

**Researching is to strange reality:
subjectivation process and everyday life**

*Pesquisar é estranhar a realidade:
processos de subjetivação e cotidiano*

*Investigar es producir extrañeza en la realidad:
procesos de subjetivación y vida cotidiana*

Eduardo Simonini¹ 

Roberta Carvalho Romagnoli² 

Knowledge production is not a straight line that heads towards an undoubted progress. Rather, such production suffers continuous interferences from the interlacing of knowledge, practices, ways of thinking, since “ideas, after all, are part of a composition of historical circumstances and germinate in culture where other ideas and beliefs circulate, where they can or cannot find resonance” (MARTINS, 2020, p.150). And it was not different in the last five hundred years in occidental society, where little by little germinated world views which it is agreed to call “modernity”. And it became equally conventional to consider that this modernity have their “inaugural point” in the idea system French René Descartes (1596-1650) put into movement. If Middle Age was traversed by a markedly theological thinking, having as its primary organization source the indubitability of God’s power, Descartes built his problematizations – marked by the primacy of doubt and questioning – in the tension between the experience of “I” and the notion of what constitutes reality. Differently from the questioning recurring then about “what is the world?”, the Cartesian thinking asks other questions: “who knows?”, “How to get to know if the world is true to the one who knows it?”. Political and socially, French revolution has become a social landmark of such modern age, since it was a movement that literally chop off the head of the millenary instituted ways of govern, inaugurating in Europe other possibilities if governmentality, but also of thinking individual autonomy and social construction.

In face of the fragmentation of medieval certainties, when beliefs and values – that till then seemed to constitute a stable “forever” – were suddenly replaced by an uncertain, provoking, stimulating and equally dangerous horizon, “estranging” worked both as an object of enchanting and of anguish, managed by the primacy of reason. The modern age emerged, then, from convulsions of estranging in world till then fixed as immobile, supported by the progressive advance of man’s action upon nature. The provoking doubt brought by modern thinking put into critique the perpetuity of thinking-doing produced by religious institutions,

¹ Federal University of Viçosa (UFV) – Email: simonini198@gmail.com

² Pontifical Catholic University of Minas Gerais (PUC Minas) – Email: robertaroma1@gmail.com

kingdoms and other ways of being that, for not supporting the vehemence of proofing in the observable fact, have come, by modern perspective, to be qualified as superstitious.

In modernity, the world itself, not only the world of thinking, has suffered questionings. The planet's geography itself has changed since the great navigations that put into contact the European, American and Asian worlds; in the field till then hegemonic of catholic religion there appeared different Christianities as, for example, the movement of Protestant Reformation; popular knowledge begun to be qualified as ignorant beliefs, since they were no longer considered legitimate due to the fact they did not have empirical proofing according to the rules of the emerging scientific logical. However, that same age brought, along the movement of estranging the reality till then stablished, the proposal of a new search for an irremovable truth – thus eternal – that would be revealed to human beings no longer by means of divine intuition, but by means of scientific experimentation. Thus, certainty was transferred from religion to the idolatry of scientific knowledge. Modernity thinking little by little begun to defend the perspective that the world had secrets that were not necessarily relegated to the mysteries of faith, but articulated to the laws of nature that could be unveiled by human mind itself. Estranging was, thus, questioning the seeming mysteries of existence – whether from world subjects or from the starts' – in order to extract from them hidden truths to unveil hidden laws of a mathematizable and equally thinkable universe inside the cognitive references of human beings.

In fact those questions caused interferences to the very notion of scientific research, since reality, seen as a puzzle to be solved – a code to be unveiled by means of theoretical-methodological tool increasingly precise – was considered to possess an immutable essence that served as a model from which to organize all the possible variations. Understanding that founding nucleus, that truth, point of genesis of the cosmos, of the great narratives of everything that is different from them, has become a project, surely ambitious, of modern science in its deployments in different knowledge areas.

However, would it be possible to turn the methodical Cartesian doubt a tool for questioning the truths that modernity chose for itself: truths installed into great narratives to define positions of gender, of universe, education, behavior, future, order, happiness, of humanity? Would it be possible to estrange inclusively the very notion of “essence”, “truth” and “reality”? Would it be possible to use again the tool of doubt to produce estranging on what is already given as undoubted and put into a problematizer movement that which already assumed as unquestionable?

From those restlessness, the papers gathered into that dossier have as goal – each one in its field of problematization – to bring a thought that estranges, putting movement into perspectives considered stable in their naturalization, dribbling the “truth” and welcoming the interferences produced (both in the reality, and in the researcher himself) by the process of knowing.

In this sense, Roberta Carvalho Romagnoli, teacher at *Pontifícia Universidade Católica de Minas Gerais*, puts into analyses, in the paper entitled “**The (im)possibility of giving voice to users of public policies: reflections from intersectoral practice**”, the relationships of

intersectorial practices with the families in Regional Technical Intersectorial Nucleus (NIR-T) of one of the regionals of Belo Horizonte, Minas Gerais, Brazil, problematizing how public policies interfere with the dynamics of family treatments. Within the same perspective of problematizing social policies, Maria Jose Garcia Oramas, teacher at *Universidad Veracruzana* (Mexico), analyzes in her paper “**Abuse and sexual harassment in the university context, the ways of praxis**”, the implementation of a program for prevention, attention and penalty for sexual harassment in that very University.

Still following the minority intensities that transverse the dimension of social, Ana Karenina de Melo Arraes Amorim and Maria Teresa Lisboa Nobre Pereira (both from *Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte*), when considering the contemporary biopolitical context, aimed at the paper “**Knowledge production and everyday life: challenges for research in the affirmation of life**”, to discuss the knowledge production in daily life from an experience of intervention research with homeless people and users of the psychosocial attention net.

Within the same perspective, Diego Arthur Lima Pinheiro (from *Universidade Estadual de Feira de Santana*) and Luis Antônio dos Santos Baptista (da *Universidade Federal Fluminense*) propose, in the paper “**Narrative Atlas of street lives: ethical experiments of a methodology**” the composition of an atlas produced from narrative fragments of a meeting with homeless population that occupies the Historical Center of Vitória/Espírito Santo, in order to explicit the ethical-political dimension of the occupations carried out by that population. Also in the city of Vitória, from their works at *Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo*, Janete Magalhães Carvalho and Steferson Zanoni Roseiro problematize, in the paper “**The potency of images and creative fabulation for research in everyday school life**” the use of images in social media chats in school daily as a potent resource for, in the production of creative fabulation, to move ways of thinking that distance from cliché-images.

Sandra Kretli da Silva, Priscila dos Santos Moreira and Nathan Moretto Guzzo Fernandes, researchers from the same University, present, in their paper “**Researches and discursive practices about curriculum in the scientific-academic community: territories and connections**” the proposal to cartography, from the dialogue with Gilles Deleuze, Félix Guattari and Michel Foucault’s works, the institutional bounds of authors that, dedicating themselves to the discussion about curriculum, have published in the international journal *Transnational Curriculum Inquiry* (TCI) and in the dossiers organized by Brazilian Curriculum Association (ABdC).

Eduardo Simonini, from *Universidade Federal de Viçosa/Minas Gerais*, on his turn, proposes in his paper “**We are flying over a fireball: movement, multiplicity and everyday reality**” that reality be thought as not as an immutable essence, but as a process of multiplicity in which a given daily has different existence dimensions and intensities. That weaves a dialogue with the paper “**Didactical procedures of invention: the potency of the art signs**”, from Karen Elisabete Rosa Nodari and Sandra Mara Corazza (both from *Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul*) that is dedicated to trace a parallel between the investigative posture of logical-Cartesian thinking and the difference philosophy thinking.

A difference that equally promotes estranging in the meeting of daily diversity, especially in the paper “**1“Putting the beads on necklaces”**: the health research in the **Umbanda terreiros**”, that Matheus Barbosa da Rocha (at *Universidade Federal do Piauí*), Ana Kalliny de Sousa Severo (at *Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte*) and Antônio Vladimir Félix da Silva (da *Universidade Federal do Piauí*) dedicate themselves to present the methodological unfolding of a research carried out in the encounter between three Umbanda *terreiros* in an inland city of the State of Piauí and the consequent Family Health Teams that covered the mentioned holy establishments.

And it was by continuing to think on the multiplicity and difference that Sébastien Pesce (from *Université d'Orléans/France*), from the conceptions of Félix Guattari and the difference philosophy aims in “**The actuality of the schizoanalytical perspective: astonishment, enunciation, subjectification**”, to problematize whether the education professionals are open to the sensibility to be surprised (and thinking differently) on their daily professional reality from the subjectivation processes they are involve in.

And in the movement of thinking about “surprising oneself”, Rosane Preciosa (from *Universidade Federal de Juiz de Fora*) in her paper “**Noticing things: suddenly something happens and we are somebody else**”, dedicates herself to weave reflections upon the act of thinking and writing present on today’s academic practices, questioning how much the texts, when dealing with information and quotes, many times bring the absence of voice of that who thinks and write; an absence of a singularity of an author that is, herself, transverse by multiplicities.

Finally, Simone Mainieri Paulon, Ariadne Cedraz de Cerqueira and Fernanda Goulart Martins (all researchers from *Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul*) propose in their paper “**Strangeness in bibliographic research: cartography invention in systematic search**” to think a bibliographic research methodology that even when practiced in seeming standardized procedures can, anchored in a cartographic proposal, to commune also with invention, difference and multiplicity.

We hope, therefore, that the reading of that dossier can be potent and multiplying, in the expectative that other estranging be produced in the meeting with doubts that support complex processes and bid on science as a social practice.

References

MARTINS, Ana Cecília Impellizieri. **O homem que aprendeu o Brasil**: a vida de Paulo Rónai. São Paulo: Todavia, 2020.

