



## Psychopathologies in deleuze and guattari and merleau-ponty: from the power of institutions to the power of being

  <https://doi.org/10.56238/devopinterscie-148>

### Francelino Eleutério da Silva Junior

Discente do curso de Psicologia da Universidade Federal do Delta do Parnaíba

### Ronald Taveira da Cruz

Professor Doutor do curso de Psicologia da Universidade Federal do Delta do Parnaíba

### ABSTRACT

This paper contemplates the conclusion of research developed in the period of one year, 2021-2022, from the Voluntary Scientific Initiation of the Federal University of Delta do Parnaíba – UFDPAR. Its critical assumptions, as well as its results, stem from the meetings and discussion seminars of the study group – NEM (Centre of Mental Studies) – thus characterizing itself as a critical and investigative study of literature review. The current and consolidated literature is an important tool for understanding the ways of understanding psychopathological phenomena and the symptomatic ways that lead

to the identification of the pathology in favor of normality without recognizing the processes that promote illness, considering its phenomena and symptoms. The objective of this article is to create an important precedent for the critical incitement of the practices of modern psychology and other scientific devices in the light of the philosophy of what psychopathologies are in their embryonic sense, between the construction of normality of the body and psychopathologies in the course of your healing process. The study focused on the foundations of Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology and the philosophy of difference with Deleuze and Guattari and other authors, thus weaving a theoretical and critical framework for building an understanding of the symptoms and the relational phenomenon in the face of what is normal and pathological.

**Keywords:** phenomenology, philosophy of difference, normal, pathological.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

This article is the final result of a year of research carried out between 2021 and 2022, by the Voluntary Scientific Initiation - ICV, from the Federal University of Delta do Parnaíba - UFDPAR, with guidance from Professor Ronald Taveira da Cruz and the student of Psychology Francelino Eleutério da Silva Júnior. The research had as a recurrent activity, in the critical search of the elements studied, the meetings and seminars of the study group - NEM - and which has as its initial theme "The psychopathologies in Merleau-Ponty: from the symptom to the phenomenon", which was modified during his research journey, thus adding the foundations of philosophers Deleuze and Guattari from the philosophy of difference. It is a critical and investigative study, based on literature, to refute the traditional understanding of psychopathological phenomena and the symptomatic paths that lead to the identification of pathology in favor of normality without recognizing the processes that promote illness. The study opens

an important precedent for the critical incitement of contemporary psychology practices and other scientific devices in the light of the perception of what psychopathologies are in their embryonic sense between the construction of the body's normality and incongruous pathology and their relationships.

Phenomenology enters as an important methodological management and opens an important discussion to possibly understand the relationship between the physiological edification of the symptomatic processes of the psychopathological phenomenon for the construction of normality. Taking into account the symptomatic pathologies of the body and scientific practices, elevating the body/mind/flesh and other factors within that same process. After all, when constructing a pathology of the other between the difference and the practice of knowledge, the existence between a rule willing to imprint methods for the retention of a phenomenon of the body and the search for the state of nature about us – normality; about building an absolute truth – scientific practices; about a physical state between nature and science – healing; will fall back on different sources, be it scientific, social, economic and historical and which are important factors and at the same time disowned by practices in the scientific domains of the processes that generate illness. Thus strengthening a system that disregards the body and the mind, the body, and the environment, creating a hegemonic binarity to define a normal body and a body in the presence of important symptoms for the tracking, function, and practice of a phenomenon.

A phenomenon that establishes ways to diagnose a pathology that goes against the rule of nature of the other, without considering other important phenomena up to the identified psychopathology, giving possession of binary hegemony. The construction between the normal and the pathological has always been, to a large extent, a pillar for the justification of totalitarian knowledge based on control – social, economic, cultural, and of bodies. The dynamics between the systems of control and assemblages were fostered by science that distances itself from difference to culminate in a general normative – medicine and psychology used scientific methods as promoters of an absolute truth, which changes but is always recognized in the change itself.

In the literature of Foucault (2005), in his post-structuralist analysis, the triad between power-right-truth falls directly on the legitimated actions of scientific, social, and private institutions on bodies and their definition between normal and pathological. This binary construction that emerges from time to time to take for itself an absolute truth about the conditions and the determinism of modern sciences that follow as Canguilhem (2010), without classifying that the normal and pathological states are analogous, only in different conditions, giving a dichotomy between good and evil. The activities that were related to the Scientific Initiation, resulting in this article, related precisely the perspective of the relationship of the philosophy of perception of Merleau-Ponty without direct relation to Husserl, with different authors such as Deleuze and Guattari, Michel Foucault, Neusa Santos, the necropolitics by Achille Mbembe, the construction of the normal and the pathological by Georges Canguilhem, which incites a discussion for the construction between the two poles from a philosophical, scientific prerogative and our common sense.

In addition to study approaches, the research was based on the relationship between psychopathologies and the methodological construction of phenomenology in line with the philosophy of difference. As an identification of critical thinking, the institutions that determine what is normal and pathological, the body and the mind - treated separately among many scientific methods - have become objects of study from the philosophy of difference, related not only to the structure that the conceives, as well as the spatial, social and economic aspects and symbologies, which fell into the very conception of the aforementioned authors. The study does not only open the way for the discussion and construction of new possibilities in the face of Merleau-Ponty's philosophy (1945): flesh/body and mind in a prerogative that, my hand is as much my mind as my mind is as much my body; as well as understanding psychology itself as an effective change in its practices, enabling a path of critical thinking about its historical and current actions.

This chapter aims to create a critical tension about what is itself, or what may become, truth – deterministic between body, pathology, medicalization, and segregation – which the perception itself does not culminate as a method for the construction of knowledge and intellect in pathological and normalizing epistemology throughout history. Merleau-Ponty himself (1945), in his interpretation of pre-reflection – our interpretation is not always relegated to the context of the formation of our intellect – contests the direction that our perception – one of the first instruments of the cognitive development of the being human – is not taken into account in the construction of medical and psychological knowledge and practices.

The multiple and varied perceptions of the world are invalidated by not building a regulated scientific epistemology, just as the body, in a kind of fabrication of behaviors about its movement, in recognition of the imposed and preconceived regularity, is relegated to the place it occupies. perception occupies the instruments of knowledge construction. The philosophy of perception, both from a cultural and cognitive point of view, as well as the body, is our first contact with the relational and agent universe. Who then determines that the cogito, my way of being and being in the world is normal and pathological? My psycho-pathological-normal-intellectual-perceptive body-mind is crystallized only in an intellectual rule in the search for the general-regulating identity, which leaves an important clinical spectrum for psychology, the personal and collective intersubjectivity of bodies, beyond the becoming other in the perspective of the philosophy of difference as the construction of otherness, becoming I and becoming-body-normal-pathological-mind.

## **2 METHODOLOGY**

The proposal for the theme of the Scientific Initiation itself already envisaged an important literature on the subject and problem of the research to be carried out during one year of its validity. The debates proposed by the research group – NEM – as a complementary source for the debate instigated the directions that led to the completion of the work. Given the above, this article was carried out from a literature review, a review that was debated, and experienced in discussion groups, which became a literary

rhizome for its effectiveness. According to Echer (2001), every literature review is “essential for the preparation of a scientific work”; even more so when it concludes a scientific activity. The theoretical and methodological contribution to the construction of critical thinking on the phenomenology and philosophy of difference to discuss the binarity between normal and pathological, their power relations - social, cultural, scientific, and political; needed to resort to theoretical works already completed in their praxis as dancers of a critical and propositional discussion on the subject, in addition to new research in scientific articles published between the years 2017-2020 in different research bases, such as Scielo and Google Scholar.

The formulating heterogeneity of concepts and positions about psychopathologies among the authors creates in itself a rich discussion and a founding proposition so that we have a greater theoretical contribution to the subject in question. As stated by Echer (2001), “From the confrontation of the opinions of different authors, a position on a given subject was born; with that, some ideas are abandoned, new ones are added”. The research began by looking into phenomenology to discuss psychopathologies in Merleau-Ponty, this idea throughout the research was like a blank slate that was transformed over time, with the insertion of philosophers such as Deleuze and Guattari, Foucault, Achille Mbembe, Neusa Santos and Georges Canguilhem; which were of paramount importance for the final painting with the due result expected by the participants. Thus, this article is a literature review that aims to discuss in a critical, ethical, and propositional way the normal and the pathological in the phenomenological views and the philosophy of difference.

### **3 DEVELOPMENT AND RESULTS**

In the construction of the research and its course, as already mentioned above, we verified the importance of relating the philosophy and important authors of this science, as well as their contemporaries, for the critical construction that focuses on the work and its established objectives. This relationship between the postulates of philosophy, to identify the scientific and rule organization between normality and pathology, in Merleau-Ponty's phenomenological processes, was an embryonic and unique link for us to point out our perception in the literature review on how normality and what operates contrary to it – pathological, disease, psychopathologies – are related in communion within an operating system constructed by us, as well as the body of the other as an agency machine. This perception reveals devices that feedback in a hegemonic consonance of the inexistence of other forms and perceptions about the symptomatic phenomena of the psychopathologies crossed in the subjects - it is important to highlight that this relationship not only imposes the body as a perceptive instrument of the normal and pathological, but the body becomes a single target of medical and psychological physiology, thus ignoring important factors that lead us to the path of understanding how and when the normal and the pathological differ for the undeniable valence of a model of power, truth, and law (Foucault, 2005 ).

## **The relation between Foucault and Georges Canguilhem is about the normal and the pathological.**

In *Vaca Profana*, Veloso (1984) writes a symbiosis between two bodies, the individual/subjective body, and the collective body. Both are unified and give meaning to the social context in which we are inserted. That's why he is assertive when he says that "nobody is normal up close". This micropolitical insurrection for the macropolitics of the domains of bodies and their judgment between the normal and the pathological on the other is directly linked to the power that we give life and foster through agency fields. The right of decision to this body endowed with powers over ourselves and the reliable construction of a crystallized truth, corroborating with the collective absolutism over bodies, creates this field of control. This triad that Foucault (2005) denounces is linked to the image of the institutions that regulate power, law, and truth. Relegated to the right over bodies/life, the individual and social field in which we are inserted is transferred the responsibility of surveillance over ourselves and the defining ruler of the binary pathological metric between normal and abnormal to institutions, without the possibility of bodies and their subjectivities exercise new perceptions of themselves outside the regulatory field. Therefore, when Veloso (1984) incites in *Vaca Profana* the established power of control agencies for the subjective field of each of us, he denounces the complexity imbued in us the power/right/truth of a (non)existent metric on the mind-body pathology we build into our collective unconscious.

Unlike Caetano Veloso (1984), who points out the production of this truth in us, Foucault (2005) denounces control agencies as a universal instrument of responsible surveillance. The same institutions, as an extension of our body, find ways to produce a truth about ourselves, which will regulate the production of their biopower over bodies, as the essential source of their existence. It is paradoxical to think that the institutions that are figurative bodies created by us are the same ones that exercise power over ourselves, that make us produce truth, law, and power in a construct between the pathological and the normal. These control technologies are used at different levels and improvements with the same purpose, as observed by Foucault (2005): "we are subjected by the power to the production of truth and we can only exercise power through the production of truth.". This dysphoria about us and the way we associate institutions and our behavior are intertwined in the multiple power relations in which we are inserted, thus creating a field in which we build a society that is not capable of dealing with the difference of the other.

To simply point out, not the very mechanism of the relationship between power, law, and truth, but the intensity of the relationship and its constancy, let's say this: we are forced to produce truth by the power that demands this truth, we are coerced, we are condemned to confess the truth. truth or to find it. Power does not stop questioning, questioning us; he never ceases to inquire, to record; he institutionalizes the truth, he professionalizes it, and he rewards it. (FOUCAULT, 2005, p. 29).

This difference is denounced in the assumptions which Canguilhem (2010) questions whether there is a science for the normal and the pathological, as he observes that the operator of medical practices can't understand the symptoms of the pathology called abnormal by the very action that the puts you in that state of power and truth. At some point in the historical course, medical science was waging a battle between



health and disease over the man himself, this image understands Canguilhem (2010) an ancient dispute related between good and evil over our environment, and the world. This dyad that Canguilhem (2010) brings to light on the normal and the pathological in his 1943 doctoral thesis in medicine opens a profound philosophical discussion that will permeate the fields of science and common sense knowledge, often denied the status of importance in the construction of knowledge.

Estellita-Lins (2021) points out how Canguilhem's (2010) approach has a reflective influence on phenomenology itself. Estellita-Lins (2021, P. 60) points out that “this coherence never nullifies or eliminates an axiological dimension, that is, moral, ethical and political evaluation of life by life itself.”. That is, Canguilhem (2010) himself relates philosophy as an important guide for understanding life and science's relationship with it, as Foucault (2005) uses genealogy and archeology to shed light on the understanding of power over life and create agency fields for the promotion of hegemonic knowledge about the other – biopower as a denominator of change and right over the life of the other in a system of regulation and production of the same (MUHLE, 2021, P. 301). Canguilhem relates the pathological as an intrinsic part of man and of nature itself, making pathology itself a path of knowledge about the natural (normal) state of us: “to master the disease is to know its relations with the normal state that man alive wants to restore since he loves life.” (CANGUILHEM, 2010, P. 11). Despite the complementarity that the normal and the pathological are constructions within an operating system between scientific knowledge, Canguilhem, and Foucault have complementary divergences about practices, while the first relates medical actions as interdisciplinarity of several other sciences, getting to relate them with art and technique, the second believes that the rise of the search for normal bodies by a society demonstrates the resolution of technologies that operate on the lives of these bodies in search of a current norm (TEIXEIRA, 2019).

We can thus observe that for Canguilhem (2010), what operates on the normal and the pathological is in the relationship between vital poles which, regardless of the state of the body of the other, life exists and operates, the subject has his decision-making capabilities about himself. Foucault (1999), on the other hand, sheds light on the technologies that operate on the life which is allowed to live by right or which is left to die is in the hands of those who hold the right, power, and truth:

What this new technique of non-disciplinary power applies is – unlike the discipline that is addressed to the body – the lives of men, or even, if you prefer, it is addressed not to body-man, but to the living man, to man being alive; at the limit, if you will, to the species-man. More precisely, I would say this: discipline tries to govern the multiplicity of men to the extent that this multiplicity can and should result in individual bodies that must be watched over, trained, used, and eventually punished. And, then, the new technology that is installed addresses itself to the multiplicity of men insofar as they are reduced to bodies, but insofar as it forms, on the contrary, a global mass, affected by processes such as birth, death, production, disease, etc. (FOUCAULT, 1999, P. 289).

There is a close relationship between Foucault and Canguilhem to relate the postulates of knowledge about the domination of bodies, there is a difference that extends to the complementarity of the problem, the normal and the pathological are phenomena of the human body itself, but they are tools of operation of domination, which the sciences operate in favor of a complex system of domination. What perhaps

differentiates the questionings of both is that, while Foucault (1999) relates pathology/disease as a technology of man's domination, Canguilhem (2010) launches a different perspective on the body and pathology as their own.

for Canguilhem, there is a vital polarity, with illness as its contrast. Whether in health or illness, life has normativity, which makes the living being engendered strategies, options, and articulate decisions. However, from the healthy to the pathological state, there are not only different quantitative measurements, as if the pathological were just a variant of the physiological: in illness, the potentiality of normalizing a living being is effectively lowered, constrained, losing dynamism of overcoming. There is, indeed, a qualitative, vital distinction between such situations: "The pathological state is not a simple, quantitatively varied extension of the physiological state, but it is different". (MASCARO apud CANGUILHEM, 2020, P. 4).

### **The philosophy of Deleuze and Guattari**

In this prerogative of creating truth in the face of the power and the right to institutionalize it, Deleuze and Guattari (2008), establish the concept of bodies without organs (BwO). The concept created by Deleuze and Guattari (2008) in *A Thousand Plateaus* in opposition to the construction of the machine of desire managed by the imminence of institutions, including psychoanalysis on the Oedipus construct and the subjective drives of each individual, thus creating an important question: what can a body? It is in this conception of insurgent escapes as opposed to assemblages to make room for the desire that the conceptualization of bodies without organs pervades, according to Hur (2020, p. 4), "an ambiguity, a paradoxical space, which can distinguish the production of different bodies of that experience". The experimentation of fugues for bodies, where organs put the body of the other in motion and full production, "The body without organs is not a dead body, but a living body, so alive and so boiling that it expelled the organism and its organization" (Deleuze and Guattari, 2009, p. 43). In this process of fugues Deleuze and Guattari also report the power of the production of these bodies without organs not only as elements of fugues but as Hur (2020, p 7) states, "practice, experimentation, and production.". Bodies that do not experience this production expose a failure and thus build emptied/lobrignes bodies:

But why this dismal parade of sewn, glazed, cationized, aspirated bodies, given that the BwO is also full of joy, ecstasy, and dance? So why these examples? Why is it necessary to go through them? Bodies emptied instead of full. What happened? Did you act with the necessary prudence? I'm not saying wisdom, but prudence as a dose, as a rule, immanent to experimentation: injections of prudence. Many are defeated in this battle. Will it be so sad and dangerous not to support the eyes to see, the lungs to breathe, the mouth to swallow, the tongue to speak, the brain to think, the anus and the larynx, the head, and the legs? Why not walk with your head, sing with your sinuses, see with your skin, breathe with your belly, Simple thing, Entity, Full body, Motionless journey, Anorexia, Cutaneous vision, Yoga, Krishna, Love, Experimentation. Where psychoanalysis says: Stop, find yourself again, it would be necessary to say: let's go further, we still haven't found our BwO, we haven't undone ourselves sufficiently yet. Replace anamnesis with forgetting, and interpretation with experimentation. Find your body without organs, and know how to do it, it's a matter of life and death, youth and old age, sadness, and joy. That's where everything is decided. (DELEUZE; GUATTARI, 2009, P.10).

And this body to which the authors refer is precisely the conception of the same in its pre-existence before the bodies that constitute it in the extension of the organizations that control them. Using Espinoza's

philosophy, relating the kinetic conception and the dynamicity existing in bodies, Deleuze and Guattari (2008), the organ is a peripheral component of a body and in the existence of its varieties constitute it, but do not define it. Based on this conception, the authors seek an escape from trying to theorize any instrument of control and agency over these bodies, creating this allusion of the organs to the social institutions that determine control over the normal and the pathological, to create a body without organs. , with the fullness of exercising their impulses in the extreme concept of freedom and difference, creation, and tensions between experience and desire.

It is not a question of feeling desire as an inner lack, nor of delaying pleasure to produce a type of externalized surplus value, but, on the contrary, of building an intensive BwO, Tao, a field of immanence where desire lacks nothing and which, thus, it no longer relates to any external or transcendent criterion. (DELEUZE AND GUATTARI, 2008, P. 19).

In *Molecular Revolution*, Félix Guattari (1981: 65) relates the interactions of organs as institutions for the production of desired machines, which is related to the production of “a flow of decoded individuals as a condition for capturing the workforce”, (GUATTARI, 1981). This production of desires serves the market as the propagation and demand for drives validated for normalized bodies and excluding those who fit the ideation of the pathological, which culminates in what Guattari (1981, p. 66), observes that “this function generalized equipment, which stratifies roles, hierarchizes society, codifies destinations, we operate a function of collective agency”. The agency this present between the operations of social relations that discriminate and exclude bodies outside the determining pattern, not only by clinical pathologies but by the creation of race. Lima Barreto (1993), in his work “Hospício Diary: the cemetery of the living”, brilliantly denounces the relegation of black bodies to the stigma of psychopathologies disguised as racist technologies that developed in Brazil throughout the colonial period and which became extended as agency mechanisms in the present day. But we can observe the power of this body in its composition and state of production and reproduction of escape elements, as Canguilhem (2010, p. 11) suggests: “Nature would find means for healing”, which corroborates with Deleuze and Guattari (2009), of the BwO “being seething”; which has reproduction and in its schizoid moments attribute new other possibilities to itself, autonomy even when technologies of biopower that Foucault (1999) also denounce: they experience the marginality of the norm, showing its true face as well as contempt for difference. Neusa Santos (1983) in her clinic creates the concept of the White Ego Ideal, pointing out the onslaughts of violence suffered by black bodies in the construction of their identity. She postulates that in the construction of our Ego Ideal, we build a fetish for reaching an unreachable body.

The reaction of black thought to the violence of the White Ideal is not a response to the displeasure of frustration, a peripheral element of the conflict, but a response to pain. The black subject, faced with the wound that is the representation of his body image, tries, above all, to heal what bleeds. It is to this work of siege to pain, of injury regeneration that thought is dedicated. At a cost that, as can be seen in this work, will be increasingly high. The tribute paid by blacks to the racist spoliation of their right to identity is that of having to live with a thought incapable of formulating statements of pleasure about the subject's identity. Racism tends to banish from the psychic life of the black person all pleasure and all thoughts of pleasure. (NEUSA SANTOS, 1983, P. 10).



Santos' thought (1983) is directly linked to the philosophy of difference, which focuses on the reproduction of a crystallized identity on a system that strains its truth over any other change from the exclusion of any other difference between themselves. The process of illness that Santos (1983) evokes is precisely related to the concentration of an imposed rule of normality of being, in which bodies that are different from themselves are subjected to the production of psychopathologies by the unattainable hegemonic identity of an ideal body. The black body was subjected to the process of illness and the production of pathologies created by hegemonic groups that face pillars of power over the other which Foucault (1999, p. 217) says "selection, normalization, hierarchization, and centralization.". These elements that Foucault (1999) addresses as pillars for the production and reproduction of knowledge and right over the other, is what Santos (1983, p. 33) relates: "There needs to be a model from which the individual can be constituted"; the very normalization of the white body as an ideal over a norm that places it in difference to the pathological, which takes Lima Barreto - even as a body with great creative power - to spaces relegated to illness, pathological, abnormal. construction of a psychopathology that is not constitutive of nature, it is molded and created by society, Santos (1983, p. 78) states: "this narcissistic wound and the ways of dealing with it constitute the psychopathology of the Brazilian black".

The philosophy of difference enters as a primordial axis, in addition to exemplifying and exposing the technological tools of the illness of the black population and the general population, it also raises the thought that it is through reproduction that we can overcome not only the disease itself but also your healing process. Teixeira (2019, p. 190) reports that: "diseases are at the same time natural and ideal species". In this way, the philosophy of difference helps us to think in different ways about the normal and the pathological since thinking about them is an important way of elaborating new visions and new perspectives for the production of knowledge. Grisotto (2012, p. 180) reports the importance of overcoming: "the existence of a true way of thinking, universally shared; the one according to which we are diverted from thought by forces alien to it". If Deleuze (2008) enunciates that the Being is in the difference of its multiplicity and not in the identification of a crystallized being, the way of observing and verifying the normal and the pathological should in itself consider this assumption.

### **Contemporaries and Merleau-Ponty**

It is in this identification between power and life that Achille Mbembe (2018) reconstructs Foucault's concept of biopower for necropolitics. The theme of Mbembe (2018) relates the didactics between the choice of life and death which is fostered by the State machine and control institutions in the social environment. Who are the bodies that we can kill or imprison and that are on the reverberation between the normal and the pathological? Necropolitics opens up this narrative that biopower does not always carry out by exposing identifiable technologies of control over bodies in contemporary times. The sovereignty of the sovereign transferred to the bureaucratic instances of the rule of law as a metric for a decision about us, our destiny, and our conditions in a model baptized by science as an absolute truth about

bodies. It is this sovereignty over the institutions that Mbembe (2018, p. 38) entangles: “in this case, sovereignty is the ability to define who matters and who does not, who is “disposable” and who is not.”. Even referring to war machines and social urgencies in which the State has the right to decide between life and death, the concept extends to the instrumentalization of bodies between normal and pathological.

The mention of the aforementioned authors fits in the context of the relational work method of Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology (1945), in the thinking between the normal and the pathological. In this close relationship, expand - like an atmosphere - different and important concepts that are prominent crossings in the construction of criticism about the proposed theme. The same pointed out that our consciousness does not have an existence on the individual pass of itself, just as science and phenomenology do not constitute it as a single objective. Moreira (2004, p. 448) states that “perception, for Merleau-Ponty, is the field of the revelation of the world - field of experience - it is not a psychic act.”. Between the normal and the pathological among the precepts of Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology and the philosophy of perception, there is no interest in itself in the crystallized scientific assumptions, but in the perception between the subject and the object to be analyzed. Thus, the identification of phenomenology between the normal and the pathological is directly linked to the constitution of the perceptive experiences of the body/mind and its surroundings in the conception between the body and its pathological and normal constitution and, above all, criticizing the truth.

The notion of truth in Merleau-Ponty moves, then, towards the meaning that appears and disappears, escapes, in the opacity of the world. Truth is a movement in the making, not a state. This moment is constituted in my relationship with the world, in my perceptive field and what characterizes the essence of this truth is the inexhaustible mystery, a perpetual genesis, always open. Truth is a mystery, endlessly starting over, inexhaustible. It's about revealing it. Merleau-Ponty abolishes closed truths and idealistic thoughts. He puts phenomenology on its feet in the world. Knowledge is always unfinished, there is no absolute. His perspective has a political stance that disallows any kind of totalitarianism. (MOREIRA, 2004, p. 449).

The first conception that we must elaborate on the institutions of power and truth about what is normal and what is pathological is to understand how Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology describes the body. In the model between theory and practice, the body is not just a truth that will inhabit what is said about the inner man, man is an extension of the world about himself, Merleau-Ponty (1945) observes that "there is no inner man, man is in the world, it is in the world that he knows himself". It is in this subjective multiplicity that bodies are not mere instruments that organs and their psychic constitutions will accumulate. Our existence ceases to be a cumulative object of causal crossings only between our body and the pathological truth as a determinant of what we are.

That is why, for Merleau-Ponty (1945), in psychopathologies linked to the object, it is necessary to have a relationship with the phenomena that constitute that being, not only with a single piece of our body/organs that defines the being for the pathological, but observes Santos, Júnior, and Fontenelle (2018), “it is therefore necessary that psychic disorders be understood from their respective phenomenal fields, that is, personal, family and social history of the patient.”. Merleau-Ponty (1945) himself emulates this

opposition that when we observe and treat the body as a machine and its organs separately as constituents of its being, it corroborates the idea that only the imposition of the pathological is the only metric to institute what it is normal or not. This aversion places the perspective on the structuring of the adult body as an idealizing point of the ideal norm outside the pathological parameters, thus replicating the constitution of bodies outside the molds as abnormal the ideal prerogative - children, adults within some spectrum and pathology (CID), elderly:

Perhaps there is a hypothesis there for the ever-increasing tendency to pathologize childhood and old age. In general, childhood has become essentially pathological insofar as it imposes any type of obstacle, resistance, delay, inadequacy, nonconformity, or even lack of interest in everything that concerns the productive normality of adult life. To be healthy in this sense is to stop being a child sooner and earlier to be able to perform an adult and productive performance, that is, to be useful. On the other hand, the insane and the sick, most of the time, are evaluated much more on scales that demonstrate how far they are from performing the adult performance. (SANTOS, JÚNIOR AND FONTENELLE, 2018, p. 235).

Among Foucault's triad (2005): power, law, and truth; phenomenology points out the conditions in which the body finds itself in the world and its experiences, relating time, space, and especially the other. In the agency instrumentalization of bodies, the other is faced with the need for identification as a bridge between resolutions about the world, starting from a logic of the collective unconscious as a mass of basic maneuver on the spaces in which we live and the time. This perspective creates a dysphoria between subjective resolutions between differences. For Souza, Bloc, and Moreira (2020), phenomenology fits as “a tool for diagnostic understanding that, through a phenomenological lens, enables the understanding of the (psycho)pathological lived world.”. Questioning raises the projection for us to understand the perspectives and worldview of the body that is categorized as pathological. It is necessary that in the process we understand the phenomenon of illness and how it happens between the conjunctures that cross the body.

### **A critical thought: some results**

Throughout this research, the bibliographic survey was added to the discussion seminars with the NEM study group, with meetings for the discussion and development of critical thinking about the most varied themes, including the processes of illness that lead to the production of phenomena, we consider some important results to be exposed. First, there is an existing system that corroborates the processes of illness and the functionality of pathologies within a binary system that makes other forms and narratives of perception impossible. The merit of medical practices and the psychology clinic itself is not judged here regarding the treatment of psychopathologies, but the elimination of other perspectives beyond the normal and pathological. There is a body, made up of subjectivities, desires, and potential products for the most varied purposes of life. This body, when it becomes ill, deconfigures its notion and personality to be reduced to its pathology in the search for its normal state. In the readings of Canguilhem (2010), we can highlight that the processes between normal and pathological eliminate their natural character of the search of the

body itself to denounce changes to create, recreate, and build, a new body, a new possibility of existence, which the pathology itself demonstrates its path.

This physiological dynamics of practices in removing the whole character of the illness process recurred in what we can discuss about the readings of different fundamental authors for understanding the pathologies and practices of science - Foucault, Georges Canguilhem, Deleuze, Guattari, Neusa Santos, Achille Mbembe and Merleau-Ponty who point to the following discussions and interpretations as relevant results: a) the body is no longer a body in the process of becoming ill, it is a damaged organ that needs treatment and evasive and urgent practices, at cost - many of the sometimes going over the wishes and desires of the other for the fulfillment of practices that use power, right and truth - to recover their normal state; b) bodies that are pathological or in states of pathologies, abnormalities and that flee the normative rule are not seen as potential for the production of life and new forms of affections, reproduction, it is disqualified and is reduced to its pathology; c) the normal and pathological state does not interfere with the potentiality of bodies to produce life and other perspectives, which directly interferes with the critique of the normative rule; d) depending on the environment and the relationships produced by it, pathology is a creation of the system itself; e) there is a relationship of power, truth and rights where life and death are enforced from the logic imposed, related to the normal and pathological, not necessarily related to psychopathologies, but also on ways and rules that are not aligned with the prerogatives hegemonic.

Life and its reproduction would thus be associated with mechanisms and technologies that produce norms about their realization and functioning. In normalizing practices, the search for the normal state to subject bodies to a hygienist logic of a society that does not deal with difference, reports how our relationship with psychopathologies relegates life to spaces as regulatory institutions of a logic that mischaracterizes its existence. In clinics and hospitals, the discussion rises to characterize a body that is not in its entirety, a body without organs that can make itself the promotion of life and freedom for the construction of the new. In these spaces, our discussions remained at an impasse to carry out critical thinking, which promotes not only the cure and the mischaracterization of life for pathology in the search for its normal state, but that we can understand these processes of illness so that in the process itself it is possible to find the character of the pathology, whether it is produced by the environment or by the very nature of the body.

#### **4 CONCLUSION**

Social configurations lead us to rethink the construction of knowledge and hegemonic knowledge, the relationship between power, law, and truth - which drive the construction of the normal and the pathological - are reconfigured when we analyze new perspectives of agency on bodies. The role of phenomenology is not the reproduction of assemblages and having a single truth about the practices that interfere in the relationships we have between our body and institutions, much less to establish an absolute right over any resolution regarding the psychophysiological demands of others and their bodies. , but to

rethink an absolute right over them, where the interdisciplinary meeting of thoughts can provide a liberating subjection. In thinking that the environment itself is the production of pathologies of existing bodies, and that difference can be a way to raise new dynamic prerogatives of physiology - medical and psychological. Merleau-Ponty's thought faces an interesting crossroads: the interdisciplinary encounter in practices as the promotion of micropolitics for the molecular reach of the other's desires. This thought encourages the reconfiguration and proposal of ideas that permeate common sense about the normal and the pathological - relating the multiple forms of observation and knowledge, without the technological character of agency machines with regulation to the normative logic. Common sense will also operate in communion with the sciences and philosophy itself in providing a body without organs that can think and produce powers over life, from the art of Lima Barreto to the confrontation of devices that provide the construction of illness.

The devices that create and recreate war machines as a food promotion of their system to arrange binarity where the existence of letting live and letting die is the promotion of its action on the other, refute the importance of the struggle between the normal and the pathological. There is not only one society, there is a norm, when bodies are placed in the movement of their desires and that flee from the normative logic, the control of biopower infers regulatory devices of power, law, and truth, to control and frame this movement within the institution's feedback binarity. Phenomenology runs away from the binary norm, it does not reproduce a homeland of a totalizing philosophy of knowledge, it recreates a homeland to meet a phratry as an insurgent revolution of the macropolitics of movements of thought and body. The phratry as a device of phenomenology does not accept binarity, it is interdisciplinary, where the sciences operate not as power and right over the other, but rather as becoming normal, becoming pathological, becoming psychopathological, and becoming different. The difference is the meeting to understand the processes of illness, not as an outcast, not as the disease being a manifestation contrary to nature, but rather, that up close nobody is normal, there is no absolute truth, there is a cure when there is the disease, the disease is part of the very process that nature makes and reproduces itself.

Thus, we observe that a society that experiences the resolution of universal knowledge, is subject to conceiving new pathologies as its way of maintaining biopower and necropolitics. This resolution sheds light on understanding that bodies are effects of devices in pursuit of an unattainable norm, where institutions have the right and power of who lives and who dies, of what is normal and what is pathological, thus depriving possibilities of creation of knowledge, of life, of freedom and of recognition and reproduction of ourselves and of what we do not make our own. The difference is a power device for interdisciplinary freedom that restricts agency technologies. What is different from psychopathology to the body? The very path of illness, the very nature of the pathology which is also analogous to normality, even if under different conditions, are parts of a whole, often ignored by the sciences and medical practices and psychological clinic, and it is through this path that we are interested. to phenomenology, the illness process, which is also important for science and the promotion of bodies that are powers, creators, with the powerful freedom to produce the new and not just parts of normality and pathology:



“But what is this power? It is the power to start something else, as we never remain suspended in nothingness. We are always in fullness, in being, just as a face, even at rest, even dead, is always condemned to express something (there are frightened, calm, discreet dead), and just as silence is still a modality of the world of sound.” (Merleau-Ponty, 1945 p. 606)

## REFERENCES

- BARRETO, Afonso Henriques de Lima. **Diário do hospício; o cemitério dos vivos**. Rio de Janeiro: Secretaria Municipal de Cultura, Departamento Geral de Documentação e Informação Cultural, Divisão de editoração, 1993.
- CANGUILHEN, Georges. **O normal e o patológico**. Rio de Janeiro, 6. ed. rev. Forense Universitária, 2010
- DELEUZE, G.; GUATTARI, F. **Mil Platôs: capitalismo e esquizofrenia**. v. 1. Tradução de Aurélio Guerra Neto e Celia Pinto Costa. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2009.
- DELEUZE & GUATTARI. **Como criar para si um corpo sem órgãos**. In Mil Platôs. Vol. 3. Tradução de Aurélio Guerra Neto et alli. São Paulo: Ed. 34, 2008.
- ECHER, Isabel Cristina. **A revisão de literatura na construção do trabalho científico**. R. gaúcha Enferm., Porto Alegre, v22, n.2, p.5-20, jul. 2001. Disponível em: <https://www.lume.ufrgs.br/bitstream/handle/10183/23470/000326312.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>. Acesso em: 18 de maior de 2022.
- ESTELLITA-LINS, Carlos. **Saúde vulgar e fabricação do corpo a partir de Georges Canguilhem**. São Luís, v. 7, n. 2, p. 55-79, jul./dez. 2021. Disponível em: <https://periodicoseletronicos.ufma.br/index.php/ricultsociedade/article/view/18377/9915>. Acesso em: 15 de janeiro de 2020.
- FOUCAULT, Michel. **Em defesa da sociedade: curso no Collège de France (1975/1976)**. 4º tiragem, 2005. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 1999. – (Coleção tópicos).
- GRISOTTO, Américo. **Filosofia da diferença: apontamento em torno da aprendizagem do pensamento em filosofia**. Campinas, v. 14, n. 1, p. 179-198, jan./jun. 2012. Disponível em: <https://periodicos.sbu.unicamp.br/ojs/index.php/etd/article/view/1246/pdf>. Acesso em: 18 de maio de 2022.
- GUATTARI, Félix. **Revolução molecular: pulsações políticas do desejo**. Editora brasiliense s.a. 1981.
- HUR, Domenico Uhng. **A clínica do corpo sem órgãos: esquizoanálise e esquizodrama**. Revista de Artes Visuais, v. 25, n. 44, jul./dez. 2020. Disponível em: <https://www.seer.ufrgs.br/index.php/PortoArte/article/view/110078/59875>. Acesso em: 20 de agosto de 2022.
- MASCARO, Alysson Leandro. **Canguilhem: saúde, doença e norma**. Veritas, Porto Alegre, v. 65, n. 1, p. 1-15, jan.-mar. 2020. Disponível em: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15448/1984-6746.2020.1.35902>. Acesso em: 14 de maio de 2022.
- MBEMBE, Achille. **Necropolítica**. 3. ed. São Paulo: n-1 edições, 2018. 80 p.
- MERLEAU-PONTY, Maurice. **Phénoménologie de la perception**. Paris: Gallimard, 1945.
- MOREIRA, Virginia. **O Método Fenomenológico de Merleau-Ponty como Ferramenta Crítica na Pesquisa em Psicopatologia**. Psicologia: Reflexão e Crítica, 2004, 17(3), pp.447-456.
- SANTOS, Neemyas Kerr Batalha Dos; SILVA JUNIOR, Almir Ferreira Da; FONTENELLE, Plínio Santos. **A medicalização da existência segundo a fenomenologia de Merleau-Ponty**. Arq. bras. psicol.,

Rio de Janeiro, v. 70, n. 3, p. 232-245, 2018. Disponível em:  
[http://pepsic.bvsalud.org/scielo.php?script=sci\\_arttext&pid=s1809-52672018000300016&lng=pt&nrm=iso](http://pepsic.bvsalud.org/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=s1809-52672018000300016&lng=pt&nrm=iso). Acessos em: 18/03/2022.

SANTOS. Neusa Souza. **Tornar-se negro ou as vicitudes da identidade do negro brasileiro em ascensão social**. 2ª edição – Rio de Janeiro: Edições Graal, 1983.

SOUZA, Camila Pereira de. BLOC, Lucas Guimarães. MOREIRA, Virginia. **Corpo, Tempo, Espaço e Outro como Condições de Possibilidade do Vivido (Psico)patológico**. Estudos e Pesquisas em Psicologia, 2020, Vol. spe. doi: 10.12957/epp.2020.56660. Disponível em: <https://www.e-publicacoes.uerj.br/index.php/revispsi/article/view/56660/36219>. Acesso em: 22/03/2020.

TEIXEIRA, Rafael Henrique. **Canguilhem, Foucault e a medicina**. Discurso, v. 49, n. 2, 2019, pp. 187-210. Disponível em: <file:///C:/Users/Porto/Downloads/138092-Texto%20do%20artigo-387077-1-10-20200103.pdf>. Acesso em: 17 de junho de 2022.

VELOSO, CAETANO. **Vaca profana**. Rio de Janeiro: RCA: 1984. 4:40