. Sufferings and difficulties that were put most of the time as limiting of the participation in the collective spaces and of support of the political participation. At played the role of mediation and intercession for the rights of those people in the spaces of the city and also functioned as support to the other actions being carried out in the project.

The accompaniment as a vital sharing, a displacement axis by means of which we create access ways to the affections, "ways of existentialization", in a process that is created in the city and recreates it through the crossing of boundaries and the displacement caused by them. In that sense, AT constituted "an eminently political device for the circulation of affects and senses" (MUYLAERT, 2006, p. 112). Thus, the experience if made in provoking the city, in the "uneasy familiarity of the city" in which is produced the displacement of gazes and ways of going through the public space, acknowledging that the cities "are territories of fecund conflicts, experimentations, a place where is produced the face of the diverse, of the stranger, of the familiar, of the foreigner" (BAPTISTA, 1999, p. 123).

Each conflict and tensioning, when shared in the conversation circles, allowed for an opportunity of thinking and analyzing, and consequently denaturalizing what is given, integrating the agenda and fight spaces, feeding and nurturing certain ways of doing politics and producing health, in solidary and affective net. The effects were different and singular for each one, but supported collectively, challenging us to invent each time other ways of making it happen the actions, the academic training and the knowledge production.

The questions raised by the field work made us wonder of how the scientific field, the political commitment of producing knowledge allow for the construction of actions and programs capable of facing and reverting scenarios of precarious living. And, more than this, they demand reflections about how we are producing knowledge that many times are considered negligent and distant from the real problems faced by society, contributing to the maintenance of naturalizations that imply the destitution of the value of certain lives. That is, if the knowledge production does not acknowledge, in its regime of knowing, the lives and their precariousness as fundamental question, it participates on the constitution of the violent scenarios we witness. Besides, that participation also works by the incapability of generating foundations for other policies for life be constituted in the sense of the transformation of those frames of violence and precariousness.

With those questions in mind, we remember Foucault (1972) in interview to Deleuze, where he makes us think about the role of the intellectual today by acknowledging his position within the logic of the dominant power:

The role of the intellectual is no longer to place himself a "little ahead or a bit to the side" so as to speak the silent truth of all. Rather, it is to struggle against the forms of power in relation to which he is both object and instrument: within the domain of "knowledge", "truth", "consciousness" and "discourse". [...] This is why theory will never express, translate or apply a practice: it is a practice. But as you say, it is regional and local, and not totalizing (FOUCAULT, 1972, p. 39, emphasis on the original).

The challenge put by Foucault is in the production of theories as a system of fights, as ways of facing the insidious and invisible formations of power that are presented and are reinvented in contemporaneity. It would be up to the intellectual a production of knowledge that is put at the side of life and not in front of it, refusing a posture of "clarification" in front of them. It also puts another relationship between theory and practice, since a theory is always "a theory is always local, relative to a small domain, and it is applicable to domains more or less far removed" (FOUCAULT, 1972, p. 37) and which always find obstacles, walls, tumbling that leads to another domain, to other discursive forms, by means of the practice.

We aimed with that intervention research to create forms of coping there where the power formation were present in the body, in people's daily and in the relation with the institutions. The supporting of the analytical position, in the terms that Foucault (1972) and Deleuze (2003) invite us to, was fundamental to the collective spaces in their task where appears the "truth", the "knowledge", the "consciousness", the "discourse", giving way to the doubts, the affections, the unconscious intensities of the meetings, to the silences. An analytical position that is put always as a source of questioning and denaturalization of truth by means of a work with affects and the production of meetings between researchers and participants of the researchers and other projects of extension and teaching. There where a homeless person and an insane person are silenced, sidelined, ridiculed, oppressed, violated, to begin to affirm their potencies, voices, bodies, joys and pains.

Final considerations

Carrying out that research allowed us to understand that is needed to develop in the production of knowledge another position in front of reality, what involve a few ethical conditions: 1. Acknowledging that every knowledge production if political, since it fights either for or against the maintenance of the scenarios of precariousness of life; 2. Knowledge production takes place in the immanence of living, being theory a practice and not something to be "applied to"; and 3. Knowledge production involves the experience with lives (by its side), and within it, the development of certain sensibility for acknowledging of every and any life as "living".

For a research to meet those conditions seems to require a certain education of the body to produce other forms of seeing and saying what the power formations tend to invisibilizing or silencing. From there emerges the particular interest exactly for those "precarious lives" in their immanence to knowledge production as a needed way of coping today.

By accepting the challenge of producing research in the immanence of living, we understand that the research is produced from the experience with "concrete" lives, calling us

to follow them in the scenarios where we work as researchers, beside the people and their fights, in the case of that intervention research, along with groups with historic of violation of human rights by the State, by society and by the institutions, as well as the psychiatric asylum, for example.

Under that perspective, the act or research demands a work of oneself in the present of who is implicated in the construction of those rights and with the affirmation of life, what also requires a “genealogical” search for singularities, for what produces the difference in the “effective history” of the things (FOUCAULT, 2006), in a research practice committed with life.

The relationships constructed along with the people, in the precariousness of living, but also in their potencies of invention of life, led us to follow those two movements, simultaneously. The position for action upon the world together with the people implicated in the experience, at the same time that the analysis of the lived realities were being produced marked the analytical and interventive field of the research. In that processes we realized, collectively, how in the lives of the homeless people and users of psychosocial attention network with psychiatric historic there was nothing natural in the reality that was violently presented there. In the same sense, in the encounter with them, we did not consider ourselves “researchers” anymore, in the already conformed meanings. Rather, we felt called to radicalize meeting with the difference, to produce deviations towards the estrangement of what is put, given and accepted as natural and true, inclusively in the act of doing university research and extension, places that no rarely make us to exert a hierarchized power in front of the “other” we take as object of investigation.

By analyzing the situation of the universities today, Boaventura de Souza Santos affirms that with their increasing commodification and appeals to productivity that bounds science to market, we are training “incompetent conformists” (JERÓNIMO; NEVES, 2012, p. 686). The alternative, he says, would be the training of “competent rebels” in a society that “demands nonconformity and longing for fight for a better world” (JERÓNIMO; NEVES, 2012, p. 686). That would be, thus, the task of the “rear intellectual”, that on the contrary of that who is in the vanguard, do not point ways nor occupies the place of guide. Rather, he follow the social movements, strengthen them and walks besides them, identifying their fragilities and making their walk easier.

That indissociability between knowledge production and concrete practices in favor of disposable or precarious lives express the intentions of that intervention research. In that way, the intercession between politics, art and the city in the encounter with those lives questions he instituted ways of living and researching, challenging the production of new forms of knowledge effectively committed to the affirmation of all lives.

References

ARRAES AMORIM, Ana Karenina *et al.* O Teatro Documentário como intercessor na produção de vida e saúde. *In: NOBRE, Maria Teresa et al.* (org.). **Vozes, imagens e**

resistência nas ruas: a vida pode mais! Natal: EDURN, 2019 (no prelo).

BAPTISTA, Luís Antônio. **A cidade dos sábios:** reflexões sobre a dinâmica social nas grandes cidades. São Paulo: Summus, 1999.

BUTLER, Judith. **Frames of war:** when is life grievable? London/New York: Verso, 2009.

BUTLER, Judith. **Quadros de guerra:** quando a vida é passível de luto? Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2015.

COIMBRA, Cecília Maria. Tensão e/ou oposição entre ciência e política na pós-graduação? Notas Introdutórias. **Psicologia & Sociedade.** Belo Horizonte, v. 16, n. 1, p. 86-97, 2004.

DELEUZE, Gilles. **Lógica do Sentido.** Tradução de Luiz Roberto Salinas Fortes. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 2003.

DELEUZE, Gilles; PARNET, Claire. **Diálogos.** Tradução de Eloisa Araújo Ribeiro. São Paulo: Escuta, 1998.

DELEUZE, Gilles; PARNET, Claire. **Dialogues.** New York: Columbia University Press, 1977.

FOUCAULT, Michel. Direito de morte e poder sobre a vida. *In:* FOUCAULT, Michel. **História da sexualidade:** a vontade de saber. Rio de Janeiro: Graal, 1993. p. 125-149.

FOUCAULT, Michel. Os intelectuais e o poder: conversa entre Michel Foucault e Gilles Deleuze. *In:* MOTTA, Manoel da (org.). **Estratégia, poder-saber:** Ditos & Escritos. 2 ed. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 1972. p. 37-47.

FOUCAULT, Michel. **Microfísica do poder.** Organização e tradução de Roberto Machado. Rio de Janeiro: Edições Graal, 2006.

JERÓNIMO, Helena Mateus; NEVES, José. Entrevista com Boaventura Sousa Santos. O intelectual de retaguarda. **Análise Social.** Portugal, v. XLVII, n. 204, p. 685-711, 2012.

LIMA, Elisabeth Maria Freire de Araújo. A análise de atividade e a construção do olhar do terapeuta ocupacional. **Revista de Terapia Ocupacional da Universidade de São Paulo.** São Paulo, v. 15, n. 2, p. 42-48, maio/ago. 2004.

LOPES, Graziela; DIEHL, Rafael. Intervir. *In:* FONSECA, Tania Maria Galli; NASCIMENTO, Maria Lívia do; MARASCHIN, Cleci (org.). **Pesquisar na diferença:** um abecedário. Porto Alegre: Sulina, 2012. p. 135-137.

LOURAU, René. **Análise institucional e prática de pesquisa.** Rio de Janeiro: EDUERJ, 1993.

MERHY, Emerson Elias. **Cuidado com o cuidado em saúde:** saiba explorar seus paradoxos para defender a vida: o ato de cuidar é um ato paradoxal: pode aprisionar ou liberar. Campinas. 2004. Disponível em:

<https://www.yumpu.com/pt/document/view/12817362/cuidado-com-o-cuidado-em-saude->

[saiba-explorar-seus-uff](#). Acesso em: 02 jun. 2018.

MUYLAERT, Marília Aparecida. AT como dispositivo clínico: uma perspectiva da esquizoanálise. **Psychê**. São Paulo, v. 10, n. 18, p. 109-114, set. 2006.

PASSOS, Eduardo; BARROS, Regina Benevides de. A construção do plano da clínica e o conceito de transdisciplinaridade. **Psicologia: Teoria e Pesquisa**. Brasília, v. 16, n. 1, p. 71-79, 2000.

PAULON, Simone Mainieri. A análise de implicação como ferramenta na pesquisa-intervenção. **Psicologia & Sociedade**. Belo Horizonte, v. 17, n. 3, p. 18-25, 2005.

PELBART, Peter Pál. Manicômio mental: a outra face da clausura. In: GUATTARI, Félix *et al.* (org.). **Saúde Loucura 2**. 3 ed. São Paulo: Ed. Hucitec, 1990. p. 131-138.

PELBART, Peter Pál. **A nau do tempo rei**: sete ensaios sobre o tempo da loucura. Rio de Janeiro: Imago, 1993.

PELBART, Peter Pál. **Vida Capital**: ensaios de biopolítica. São Paulo: Iluminuras, 2003.

PRADO FILHO, Kleber. Desnaturalizar. In: FONSECA, Tania Maria Galli; NASCIMENTO, Maria Lívia do; MARASCHIN, Cleci (org.). **Pesquisar na diferença**: um abecedário. Porto Alegre: Sulina, 2012. p. 71.

SOLER, Marcelo. **Teatro Documentário**: a pedagogia da não ficção. São Paulo: Editora Hucitec, 2010.

VASCONCELOS, Michele de Freitas Faria de; MENDONÇA FILHO, Manoel. Por uma genealogia das políticas de inclusão de saúde mental contemporânea: produção de políticas identitárias e de modos variados de confinamento. In: MENDONÇA FILHO, Manoel; NOBRE, Maria Teresa (org.). **Política e afetividade**: narrativas e trajetórias de pesquisa. Salvador: EDUFBA, 2009. p. 181-210.

VENTURINI, Ernesto. A cidade dos outros. **Fractal: Revista de Psicologia**. Niterói, v. 21, n. 2, p. 203-222, maio/ago. 2009.

Notes

¹ Translated by Ernane Oliveira.

² The homeless People's Movement is a social movement create in 2004, exists in more than 18 Brazilian states and fights for the rights of that population. The Potiguar Plural Associação is a collective of users of Mental Health Services of the city of Natal, Rio Grande do Norte, Brazil, and also aggregates relatives, staff and defenders of the Anti-Asylum Fight.

³ "Mental Asylum" is an expression used to refer to the symbolical kinds of asylums (prisons, hospitals, chains etc) that humans have in the mind.

⁴ "Capscômio" is an expression used to show some symbolic meanings of the asylum still present in the *Centros de Atenção psicossocial (CAPS)* (Psychosocial Attention Centers), that substitute the old asylums in Brasil.

⁵ "No more asylums" is the motto of the *Movimento de Luta Antimanicomial (MNLA)*, instituted in the 1980's decade, a still ongoing movement of fight against the old psychiatry hospitals which were a scenery of torture in the Brazilian military dictatorship (1964-1985), a scenery that is constantly reinvented in Brazil.

⁶ Translated from Portuguese. In this article, all quotes from other languages were freely translated to English.

⁷ "(In)visible and insane people around the city: strengthening human rights and mental health in contexts of vulnerability" is a possible tradition.

