

The actuality of the schizoanalytical perspective: astonishment, enunciation, subjectification

*Actualité de la perspective schizoanalytique:
étonnement, énonciation, subjectivation*

*Atualidade da perspectiva esquizoanalítica:
assombro, enunciação, subjetivação*

*Actualidad de la perspectiva esquizoanalítica:
asombro, enunciación, subjetivación*

Sébastien Pesce² 

1

Abstract: This article proposes a work of theorization that articulates the daily life of a professional field, that of teaching in France, considered from the standpoint of the relationship that teachers have with language. The article provides a description and an analysis of a socio-clinical intervention practice implemented by the author of this article and a theoretical framework, that of Félix Guattari's schizoanalysis. This reflection aims to propose some elements of an answer to the following question: how should professionals be supported in developing new forms of language that allow them, on the one hand, to be surprised again (and to think differently) about their daily professional reality and, on the other hand, to engage in processes of collective subjectivation?

Keywords: Socio-clinical intervention. Schizoanalysis. Enunciation. Collective subjection.

Resumé: *Le présent article propose un travail de théorisation articulant: le quotidien d'un terrain professionnel, celui de l'enseignement français, envisagé du point de vue du rapport que les enseignants entretiennent au langage; l'évocation et l'analyse d'une pratique d'intervention de type socio-clinique, celle mise en œuvre par l'auteur du présent article; un cadre de référence théorique, celui de la schizoanalyse de Félix Guattari. Ce travail d'articulation théorique vise à proposer des éléments de réponse à une question: comment accompagner des professionnels à développer de nouvelles formes de langage qui leur permettent, d'une part de s'étonner de nouveau (et de penser autrement) leur réalité professionnelle quotidienne, d'autre part de s'engager dans des processus de subjectivation collective?*

Mots-clés: *Intervention socio-clinique. Schizoanalyse. Énonciation. Subjectivation collective.*

Resumo: *Este artigo propõe um trabalho de teorização que articula o cotidiano de um campo profissional, o do ensino na França, considerado do ponto de vista da relação que os professores têm com a linguagem; a evocação e análise de uma prática de intervenção socioclínica, que é implementada pelo autor deste artigo; um referencial teórico, no caso a esquizoanálise de Félix Guattari. Este trabalho de articulação teórica visa propor elementos de resposta a uma questão: como apoiar os profissionais no desenvolvimento de novas formas de linguagem que lhes permitam, por um lado, serem novamente surpreendidos (e pensar de forma diferente) sobre a sua realidade profissional diária e, por outro lado, envolverem-se em processos de subjetivação coletiva?*

Palavras clave: *Intervenção socioclínica. Esquizoanálise. Enunciação. Subjetivação coletiva.*

¹ **Submitted:** 20 Dec. 2018 – **Accepted:** 16 May. 2019 – **Published:** 18 Nov. 2019.

² University of Orleans, France, EA7493 ERCAE EA7493 – Email: sebastien.pesce@univ-orleans.fr

Resumen: Este artículo propone un trabajo de teorización que articula: la vida cotidiana de un campo profesional, el de la enseñanza en Francia, considerada desde el punto de vista de la relación que los profesores tienen con el lenguaje; la evocación y el análisis de una práctica de intervención socio-clínica, la implementada por el autor de este artículo; un marco de referencia teórico, el del esquizoanálisis de Félix Guattari. Esta articulación teórica pretende proponer elementos de respuesta a una pregunta: ¿cómo apoyar a los profesionales en el desarrollo de nuevas formas de lenguaje que les permitan, por un lado, sorprenderse de nuevo (y pensar de otra manera) sobre su realidad profesional cotidiana, y por otro lado, comprometerse en procesos de subjetivación colectiva?

Palabras clave: Intervención socio-clínica. Esquizoanálisis. Enunciación. Subjetivación colectiva.

Introduction

This article proposes a work of theorization that articulates the daily life of a professional field, that of teaching in France, considered from the standpoint of the relationship that teachers have with language. The article provides a description and an analysis of a socio-clinical intervention practice implemented by the author of this article and a theoretical framework, that of Félix Guattari's schizoanalysis. This reflection aims to propose some elements of an answer to the following question: how should professionals be supported in developing new forms of language that allow them, on the one hand, to be surprised again (and to think differently) about their daily professional reality, and on the other hand, to engage in processes of collective subjectivation?

A common observation in the literature of the institutional analysis field is that when subjects attempt to emancipate themselves from the ideology imposed on them by those who dominate them, they are prevented from doing so by the way that the language carrying that ideology is imposed on them. The subjects lack an alternative language, which would allow them to develop a different relationship with the world. Thus, emancipating oneself from an ideology and a dominant world view implies certain conditions. Actors must collectively engage in new forms of enunciation, renewing their way of speaking, in terms of vocabulary, but especially in terms of arrangements of enunciation or the rhetorical dimension of language. These new enunciation arrangements are the condition for the initiation of a process of collective subjectification. This double process of enunciation and subjectification, within groups of professionals, is in my opinion directly related to the question of astonishment: a new language makes it possible to construct a new perspective on the world and on the situations experienced daily; it makes it possible to rediscover aspects of the world that were previously ignored because the forms of enunciation privileged until then imposed a certain definition of the situation and led to observing certain aspects of reality and ignoring others.

As we will see, several authors have raised the following idea in the past: Guattari's thinking proposes a perspective that remains original regarding the processes of enunciation and subjectification, and one challenge would be to translate these theories into intervention practices. I will adopt a slightly different perspective here: all "institutional practices" (i.e., institutional pedagogy, institutional psychotherapy, institutional analysis) aim at favouring the emergence of new forms of enunciation and subjectification. They do not reflect or

decline Guattari's thought; however, Guattari's thought can constitute a grid of analysis to account for it. This is the objective that this article proposes to pursue.

Definition of the problem

My teaching and research experience lead me to explore two types of environments in which very different forms of teaching speech are deployed. As a “teacher-researcher” (following the French way of designing academics), I am daily immersed in the various worlds in which the usual, dominant language of the French education system is used: the ESPE (*école supérieure du professorat et de l'éducation*, an institute dedicated to teacher training), classes and schools, and meetings during which I collaborate with various actors in this education system. As a researcher, my work is related to socio-clinical intervention and leads me to accompany teams within the framework of mechanisms inspired by institutional analysis; mechanisms aimed, according to Lourau's definition, at promoting the development of the power of actors. In the first of these worlds, I am constantly confronted with stereotypical thinking based on the dominant language of the institution. In the second, my work consists of accompanying the emergence of a different language: forms of enunciation that are differentiated by the words used, the meaning associated with them, and the rhetorical forms that structure them (the way in which enunciation and interaction are organized) with the stereotypical language of the institution, but especially the ideology that this language carries.

In the first of these worlds, we perceive a rejection, a resistance, attempts to denounce these dominant forms of thought and language. A question arises in the face of these resistances, the one that Michel de Certeau (1968/1997) has already formulated with regard to status and content, and with them the effects of these critical, even deviant statements—the question of the capacity of those who are speaking, those who are usually represented but who question the legitimacy of the representatives to speak for them, to hold a speech that is not reduced to simple negation, simply the opposite of what was said until then: “every negation is content with inverting the terms of the affirmation that it contradicts [...] this sign still acknowledges a pedagogy or institutions that are incapable of furnishing other generations with the instruction that would allow them to recognize an experience other than that of their ‘cadres’ or of their teachers” (CERTEAU, 1968, p. 44-45). In other words, do the “revolted” have a language, a vocabulary or symbols that allow them to do something other than validate or reject the usual, dominant discourse? Can they say something else, something new, to open a third way, which is, in the words of Bernard (1973) commenting on Lourau, neither the speech of the working group (submitted) nor the speech of the base group (speech of negation), but the speech of the action group, which has entered into a time of singularity, in the negation of negation?

This question of the ability to say something new, by which the dominated imposes his or her own “politics of representation”ⁱ, arises in any human organization. It is the one question, perhaps the central question of institutional analysis as a whole, that is explicitly posed by Guattari's schizoanalysis. To address the theme proposed in this issue by Eduardo

Simonini Lopes and Roberta Carvalho Romagnoli, my purpose will be to put into perspective the socio-clinical intervention programmes implemented for educational and pedagogical teams with regard to certain aspects of the schizoanalytic theoretical framework. The purpose will be to understand to what extent the methods favour, at the very least, collective arrangements of enunciation, envisaged as levers for a discussion that is structured as a negation of negation and that presupposes that a collective should shift its focus, take a fresh look at its environment, its daily life, in short, that it should “be surprised”: arrangements of enunciation and subjectification, in a spirit characteristic of Guattari’s thought - in my opinion, more generally of the institutionalist movement - are articulated in these speaking arrangements. I will begin by going back to Guattari’s work, before turning to the research-intervention programmes that are of interest to us here.

From the experience of institutional psychotherapy to an attempt to historicize semiotic phenomena

Guattari’s reflection is rooted in the experience of “intra-hospital therapeutical clubs” in which “new instruments of disalienation were forged” (GUATTARI, 1974/2015, p. 61-62). The care given to the “madmen” implied, beyond a simple “psychology of adaptation”, in order to “really reach the level of the subject” (GUATTARI, 1974/2015, p. 40) and to question the processes of institutionalization, a detour necessary to “access to the most fundamental desires”: “This is where we introduce the notion of “institutionalization”, the problem of the production of institutions: who produces the institution and articulates its sub-groups Is there a way to modify this production? The general proliferation of institutions in contemporary society leads only to reinforcing the alienation of the individual: is it possible to operate a transfer of responsibility, of replacing bureaucracy with institutional creativity?” (GUATTARI, 1974/2015, p. 62).

To address these processes of institutionalization, Guattari engages in a project to historicize the processes of semiotization and their role in the games of power to which human groups are subjected, beyond the confines of the psychiatric institution; a historicization that, as we will see, aims to overcome the structuralist impasse (GUATTARI, 1974/2015, p. 174 - see Kerslake’s analysis, 2008, p. 44). Guattari thus analyses the effects of “modernity” on language and desire: “current informatic and communication machines do not just convey representative contents but equally contribute to the preparation of new (individual and/or collective) Assemblages of enunciation” (GUATTARI, 1989/2013, p. 2). This critical endeavour (a defining element of schizoanalysis) aims to account for these “voices/pathways of power, circumscribing and circumventing human groups from the outside, either by direct coercion and the panoptic hold on bodies, or by the seizure of the soul through the imaginary” (GUATTARI, 1989/2013, p. 3). Time is “emptied of its natural rhythms”, “chronometric machines” paving the way to “Taylorist dividing up of work” (GUATTARI, 1989/2013, p. 10). Subjects are deprived of the social territorialities they believe to be immutable (GUATTARI, 1989/2013, p. 9) and with “the general penetration of the printed text throughout the gears of social and cultural life, corresponding to a certain

collapse of direct oral performances, but which, in compensation, will authorize a much greater capacity for the accumulation and treatment of knowledges” (GUATTARI, 1989/2013, p. 10).

This phenomenon of substitution of written for oral language is widespread, and the way it is organized in the field of education is of course only an avatar. Writing stabilizes and sediments ideas and practices within customs, habits, rules, and procedures. It imposes modes of apprehension of reality and reinforces the incorporation of constraining semiotic frameworks. An example can be given here from the field of education. The competency-based approaches favoured in France and elsewhere are changing the way in which school curricula are formalized in terms of stating what each student must learn. The “learning expectations”, when expressed in terms of competencies, make it possible to increase the level of precision and detail and to name each of the teaching contents in a language that is naturally taken up by the teachers themselves. These competencies operate with a diacritical function: they distinguish, they organize, and they categorize. However, while producing this high degree of precision, this vocabulary removes complexity, articulations and connections between knowledge contents. When teachers describe the daily life of the classroom, their own and that of the students’, they do so in the same language, in the same formulations as “suggested” in school curricula and in the documents describing national priorities in terms of education. This technocratic, technical language that organizes the institution’s discourse is thus taken up by the teachers themselves. They are required to implement programmes to the letter and are regularly assessed on the adequacy of their own practices with the national prescription, a prescription which, because of its degree of precision, comes to describe every moment of their daily professional life. They are logically led to constantly report on their slightest teaching gesture in relation to these standards, with the same vocabulary. The emptiness and absurdity of modern pedagogical language thus easily pass into their own minds and into their own speech. That is what the written text does. Orality tends to manipulate with more flexibility, to modify and revisit reality as innovation processes unfold.

The written word is a permanent part of a process of “Semiological Subjection”, carrying the products of a “complex of ‘extra-human’ semiotic machines” (GUATTARI, 1979b/1996, p. 141). “Pragmatic fields of power formation” (GUATTARI, 1979b/1996, p. 142), experienced and then stabilized in the form of languages, see their effectiveness determined by the dominant forms of semiotization that they have put in place (GUATTARI, 1979b/1996, p. 142). These fields of power formation are a frame of reference: in some cases delirious forms of semiotic performance are defined, and in others, at the other end of the spectrum, they take the form of “sclerotic encodings” - those of the “standard dictionary”, the “academic grammar”, a “religious or political credos” (GUATTARI, 1979b/1996, p. 142). These “components of semiotic enslavement constitute, in reality, the fundamental tools that permit the dominant classes their assurance of power over the agents of production” (GUATTARI, 1979b/1996, p. 143). A well-known and striking example is the “language elements” that structure the discourse of politicians when they stand up to impose a certain definition of the situation on the public. Guattari therefore seeks to historicize this language, to reconstruct its history and to remind us that it is the result of a long process and that it was alive, that it was the result of an invention, before it became sedimented.

In the time of its invention, this language was alive, it carried the subjectivity of those who produced it to talk about their world and their experience. As this language became sclerosed, it emptied itself of the substance that these subjectivities constituted. Thus, for Guattari, following Kersale's analysis (2008, p. 48), "the industrial revolution has tended to expropriate institutions, taking from them their metaphysical substance", on the basis of "signifiers that exist to block and prevent the emergence of any subjective process on the part of the group" (GUATTARI, 1974/2015, p. 220). The French education system, like probably other education systems throughout the world, does not escape this process of deinstitutionalization, the basis of which is the imposition of semiotic forms that exempt the subject from the need to engage in complex processes of semiotization, ultimately prohibiting him or her from doing so. The subject has a language imposed on him or her, and with it an ideology outside of which he or she can no longer think and no longer has the opportunity or the need to think. The words to say the world are already available, but above all, the situations that might seem "surprising", problematic or mysterious are not or seem not to be: they are already defined, and the group lives in the illusion that they are not problematic. The problem is already constructed according to a certain model: it does not need to be elucidated, and it does not require the use of an original enunciation that would allow it to be reflected in a singular discourse, inhabited by the subjectivities of professionals.

These semiotic processes maintain collectives in a status of subjugated groups, "groups that receive their law from the outside" (GUATTARI, 1974/2015, p. 107); in other words, groups with a heteronomous relationship to any form of norm. In contrast to these subjected groups, subject groups have a "vocation", "control its own behavior and elucidate its object", and even better, "produce its own tools of elucidation". This kind of group "hears and is heard", "can therefore work out its own system of hierarchizing structures and so become open to a world beyond its own immediate interests". While "the dependent group is not capable of getting things into this sort of perspective" ("its cause is heard, but no one knows where or by whom, or when"), the subject group produces a statement, takes a position, and "become open to a world beyond its own immediate interests" (GUATTARI, 1974/2015, p. 107).

The French educational system and semiotic subjection

The actors in the French education system, at all levels, from teachers themselves to managers, are caught up in the semiotic forms characteristic of such semiotic subjection. It is the same vocabulary and with it the same stereotypical thinking that organizes the discourse of inspectors, educational advisers, trainers and teachers. It is always the same explanatory, psychologizing categories, emphasizing factors external to the classroom and pedagogical practices that this language makes it possible to mobilize, maintaining teams in an often caricatural form of non-thinking. When educational and pedagogical systems fail, the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM) thus provides a whole range of terms to explain that failure comes from the student's "disease", "disorder". A hundred years ago, it was said that these students were "weak ones" ("*débiles*"), today it is said that they are

dyslexic or that they suffer from attention disorders. The teams of teachers, while constantly in a position of rejection of their hierarchy, do not seem able to emancipate themselves from the language imposed by the institution's managers. They thus oscillate between the position of the working group, a dependent group (which willingly submits to the hierarchy) and that of the base group, which has entered into rejection, negation, but not yet into the negation of negation, between the time of universality and that of particularity. In Guattari's sense, a question arises regarding the conditions for the emergence of forms of enunciation that support a dynamic of collective subjectivation: how to allow groups of professionals to carry a new word, a word that is their own, and by which these groups engage, at the same time as they engage in this process of enunciation, in a process of subjectification—in the simple sense that subjectification implies the enunciation of an “I”, of a true discourse in first person and collective subjectivation the enunciation of a “we”.

Indeed, what interests Guattari, as Deleuze analyses in his preface to *Psychoanalysis and Transversality*, are the conditions “for a new subjectivity, a group subjectivity” (DELEUZE, 1974/2015, p. 7): “Group-subjects, on the other hand, are defined by coefficients of transversality that ward off totalities and hierarchies. They are agents of enunciation, environments of desire, elements of institutional creation” (DELEUZE, 1974/2015, p. 14). However, it is not simply a question of “thinking” these semiotic springs of the institution. In a praxist logic characteristic of the institutionalist movement, the aim is indeed political. This new semiotics of the institution aims to provide tools, aiming at concrete effects: “these notions have a precise practical orientation: introducing a militant political function into the institution, constituting a kind of ‘monster’ which is neither psychoanalysis, nor hospital practice, even less group dynamics, and which is everywhere applicable, in the hospital, at school, in a militant group—a machine to produce and give voice to desire” (DELEUZE, 1974/2015, p. 19).

Frédéric Rambeau (2013) analyses these new forms of subjectivity in this way: “those by which we recognize ourselves as subjects, counted and named in the regimes of signs used by social organization to regulate production flows, and those which do not yet exist, but which are called by enunciations that break or deviate from dominant semiotics”. Subjectivation is considered “the production of group subjectivity” and is therefore an “intrinsically political” issue. The question thus raised is that of the very concrete conditions of this subjectification, which can be named by the notion of “collective arrangements of enunciation” that is at the “heart of the Guattarist theory and practice of groups”; “the question of political subjectification is that of the nature of the unification of the collective: the problem of the real, effective conditions to which a collective formation must respond in order to produce a disassociated subjectivity”. This way of apprehending subjectivity “avoids confusing the subject with the self, the person” (FOURQUET, 2007, p. 50) and assumes, more simply, the person's ability, as he or she goes through the activity of enunciation, to reveal himself or herself (first to himself or herself) as a subject: “this subject is not conscious, but unconscious. What is the unconscious? That's what the conscience doesn't see. That's all. That's all. There is no unconscious in itself, but only for the self” (FOURQUET, 2007, p. 50). Subjectivity is “plural –polyphonic, to borrow a term preferred by Mikhail Bakhtin” (GENOSKO, 2002, p. 50).

The schizoanalytic approach as a quest for transversality

The subject group is the group that “enters into analysis” (Fernand Oury used this expression to define institutional pedagogy), an “analysand-subject that does not correspond to an individual” (GUATTARI, 1974/2015, p. 69). The subject group, thus having entered into analysis, “proposes to interpret their own position” (GUATTARI, 1974/2015, p. 70). Schizoanalysis is used to support this process of interpretation/subjectivation. It is defined as “the analysis of the impact of Assemblages of enunciation on semiotic and subjective productions in a given problematic context” (GUATTARI, 1989/2013, p. 18). Its vocation is “to become a discipline for reading other modelling systems” (GUATTARI, 1989/2013, p. 17). Schizoanalysis is not intended to be a general model, “but as an instrument for deciphering modelling systems in diverse domains, a meta-model” (GUATTARI, 1989/2013, p. 17). It constitutes a model for criticism (GENOSKO, 2002, p. 50).

The schizoanalytic approach is rooted in a critique of psychoanalysis and its simplified, stereotypical models of interpretation. Thinking of assemblages of enunciation aims to avoid being trapped by the traditional conception of the unconscious, which leads to the reduction of “the facts of subjectivity to drives, affects, intra-subjective instances and inter-subjective relations” (GUATTARI, 1989/2013, p. 18). Some assemblages of enunciation do not have “any subjective components” and sometimes “no conscious components”. Guattari assimilates the “structural models of psychoanalysis” to subjective figures “produced serially by television”: “their common trait, I repeat, is not to be sought in a correspondence of contents, but in a similarity of their procedures for deterritorializing-reterritorializing enunciation, and, as it happens, in a progress backwards, which leads us to ever more platitudes, ever more superficiality [...]. But the ultimate reductionist model belongs neither to literature nor to the mass media. Until further notice, it seems to belong to psychoanalysis, with its practice of signifying reduction and the generalized equivalence of affects and representations” (GUATTARI, 1989/2013, p. 45).

Transversality is at the heart of the schizoanalytical project. Transversality is opposed to the “verticality” of pyramidal structures, as much as to the horizontality that exists in hospital districts or asylums. “Think of a field with a fence around it in which there are horses with adjustable blinkers: the adjustment of their blinkers is the ‘coefficient of transversality’” (GUATTARI, 1974/2015, p. 112). Transversality is about “processual subject’s engendering of an existential territory and self-transportation beyond it” (GENOSKO, 2002, p. 55). Far from this transversality, the subjected group locks itself into its own terms of reference, repeating clichés, “and thus closing off the possibility of ever saying anything real, that is, anything that could have any connection with other strands of human discourse, historical, scientific, aesthetic or whatever” (GUATTARI, 1974/2015, p. 110).

The notion of transversality refers to “both a non-hierarchical dimension of power” and the “place of the unconscious subject of the group” (Guattari, 1974/2015, p. 84, quoted by FOURQUET, 2007, p. 557). If “the spontaneous tendency of power is to freeze into a hierarchy”, if it is “consumed by an institutional entropy that gradually petrifies human relationships and kills the institution”, there is a “real power” that is “diffuse, elusive” and

that resides in unconscious subjectivity - it is what remains “alive in this institutional prison” (FOURQUET, 2007, p. 557). Transversality is the condition for the engagement of the analytical process (GUATTARI, 1974/2015, p. 116).

Desalination and pragmatic fields of power

This transversality, this deverticalization of the institutional functioning, conditions and is conditioned by processes of subjectification that must be promoted. These processes are determined by the relationship to language, the norms that apply to the subject, and the linguistic forms that are considered “normal”: “any crystallization of competence as a standard and as a framing of concrete performances is always synonymous with the establishment of a position of power” (GUATTARI, 1979a/2007, p. 31). The aim is to understand how forms of “Semiological Subjection” and “Semiotic Enslavement” are organized (GUATTARI, 1979a/2007, p. 35). It is the contours of this linguistic normativity that Guattari seeks to deconstruct by denouncing the propagation of this norm across all aspects of social life: “semiotic components of enslavement constitute the fundamental tools that allow the dominant classes to assure their power over the agents of production. The “miracle” of capitalism is that it has succeeded to direct language, such that it is spoken, taught, televised, dreamt, etc” (GUATTARI, 1979a/2007, p. 38). It is well known to what extent the French language tends to become sedimented because of the joint action of institutions whose legitimacy seems obvious and because of an obsession, among the population, with this “proper speaking” - a definition of language as immutable, which makes the French language a kind of dead language. The official forms of language are overhanging, they are imposed on the subjects and are gradually internalized: “national languages, those spoken in the French Academy or on television, are metalanguages. Their ‘distance’ compared to the languages of the earth and the arbitrary forcefulness of their overcoding are the guarantors of their efficiency and paradoxically of their degree of internalization” (GUATTARI, 1979a/2007, p. 40).

The schizoanalytic approach thus implies a regaining of control over the language. It consists of using existing notions and giving them a specific, private meaning. “We thereby tend to constitute a subjective unity of the group by diverting the meaning of habitually used concepts. Recognition of the subjective consistency of this dialog between social persons depends on this unity” (GUATTARI, 1974/2015, p. 65-66). It is a question of bringing out the interpretation (interpretation that can be carried by the “deviant analyser”). “Transference and interpretation represent a symbolic mode of intervention” (GUATTARI, 1974/2015, p. 111). It is at this level that the construction of a new view of the world is at stake, the return of a certain capacity to be surprised by it: “it is no longer a question of thinking about the world, but of interpreting it, and interpreting it, is by this very fact transforming it, because enunciation frees subjectivity and it is this that does the job of transforming the world” (FOURQUET, 2007, p. 566). The institution comes to “gain control of what is being said, any possibility of creative intervention will depend on its initiators being able to exist at the point where ‘it should have been able to speak’”.

Thus, “a specific procedure of ‘institutional analysis’ could help produce ‘collective arrangements of enunciation’” (KERSLAKE, 2008, p. 52). “How can we achieve this polyphonic theoretical practice, which is that of the collective arrangement of enunciation? Of the concepts created by Félix Guattari, it is perhaps the one that best obeys his lifelong ‘ethical-political’ attention to the existential mutations brought about by the new historical contexts... because ‘the collective arrangement of enunciation’ engages the question of subjectivity from the angle of its production by reconstructing all the modalities of being as a group from the point of view of the fragmentation of the components of subjectivation that do not necessarily pass through the individual.” (ALLIEZ; QUERRIEN, 2008, p. 22).

Schizoanalysis takes the form of a critique of modelling systems, of the types of filters that apply when the subject or collective looks at the world in the sense of Sebeok (1994, p. 139-140): it resides in the critical undertaking carried out by Guattari when he evokes the conditions for breaking the “structuralist deadlock”; “basically, we would break the structuralist deadlock from the moment we consider that a meaningful effect only has an impact on the signified to the extent that subjective potentialities are released, as soon as there is a rupture in the signifier. Desire only emerges as such between the moment of the collapse of a significant structure and its replacement by another. It is precisely the revolutionary rupture that allows us to reconnect with the social subject in its power of enunciation. Desire remains unconscious until this break, which opens the space for its reappearance in society” (KERSLAKE, 2008, p. 45). This particular moment, a key moment of astonishment, is when the group gives up a certain interpretation of the world and denaturalizes a usual reading of reality imposed by the sclerosed language of the dominant but has not yet reconstructed a new way of speaking about reality. It is in this moment of doubt, of uncertainty, that an investigation begins, in the sense of Dewey (1938), to determine a situation considered “troubled”. The structuralist impasse consists of considering that the signifier exists independently of the subject of the “signifying intervention that produces the statements”. The same impasse is perceived in the mirage of intersubjectivity; the relationship is being considered independently of the reality in which the subjects are inscribed (GUATTARI, 1974/2015, p. 237-238). In my view, socio-clinical intervention aims to escape this impasse by allowing the emergence of new signs and new arrangements of enunciation inhabited by the subject’s experience and by the subjective way in which he or she reports on it.

It is a question of denouncing metalanguages and linguistic frames of reference that fail to provide the essential tools to think about this investment by the subject of the signs and arrangements of enunciation, i.e., to think of a strictly subjective enunciation, in which the gap between the subject of the statement and the subject of the enunciation is as small as possible. If the linguistics of enunciation has sought to understand the pragmatic components of enunciation, it has failed in that “it does not appear to have properly seized the social-political implications of its object” (GUATTARI, 1979a/2007, p. 24). Enunciation is considered in the absolute, in the general, outside of time and space, separated from the real struggles and desires of men and women; in short, it is a question of an alienated enunciation. It is therefore necessary “to escape from language” (GUATTARI, 1979a/2007, p. 23).

The schizoanalytic endeavour has to aim at “the autonomy of a micropolitical pragmatics”, which means giving up “traditional separation between the exercise of individual speech and the encoding of language in the socius” (GUATTARI, 1979a/2007, p. 28); in other words, it has to fight against the erasure of the subject behind the “ideal listener-speaker”, a linguist’s fantasy (GUATTARI, 1979a/2007, p. 28), the danger of which is to minimize the political nature of the pragmatics.

Such a foundation requires an understanding that power does not reside in simple vocabulary elements: “it is neither at the level of the formal units of content nor at the level of distinctive elementary traits that we will be able to seize the resource of semiotic creativity, but at the pragmatic level of the assemblages of enunciation and at the level of molecular matters of expressions and the abstract machines that these materials bring into play” (GUATTARI, 1979a/2007, p. 42-43). The question is not that of vocabulary, but of the arrangements of enunciation; in other words, of the rhetoric or *dispositio* of the arrangement of speeches (PESCE, 2013).

On the (rhetorical) field of intervention

My purpose here is not to suggest that the intervention strategies I am going to describe are an instance of schizoanalysis and that they actualize in the field the principles promoted by Guattari. My aim is simply to indicate echoes between collective support practices as I implement them and some of the semiotic concerns worked on in the schizoanalytic reflection. I would therefore like to suggest that Guattari’s thought can operate as an analytical framework to account for these accompaniments. I will not be able to go into the details of these interventions in this article. I will simply report on how they have evolved since I started implementing them about ten years ago. These evolutions are linked to what I have perceived as an impediment among teachers to describe, to enunciate and to think - an impediment that I have wanted to overcome, an impediment that seems to me to illustrate some of Guattari’s analyses.

The intervention programmes in question therefore take the form of collective accompaniment, carried out with educational and pedagogical staff, within their institution, generally over a long period of time. Teams are thus accompanied for one or more years, with two to four working sessions of one to two days per year. When I started these interventions ten years ago, I believed, without thinking too much about it, that I was influenced by a model of “liberation of the word”. I thought it was a matter of letting the teams express themselves freely to perceive bottlenecks (these were crisis interventions) and then helping the professionals overcome them. However, what appears very quickly when this type of open system is proposed is what I mentioned above: the incorporation by the teams of the institution’s forms of language and ways of thinking. Where one might expect a personal, subjective, original word, one is confronted not only with the vocabulary privileged by the institution but also with visions of the world and explanatory logics that are those of the institution.

The work I have done over the past ten years follows a double logic in response to these observations: to invent, in the field, modes of intervention that encourage teams to distance themselves from this vocabulary, these forms of enunciation, as well as from the world views they maintain; to understand, on a more theoretical level, the links between these forms of intervention (what I call the rhetorics of intervention) on the one hand, and the emergence, among actors, of new forms of enunciation, on the other hand. I will summarize some aspects of these forms of intervention.

When the intervention begins, the teams are invited to describe the situations experienced: those considered critical that are emblematic of the difficulties that motivated the request for intervention. The descriptions produced, always orally, are produced on the basis of an instruction: to try to talk about what has been experienced in the most factual way possible by trying to put at a distance the interpretations that have always been there. However, there is always a huge paradox: the situations are full of analysers that easily explain, as soon as they are described, the reasons why the difficulties have emerged. The factors that have led to the critical situations seem to be in no way hidden - they are present in the situation, accessible, and yet these phenomena had not been perceived until then. The dominant language, the one that structures the actors' viewpoint, imposes such a constraining way of engaging with situations, of considering them, of defining them, that a whole aspect of reality seems to have gradually become hidden, invisible to the actors. The process of semiotization does not simply concern the way situations are expressed but also the way they are seen. It concerns what can be perceived from the situation because the language available to the actors determines what can enter the field of vision and what is always out of scope. To put it in a somewhat simplistic way, teams do not initially have the necessary language to perceive the determining role of the organizational and pedagogical factors that make up situations, but they do have a very precise language that allows them to perceive the supposed sociological (students' social belonging) or psychological factors.

Most of the time, the teachers themselves are surprised by what they discover about these situations, even though they are already familiar with them, when they refrain from interpreting them - when they agree to look at them in a straightforward way by getting rid of the blinders that generally restrict their relationship with educational situations. In other words, they are led to be astonished again by what is nevertheless their daily life, to be surprised by a dimension that is generally hidden from their experience: the facts themselves, the naked facts (even if this is always a fantasy), freed from the layer of pre-established meanings that usually cover them.

However, the problem of collective arrangements of enunciation can be considered at the heart of the approach that is implemented during these accompaniments; arrangements that I envisage, for my part, from the perspective of the rhetorical conditions of a collective enunciation: the production, not by subjects, but by collectives, of a discourse relating to their shared reality first and then of a language making it possible to enrich this discourse. The term "rhetoric" refers precisely to the arrangement of the parts of the discourse - discourse here understood as a complex set of statements, interactions, and semiotic resources that occupy the entire scene of the intervention. I am therefore not simply referring here to a

sequence of enunciation, an utterance, but a wider and more complex ensemble. Rhetoric thus means the choice of semiotic resources (in particular a vocabulary, but also other semiotic resources, such as diagrams, schemas, drawings); their authors; the way in which these speakers arrange these resources; the way in which these statements are articulated on a broader scale; and the ritual statements, the ways of asking questions and answering them.

Conclusion

The core of research intervention, a research carried out by the collective of teachers and relating to their own experience, thus lies in the way in which such rhetoric, including such collective arrangements of enunciation, allows the emergence of new forms of astonishment and with them decentralization, making it first possible to redirect the ways of perceiving and saying situations and then of acting upon them.

Despite its success, which is still real today, Guattari's work does not immediately suggest "applications" or ways of doing fieldwork research. Despite its density and complexity, this work is anything but the translation of a pure abstraction of an "off-ground" thought, which would have to be translated, after the fact, into field practice. This thought is the formalization of a field experience, an experience of the groups, and its richness reflects what has been perceived in this field by the groups under analysis.

References

ALLIEZ, Éric; QUERRIEN, Anne. L'effet-Guattari. **Multitudes**, Les Lilas, v. 2008/3, n. 34, p. 22-29, automne 2008.

BERNARD, Michel. Les conditions du groupe d'action. **L'Homme et la Société**, Paris, v. 29/1, n. 29-30, p. 59-69, octobre-décembre 1973.

CERTEAU, Michel de. Michel. **The capture of speech and other political writings**. Translated by Tom Conley. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1968/1997.

DELEUZE, Gilles. Preface: Three Group-Related Problems. Translated by Ames Hodges. In: GUATTARI, Félix. **Psychoanalysis and transversality**. Texts and Interviews 1955-1971. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 1974/2015. p. 7-21.

DEWEY, John. **Logic**. The Theory of Inquiry. New York: Henry Holt & Company, 1938.

FOURQUET, François. Une intuition de Félix Guattari. **Revue du MAUSS**, Paris, v. 2007/1, n. 29, p. 555-568, janvier-juin 2007.

GENOSKO, Gary. **Félix Guattari, an aberrant introduction**. London & New York: Continuum, 2002.

GUATTARI, Félix. **Psychoanalysis and transversality**. Texts and interviews 1955-1971. Translated by Ames Hodges. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 1974/2015.

GUATTARI, Félix. **The machinic unconscious. Essays in schizoanalysis**. Translated by Taylor Adkins. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 1979a/2007.

GUATTARI, Félix. Regime, pathways, subjects. Translated by Brian Massumi. *In*: GENOSKO, Gary; GUATTARI, Félix. **The Guattari Reader**. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1979b/1996. p. 95-108.

GUATTARI, Félix. **Schizoanalytic cartographies**. Translated by Andrew Goffey. London: Bloomsbury, 1989/2013.

HOLQUIST, Michael. The politics of representation. **The Quarterly Newsletter of the Laboratory of Comparative Human Cognition**, San Diego, v. 5, n. 1, p. 2-9, Jan. 1983.

KERSLAKE, Christian. Les machines désirantes de Félix Guattari. De Lacan à l'objet 'a' de la subjectivité révolutionnaire. **Multitudes**, Les Lilas, v. 2008/3, n. 34, p. 41-53, automne 2008.

14

PESCE, Sébastien. From Peirce's Speculative Rhetoric to Educational rhetoric. **Educational Philosophy and Theory**, New York, v. 45, n. 7, p. 755-780, Jul. 2013.

RAMBEAU, Frédéric. Deleuze, Guattari et les apories de la subjectivation politique. **Carnet Implications philosophiques**, 14 June 2013. Disponível em: <http://www.implications-philosophiques.org/actualite/une/deleuze-guattari-et-les-apories-de-la-subjectivation-politique-2/>. Acesso em: 10 Dec. 2018.

SEBEEK, Thomas. **Signs: an introduction to Semiotics**. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994 (reed. 2001).

Notes

ⁱ Commenting upon Bakhtin ("A word is territory shared by both addresser and addressee, by the speaker and his interlocutor") Holquist (1983, p. 4) defines this concept as follows: "It is this territorial concept of the word which necessitates a politics of representation: How is the territory governed? What legislates the way meaning is parcelled out in any given utterance?"

