

ARTICLE

Variations on intervention and institution: other modes of existence and minor compositions

Variaciones sobre la intervención y la institución: otros modos de existencia y composiciones menores

Cristian Fernández Ramírez¹

Andrés Bello University, Chile

Cristian Ceruti Mahn

Andrés Bello University, Chile

José Miguel Garay Rivera

Andrés Bello University, Chile

Borja Castro-Serrano

Andrés Bello University, Chile

70

Received: 14/10/2021

Accepted: 27/01/2022

How to cite

Fernández, C., Ceruti, C., Garay, J. & Castro-Serrano, B. (2022). Variations on intervention and institution: other modes of existence and minor compositions. *Propuestas Críticas en Trabajo Social - Critical Proposals in Social Work*, 2(3), 70-90.

DOI: 10.5354/2735-6620.2022. 65779

Abstract

This article considers the possible relations between intervention and institution that, from certain experiences and registers, avoid the intents of being translated from hegemonic epistemic positions of capture and homologation. With this purpose, it aims to describe, fly over and show the potency of other modes of existence that, being crossed by the conceptualization of 'the minor' (without

Keywords:
institution;
social
intervention;
modes of
existence; minor
composition

ignoring precariousness and suffering), make possible the variations of both intervention and institution in the 'traditional' ways of conceiving them; in their ways of registering reality and, therefore, making possible another statute between intervention and production of subjectivity. In this intent, first we inquire into some forms of registering reality made in Didi-Huberman's *People exposed, people as extras* (2018) and *Survival of the fireflies* (2017), to continue to enhance the potency of the notions of other modes of existence and a certain right to exist that is expressed in Souriau's (2017) instauration philosophy. In this philosophical path we show some incarnations, practical experiences and brief narratives of an ongoing research project, conceiving them as political, aesthetical and historical resonances that, from their minorness, allow us to question some of the contemporary subjection processes, and reflect on the questions and potencies related to the way in which the present is intervened, and the ways in which it is socially instituted. Consequently, and from a critical commitment, we open other places and territories that allow us to take other paths to those in which the epistemic violence of hegemonical interventions and institutions are present. In this way, with a firefly light with which we intend to follow the footprints of the minor, this article ends with some elements to think about the professional intervention of Social Work and its way of intervening in the social.

Resumen

El escrito pretende pensar relaciones posibles entre la intervención y la institución, de sus experiencias y sus registros, que eviten ser traducidas desde la captura y homologación de posiciones epistémicas hegemónicas. Para ello se pretende describir, sobrevolar y mostrar la potencia de otros modos de existencia que, atravesadas por la conceptualización de 'lo menor' (sin obviar la precariedad y el sufrimiento), desfondan las 'tradicionales' nociones de intervención-institución, posibilitando variaciones en sus modos de registro de toda realidad y, con ello, de otro estatuto posible de la institución y sus producciones subjetivas. Se indaga primeramente en algunas claves de lectura emprendidas por Didi-Huberman en *Pueblos expuestos, pueblos figurantes* (2018) y en *La supervivencia de las luciérnagas* (2017); para luego relevar la potencia de los *modos de existencia y el derecho a existir* que se expresan en la filosofía de la instauration de Souriau (2017). En este trayecto filosófico mostramos algunas encarnaciones, recortes de experiencias prácticas e incluso breves narraciones de un proyecto de investigación en

Palabras Clave:

institución; intervención social; modos de existencia; composición menor



curso, en tanto guiños políticos, estéticos, históricos y prácticos que, desde su minoridad, permiten problematizar los procesos de subjetivación de nuestra época contemporánea y reflexionar sobre los modos de intervención del presente y las maneras de instituirse en lo social. Consecuentemente, y desde una apuesta crítica, abrimos otros lugares y territorios que trazan recorridos alternativos a la violencia epistémica asociada a ciertas formas hegemónicas de intervención e institución. Por último, premunidos de una *luz luciérnaga* con la que se intenta seguir ciertas huellas de lo *menor*, se cierra con algunos elementos para pensar la intervención profesional del Trabajo Social y su forma de intervenir en lo social.

Introduction: for the invention of a theoretical-practical problem

Some of the challenges that motivate us to think about this work are directly linked to the possibilities of intervention and its practices in the interstitial and inventive fields and textures of the social. In order to understand this, we believe it is necessary to clear some concepts of meaning, allowing us to broaden the frontiers, redraw the boundaries and problematize the plots that have allowed them to materialize in the ways of doing in the world. It is necessary to make this gesture with the concept of intervention: by giving it a philosophical treatment we can empty it of meaning by critically unraveling it as a certain social ontology based on practices, an issue that highlights the political that flows in it to enhance its theoretical-practical dimension. In this way, the normalizing attempt, fabricated under a “pure description” of reality, is discarded. In this way, following Donzelot (2007), it is possible to go beyond a technified social reality, to be attentive to how intervention practices could be transformed once we move from assuming the *inventiveness of the social* always as an interstitial space between the State and the individual, and we open ourselves to consider it as derived from a certain aesthetic-political overlapping.

In this sense, in the ontological approach between normalization-transformation, intervention and its practices in the inventive field of the social has been co-opted in favor of technical normalization from different professions, among which is Social Work. In its way of making the epistemic, methodical and political “object” of intervention in



different fields, the notion of “social intervention” came to be coined (Castro-Serrano, 2020; González-Saibene, 2014). Thus, intervention and institutionalization have been taken for technical-discursive instruments that have defined intelligibility frameworks and structured reality frameworks, in which the installation and emergence of observation fences, modes of interrogation, problem registers, differentiation mechanisms, image production and modes of action have been established according, in their variations, to a governmentalization of social life. By way of an anamnesis, we state that in these practices are installed -as actions of subjection of habits, rhythms and vital gestures of the social field to discipline, to a normative system or to a system of *government-diverse* forms of subjection to a program (Foucault, 2014).

In this way, intervention and its institutionalization can be thought of as articulated violences that, between hegemonic knowledge and instrumentalized practices, have allowed forms of subjection, differentiation and integration of social life to explicit mechanisms of production and administration in contemporary capitalism. That is to say, in this framework, intervention and institutionalization are constituted as forms of epistemic violence that are not necessarily exercised on a particular subject, nor on a specific quantitative minority, but act, precisely, through the homogenization and normalization of social life. From this position we can argue that the intervention in the social and its modes of institution have operated in the modern production of subjectivity from “technologies of assistance and social security, hygienic-sanitary technologies, pedagogical technologies, among others” (Chignola, 2014, p.74). As it is known, despite the fact that social disciplines -such as Social Work and Psychology, among others- have installed strong debates, both epistemological and political as well as methodological, their interventive practices still prevail due to their practical and scientific disciplinary eagerness, institutional, individual and/or therapeutic actions that favor the construction of a type of subject that requires these techniques and strategies to sustain the modes of modern suffering. Therefore, rather than transforming these conditions, their interventions often operate from epistemic and methodical plots that rather rigidify their practices within the political-institutional frameworks (Pérez Soto, 1997; González-Saibene, 2021).

For this reason, we consider it necessary to continue deepening the problematic affectations in the processes of subjectivation that take place in our contemporary era, and that have articulations in the modes of intervention of the present and its way of being instituted in the social. As pointed out by Guattari and Rolnik (2005) “(...) what we have is simply the production of subjectivity. Not only production of individuated



subjectivity - subjectivity of individuals - but a production of social subjectivity” (p.28). It becomes pertinent to articulate conceptual tools and critical apparatuses that serve to dismantle the forms of violence that are carried out from these different mechanisms and their territorializations and historical, political, aesthetic, ethical and social inscriptions. It is urgent for us to recognize alternative interventions that invent and can create different *effects* on the social in order to bring out other theoretical-practical articulations; that is, other political understandings and ways of instituting these practices, considering configurations associated with other forms of life and modes of subjectivation unmarked from a mere critical will, from an individual creator or from a profit-oriented business in our capitalist context. This is why we understand the inventive as the creation of modes of reorganization as an agentic and desiring capacity as “living vibration” (Berardi, 2019, p.241). In this sense, it is not strange that a whole line in Social Work articulates politics and criticism to think about intervention, since it is necessary “to question the established institutions” as well as “to question the representations collectively admitted” (González-Saibene, 2021, p.103). However, an attempt will be made to extend this critical and political gesture beyond the modern subject, its wills and its critical capacity.

Having said the above, from what multiple places and territories can we question and think about other ways of conceiving intervention (in the social) and, with it, another status of the institution and its subjective productions? From what other places can we make this critical bet as an alternative to the epistemic violence inherent in the hegemonic positions (state/institutional), which assume the task of translating and speaking for the minor knowledges? The central pretension of this paper is to describe and illustrate the potency of other modes of existence that, from a conceptualization of the minor (without ignoring precariousness and suffering), may enable variations of both intervention and institution in their modes of registration (Deleuze and Guattari, 1978; 1980; 2008)². Inquiring into the notions of other modes of existence and a certain right to exist that is given in every composition or minor becoming, opens, empowers and shows us other forms of life that, from all precariousness, defondate the traditional notions of intervention-institution, and from there make the particularity of a critical other emerge (Lapoujade, 2016; 2018). In this way, the question of minority as an opening to multiple processes of subjectivation can, in its potency, register intervention in another way.

² Before Mille Plateaux, already in 1975, when writing Kafka. For a minor literature, the French present the question of the minor in literary creation. In the tenor of a philosophical invention, he wants to undermine the social conditions of the major language-norm by showing a strong coefficient of deterritorialization that acquires a collective value. But, as we know, it is not restricted to the socio-linguistic, but comes to present a becoming that puts in continuous variation and drags with it the supposed constant and invariable extractions of a majoritarian system. Let us say that minor uses inwardly fragilize a major language in favor of a pragmatics that creates a new language (Deleuze and Guattari, 1978, p.28-29). No wonder, then, that Lapoujade (2016, p.276-277) quotes the French to insist that all “Becoming minoritarian is a political affair; and requires a whole work of potency, an active micropolitics (Deleuze and Guattari, 2008, p.292).”



Thus, power and registration become relevant to show other interventions, which show the emergence of minor practices that not only make her vary, but also the institution that sustains her.

To carry out this objective we will investigate in two fields: the first installs a dialogue with some reading keys that generate an epistemological renewal on the studies of art, history and image undertaken by Didi-Huberman (2017; 2018), particularly from some profiles present in his “Pueblos expuestos, pueblos figurantes” (the exposure and underexposure of peoples) and his “imagen-luciérnaga” (firefly-image). And, in the second, we highlight the potency of “modes of existence” and “the right to exist” expressed in Souriau’s (2017) philosophy of instauration, in articulation with other contemporary commentators. Philosophical imprints both of which we will seek to make, constantly resonate with some embodiments, snippets of practical experiences and even brief narratives of an ongoing research project³, pointing out political, aesthetic, historical and practical winks that, from their minority, illustrate possible variations on intervention and institution. The following path opens up interesting elements for the professional intervention of Social Work.

Variations in intervention and institution: an epistemological renewal of art and history as a minor composition

Let us first clarify an element necessary to understand the two sections that follow. The limits of critical thought in modern philosophy deal with a delimiting instance, as a framework of intelligibility, which brings into play normative principles that would guide thought. In this sense, critical thought is shaped from and with a normative horizon that would make possible the practice of thinking. However, this problem installs the subject in a relationship that exceeds this simple delimitation, placing him in a double position: “as subject-agent of his own reason and, at the same time, as external spectator of the happening of his own history” (Moscoso-Flores and Fuster, 2018, p.29). Braidotti (2015) illustrates it well by pointing out that, even pretending to dissociate ourselves from conventional humanist positions -in the promotion of

³ The current research project is entitled “Everyday energies and energy transition: an ontopolitical reflection from the La Campana-Peñuelas Biosphere Reserve, Valparaíso Region, Chile”.



certain becomings that would transcend human agency alone, we enter into this double position: on the one hand, by abandoning the agency that is inherent to us and, on the other, by assuming a role of spectators from where that subject-agent of his own reason continues to appear, when from that box he still conceives himself as moral custodian of the course of progress. In this way, insisting on repositioning the individual from that external place, he is perpetuated as the center of the possible boundaries of movements and relations. Following Foucault (1995), we could say that the notion of critique and that of a critical thought, in this sense, is traversed “by the question of the relations between the structures of rationality that articulate the true discourse and the mechanisms of subjection that are linked to it” (p.12).

That said, we can reconsider in another way the notion of a critical thought that is far from the sense delimited by a certain modern philosophy, to rather exalt a relevant operation of thought, composed of effects of practices and techniques - alluding to the relations between humans and non-humans - in a specific geo-historical ordering, which would mobilize points of convergence and divergence between epistemological and ethico-political regions. Thus, critical thinking could instead be outlined as a system of relays and assemblies “in a multiplicity of pieces and of practical and theoretical fragments at the same time” (Deleuze, 2005, p.268), rather than as a guide of universal principles for a reason determined by a subject (Moscoso-Flores and Fuster, 2018). With that we open a way of thinking and acting that retakes in another way the way in which we relate to what exists, to what we know, to what we do (Foucault, 1995).

76

Thus assumed, let us begin with a critical thinking of the intervention and the institution from which Georges Didi-Huberman works with respect to the image. In his epistemological analyses he seeks to decipher the status of the image and the relationship we keep with it, reviewing the clashes and separations that occur in conceiving the image as that which represents a status as a massified historical source today, with that which, at the same time, actualizes a singular and essential order of knowledge of historical character that takes into account the processes of memory (Villalobos-Ruminott, 2018). His analysis reviews the tensions of the times with which history is made and the times of the relationship that we keep with it. Not from the fullness of a historical knowledge sure of its sources (reduced and rigidified to a simple document of history), but rather from the interrogation of a fragile condition.

Let us say that this perspective accentuates the assemblies of intelligibility that have served and serve for the recording of a historical memory and of the intertwined



temporalities that continue, still, to resonate in our present. It would then be necessary to understand the becoming of the image at the crossroads of survivals, that is to say, of the pretended persistence of a certain image and the survival of remnants of images capable of reappearing from their vestiges. This also articulates our way of imagining and doing politics, collapsing our certainties regarding the stability of the visible world. It is then “a politics of survivals, which accompanies all politics of images and of political exposure in general” (Didi-Huberman, 2017, p.83).

Considering the constitutive precariousness of these images and the relation to the past that defines them as interrupted presence, this politics of survivals accompanies another way of interpellating the meaning of the image and of history. If we allude to Villalobos-Ruminot’s (2018) politics of registration, the exposure of these images can interrupt, in their fragile babbling, the truth of the present. “(...) It is rather as if the image were always an allegory of its own caducity, a weak testimony, a trace, of its impossible contemporaneity with that which it shows or ‘represents’” (p.191). A politics of the register that takes these images, *despite* their fragility, shows an unresolved historical event. Here lies part of the potential of the question of the register, insofar as it allows us to inquire into the problem of a political epistemology of normativity and to resist against the operations of regimes of representation that expose a principle of identification that acts as a unifying, sovereign form, functioning through classification and attribution. This favors unity, the personal, the stable norm and the established trait (Sauvagnargues, 2016), an issue that is not far from the modes of intervening that we are so often monolithically instructed by institutions. It is well illustrated by Stengers (2019, p.44) when he critically points out our approach to the devastation of the lives we live, as we are removed from certain capacities to invent “dignified lives” for ourselves sheltered in “solidarity, interdependence and cooperation with one another”.

In this logic, a politics of the register that welcomes the stammering images to dismember our relationship with history, requires the exposure of these fragile images, but always avoiding overexposure. This Didi-Huberman (2018) does in analyzing the political and aesthetic representation of peoples, who mobilize perceptual and affective horizons that would disarm and dislocate a linear logic and organization of historical time. Here he notes various modes of appearance of different collectives that interrogate the configuration of the common, and that immediately notice that the appearance is differentially constituted in the same exhibition. We are dealing with *exposed* and *underexposed* peoples, in the sense that not all the forms in which peoples appear operate



in the same way: “(...) peoples are exposed by the fact of being threatened, precisely, in their representation - political, aesthetic - and even, as happens all too often, in their very existence. Peoples are always exposed to disappear” (Didi-Huberman, 2017, p.11). Exposed to disappear by the overexposure of a certain image, of a certain history sustained in the so human and static incandescences of lights, media, devices; a way of life is perpetuated in permanent expansion that overexpose them, making a figure of some peoples and exposing others to their disappearance. Didi-Huberman (2017) questions us, asking, “what to do, what to think in this state of perpetual threat?” (p.17).

We believe that these philosophical, political and aesthetic analyses on the image of overexposure abut with the frames of intelligibility that we give to interventions and their institutional imprints, when we perpetuate the inclusion, integration, reinsertion of those who are different, of those who have erred along the way, of those who have disintegrated from the overexposed mass of a certain way of life and, as Stengers (2019) puts it, have been left behind, whether at school⁴, at home, in life. We remain disposed, thus, to perpetuate the overexposure of those subjectivities of the “paradisiacal light”; that “light that will spread everywhere in sublime concentric circles: it will be a light of cosmos and glorious dilation” (Didi-Huberman, 2017, p.8). In this light nests a promise, of capitalist order, that makes it possible to correct, subsidize and morally judge (undoubtedly in an intervention), placing us as spectators of the price to be paid for a certain future redemption. In this, the thought of overexposure or work under threat may imply that there is no alternative to the logic and organization of historical linear time that we install with the figurative images. There would be a sort of abandonment of time, or in Lapoujade’s (2011, p.11) reading of Bergson, we would say that we abandon ourselves to the affections of time in melancholy, where “the whole time is already past...everything is already over, it is always too late”, or else we are thrown into waiting where “all time is ordered around an event that is to arrive but does not arrive”.

The journey opens up an unfathomable risk, as illustrated by the story of Pedro’s father⁵, a farmer and community member of one of the four communities that have persisted in the Olmué-Limache valley since 1612, when he remarks upon seeing the news that “humanity is cursed”, referring to the fact that the only thing left is its self-extermination. Or, the songs about the debacle and the end of time written by Jorge, teacher and musician from Limache, when he declares that his melancholy was melancholy of

⁴ Having mentioned Stengers, it is worth referring to the relationship between education and intervention stipulated by the Lost Toys Collective when reading Deligny (2017, p.70) and his way of intervening with autistic children. In a critical gesture to what we have been pointing out, they establish the need to allow a zone and a temporality that is neither of the intervenor nor of the intervened, but rather an “interval of the tacit” where the intervening field is rewritten.

⁵ The names are fictitious. The first excerpt corresponds to a conversation within the framework of a daily accompaniment, participating and observing, in ethnographic exercise, their daily activities (April 17, 2019). The second corresponds to an open interview conducted on September 10, 2018. Both are part of the aforementioned research project.

the future. There, the risk is perpetuated in other durations, such as those that distill a wait, or those that come to confirm that the world is cursed, crystallizing certain institutions or political representations, an economic system or certain religions, which subject us to guilt or sacrifice because that which we expect will arrive posthumously. Subjectivities emerge incapable of criticism as they have “no perspective of opening the horizon in incessant imperatives” (Lapoujade, 2011, p.11), a question that installs the urgency of the present in the context of the exhibition. How can the overexposure illustrated by these brief situated stories be eluded? What becomes possible in this scenario and how does the intervention in the social and the institution participate in the becomings that unmark the exposed/overexposed places?

There is no doubt that this critical support is relevant to consider in order to think about other images of intervention from its aesthetic and ethico-political drifts, trying to question the logics already mentioned insofar as they cut out and distribute the real in significantly different ways. These other images of the intervention, raised under the politics of registration, are articulated with Didi-Huberman’s (2017) analysis and his politics of survival: a resistance emerges in the so-called *firefly-image*. This image emerges from the constitutive role of survivals that, in their fragile persistence, connect imagination and politics to evidence other memorial dispositions of which they reveal themselves to be bearers, not linked to an all-powerful entity. Such an image, bursting into its various expressions, poses us the problem of ephemeral existences that were condemned to silence and disappearance, insofar as “one renounces to follow them” (Didi-Huberman, 2017, p.35). This is why firefly-images are always synonymous with resistance: they rise up and establish themselves in hostile contexts. Hostile contexts, as were the times and images that we can associate with the coal mining works in Lota in the first decades of the twentieth century; or also with the images prior to October 2019 in our Chilean revolt. It is in the face of these contexts of onto-epistemic violences, of the threatening exposure that supposed and supposes waiting and urgency, that these *firefly-images* emerge as a minor composition with that “small painful glow of the faults that drag under endless accusation and punishment” (Didi-Huberman, 2017, p.8).

It is necessary to look at the firefly-images, since they question the sense of a historical hegemony without pretending to exhaust in them the truth of what happened; they operate to “open with them the closure that every past imposes on the political and indeterminate time of the present” (Villalobos-Ruminott, 2018, p.185). Exposing oneself to them is a challenge, implying to distinguish them in their minor composition and potency among so many lights, among so much truth, among so much habit and



so much dazzling in which we are. There is the danger of their disappearance by not seeing them. For this reason, it is necessary to take into account the deterritorializing function of this image and its politics of registration: their disappearance occurs when we lose track of them. Concretely, following the cases just mentioned, we do not know what would have happened to the rights won by women after Berta Recabarren and the images opened up in the twentieth century; she, in her work as a social visitor, was supposed to be in charge of the welfare of coal miners, but she reconfigured her intervention approach by prioritizing women's literacy: that is, "she emphasized an elementary tool for female emancipation in a literate culture by making them enter the codes of a 'political subject'" (Arellano-Escudero and Castro-Serrano, 2022, p. 122). Nor do we know what would have happened after that October if we had not followed the firefly images that, for years, emanated their lights in the midst of the violence exercised in our political transition. However, we can say that, by following these fragile images, intervention and institution have been challenged in the hegemony of their registers and times, being mobilized by a set of heterogeneous temporalities that run through this crossroads of survival, and that at least have opened history to a temporal porosity that invites us to think of it from new vital forms, capable of doing justice to its exercise of establishment.

The brief accounts and stories mentioned here illustrate ways of making, thinking and living history on the part of those who see and follow the *firefly-images*. In their minor actions they can elude the overexposure of the sedimented and reterritorialized organization of life, in an attempt to promote, also, a political and epistemological potential of the registry that considers variations of the intervention and its institutional imprint. In this line, as Santiago Arcila (2020) comments on Stiegler, it would enable a different way of thinking the institution from other modes of composition, allowing other variations in this appearance of peoples, linked to "practices that go through the reconfiguration of habits and relationships with the land and others, the care of certain traditions, the reformulation of their self-image, the planning of the future or the reappropriation of practice and legal knowledge" (Arcila, 2020, p.90). It becomes quite clear to us that these fragile, blurred, minor and poorly delineated traces can open the field of practices of intervention and interveners, daring to be crossed by this aesthetic, political and epistemic register that imposes another way of ordering the factors.

Other variations in intervention and institution: modes of existence, practices and minor becomings

The discussion proposed above between image, thought, history and experience, allows us to see some folds for a critical thinking, where we have visualized that the reference to the minor and its perspective in the key of becoming becomes relevant. Let us say now that the becoming-minor, being a mode of intensification of the powers of existence, in its fragility and precariousness can be constituted as an artifact of memory of an imaginal texture. This allows us to trace forms of inhabiting the violence and resistance of irreducible modes of existence, which are at play in this politics of the register described above. In this sense,

(...) the politics of the register at stake here would involve taking to the extreme the critique of historicism and of the conventional ways in which politics, community, meaning and truth are thought of. That is to say, such a possibility requires at the very least a reflexive displacement with respect to the sovereign principle that founds all politics of the subject, of history, of knowledge and of meaning. (Villalobos-Ruminott, 2018, p. 192)

81

From this approach, we consider it suggestive to think about minor interventive practices and the establishment of the institution as a minor composition, in order to open up both the powers of the register and also to deepen the question of a different epistemological and political field. Alongside all these languages of peoples that persist in a history that does not allow itself to be explained in simple terms of evolution or obsolescence, one “draw(s) zones or networks of survivals at the very point where they declare their extraterritoriality, their marginalization, their resistance, their vocation of revolt” (Didi-Huberman, 2017, p.55). Here would be added, in our opinion, those powers and coefficients of deterritorialization of the minor for other institutional compositions, which are embodied in the disengagement or discomfort already described by Faleiros (1993) around intervention and institutional compositions from the perspective of Social Work. Although we know that these discussions were outlined from a staunchly modern mode of institutionalization without critical possibility, passing through processes of “denial of institutional work” that have created alternatives from social movements, to certain “counter-institutional” deployments (Faleiros, 1993, p.19-20), we consider it necessary to show institutional disengagement that can be illustrated by rethinking minor interventional practices.



In this regard, we find suggestive the research of Verónica Gago (2015) around the La Salada fair in Buenos Aires and the notion of body-territory as keys that denote another way of understanding political pragmatics in the global South. Her analyses map practices that think, from a context of precariousness and exploitation, governmentality and processes of subjectivation from below. Here she shows how mechanisms of resistance unfold in the informal, a question that can be read as a pragmatic vitalism that undoes the political and epistemic methodics of the national-state⁶ towards minor practices that destabilize the major, being able to generate new forms of life. We believe that our philosophical, political and epistemic journey can be seen embodied in this set of interventive practices shown by Gago (2015; 2019), insofar as they are installed under existential logics that resist the ways of life of the hegemonic subjectivation of the governmental neoliberal model. In fact, to be even more graphic, the notion of body-territory exposes the conflict and confrontation of diverse communities to extractive and industrial projects (urban, suburban, peasant and indigenous) related to the discourses of neo-development, as visualized in the tension between the peasant community and the electric transmission project of “national interest” that recently took place in the La Campana-Peñuelas Biosphere Reserve. This notion would explain a new mapping of the dispossession of common goods in the conditions of daily life of these communities by the imposition of developmentalist subjectivations and, in turn, shows the strategies of resistance carried out by various communities, most of which are led by women. This scaffolding of active resistances gives rise to new modes of organization and to a “creation of existential territories” (Gago, 2019, p.99)⁷.

In this sense, the active resistance punctuated by Gago (2019) allows us to turn our gaze towards the thought of Étienne Souriau (2017), as it delineates this meeting of the potencies of the lesser in networks of survivals and their coefficients of deterritorialization with a “philosophy of instauration”. It is relevant to see that here a thought is articulated that explores different modes of existence and the recognition of the right to exist. This philosophy of Souriau’s instauration outlines powerful questions, as Arcila (2020) points out to us.

What exists and what does not, who exists and who does not? (...) how can we think of contemporary ways to enter into litigation, to witness and deputize the right to exist of ways of being and ways of life that are invisibilized, denied or actively destroyed? (p.97)

⁶ Some of these illustrations and others are discussed in more detail in another of our recent papers: Moscoso-Flores et al. (2022).

⁷ It is not superfluous to mention that some of the scope of this reading can be found in Bolados and Sanchez’s (2017) analyses of resistance in the “sacrifice zones” in Quintero Bay, Chile.

From the establishment, therefore, we can come to understand the formulation and problematicity that interpellates an irreducibility of existences as part of a philosophical, ethical, aesthetic and political reflection. In this sense, the dimension of the irreducible is played in the conquest, not from a simple fact or factual data, but from a process of expulsion of its very reality, Souriau (2017) will tell us. We can follow this point from what Lapoujade (2018) expounds in his *Existencias menores* regarding the right to exist as a problem

how could existence constitute a problem if it is an irreducible datum? (...) To exist with the permanence of a thing, to exist with a “rheic” existence, according to Souriau’s terms, is not enough to “situate” the existence conceived according to another way. It is to disregard any distinction between law and fact. One is not real by the mere fact that one exists; one is only real on condition of having conquered the right to exist. (p.83-84)

This involves a political potential oriented to the forms of composition of collective enunciations and modes of the sensitive that cross political and social relations to which a politics of registration would not be alien. We believe we can see these social and political articulations and the conquests for the right to exist in the written expression that appears in the sites of community resistance to the installation of high tension towers in the La Campana-Peñuelas Biosphere Reserve: “if you see a task, it is yours”. This slogan applied from washing the dishes and keeping the site clean to carrying out inspections, ensuring compliance with the project’s commitments, and making the complaints that, strictly speaking, should have been made by the environmental⁸ institutions themselves.

From the exposed cases we see how this framework is being articulated with the philosophy of the establishment of Souriau (2017). It is a policy that takes into account specific experiences of “impossible” spaces and identities, which lack the identity of a privileged subject from a more traditional political composition. It envisions an integration of another possible way of life. This, undoubtedly, is an important issue to consider, since in its impossibility lies the potentiality of a becoming that exceeds the majority systems of signification and inscription. This potentiality would be mediated by a problematic affectation, where we can think of a process of political subjectivation related to the process of becoming-minor proposed by Deleuze and Guattari (1978; 2008), in which virtualities are introduced against and outside the distributive and differential

⁸ From the same project already referenced, here we are facing a participant observation of resistance to the installation of the LT 2x500 kV Cardones-Polpaico LT 2x500 kV transmission line in Cerro Las Vizcachas, on February 2, 2018.



positions of the majoritarian system. It is necessary to think, then, of modes of registers and mechanisms of visibility of these other non-categorizable, non-distributable forms of life that constantly disturb the binary oppositions of the majoritarian systems. Thus, these modes of minor existences could, in our opinion, claim a particular right to exist, where

(...) to make exist is always to make exist against ignorance or contempt. We always have to defend the subtle against the coarse, the second planes against the fuss of the foreground, the rare against the ordinary whose mode of knowledge has for correlate the densest ignorance.” (Lapoujade, 2018, p.75)

By collecting this type of experience we think it is possible to consider the problematic of intervention and institution from the implications and consequences that contract the forms of territorial and subjective claim, from different events that remake territories, multiply their borders and, ultimately, constitute a mutant composition of a whole sensitive field that affects and institutes multiple practices and ways of life, taking place far from the sovereign tradition. Thus, in the descriptions made so far, including what is referred to by Gago (2015; 2019), suggestive elements seem to be available that can re-understand the relationship between intervention and institution, both for Social Work and for other intervening social professions. It is required to rearticulate the relationship between the interventive practices we want to outline and their ways of instituting them. It is for the same reason that Lapoujade (2016) states that a certain combat is at stake here, for “if it is a combat or a struggle, it is because it is about making common cause with what does not have the right to exist, against the powers that deprive them of that right” (p.276).

Now, it seems relevant to us to say that these experiences in their composition, populating and territorializing differentially determined space-times, even when they are provisional or mobile -in the same line as what Didi-Huberman (2017) posited in networks of survivals- exist in an attunement with the gesture of instauration or institution; the latter, clearly, in a terrain that aims to decenter the institutional organic, which also forces us to rethink the question of intervention. Thus, the way of instituting or instantiating the question of the institution is set against the idea that this type of experience is explained by means of a transcendent foundation, in order rather to



consider them by the folds of their constitution that witness and intensify the gestures that sustain them. It would be to think the establishment against transcendence:

What is the difference between establishing and founding? The foundation preexists in law the act that nevertheless situates it; it is external or superior to that which it founds, whereas the establishment is immanent to that which it establishes. The instauration is only sustained by its own gesture, nothing pre-exists it (...) In other words, to found is to make pre-exist whereas to inaugurate is to make exist, but to make exist in a certain way, each time (re)invented. (Lapoujade, 2018, p.72-73)

Undoubtedly, our philosophical, political, aesthetic and epistemic premises have impacts to think an intervention and another institution from a critical thinking that does not focus its exercise from the guidance and imposition of normative horizons, but from the experience of the variation of the power to exist that leaves room for an inventiveness, planes of individuation, virtualities and textures that allow to retake diverse modes of existence to which it is necessary to direct the gaze (Arcila, 2020). More emphatically, we are far from denying from our position an approach to the institution and the law, but it is a matter of composing through other practices-knowledges the recreation of possibilities of life in rupture with the sovereign capital-State domination device (Gago, 2015).

85

A preliminary closing: the openings and potencies of the minor for any institutional process of intervention

The journey undertaken shows two terrains regarding how the minor and its compositions, both existential and aesthetic-political, open possibilities for another set of practices that we see in different ways of understanding intervention and its ways of instituting itself. In other words, this brief opening of possibilities from this theoretical-philosophical reading, when articulated with possible incarnations, opens a power to establish other forms of life, other ways of existence that from minority (insisting: without ignoring the precariousness and suffering) can open up views of both the intervention and the institution in its modes of registration. This shows that in every intervention process the transforming dimensions of the institution operate, as long as other types of registers can be strengthened in the epistemic, political and methodical fields.



In the light of the path followed, with special emphasis on the thematization of potency and register, we have tried to think of a field and a possible method that traces and makes visible the planes of mobile, flexible and precarious corporeality, which escape or interrupt the governmental devices of control and valorization that are installed in the intervention and the institution. It is visualized that the resistances that they glimpse allow us to develop another logic of reappropriation: they make perceptible other struggles in these spaces and conditions in which they are cornered, since in their vacillating compositions they can deploy forms of freedom and affect the landscape of the common, instituting other forms and human, social and political relations. As we have pointed out, this opens up interesting elements for thinking about the professional intervention of Social Work and the epistemic and methodical plots that sustain its form of intervening in the social, showing that within the discipline there are places from which to invent new forms of life and other ways of existing, rewriting the common and the collective (Campana, 2021).

References

- Arcila, S. (2020). Campos de individuación fantasmal: asesinato de líderes sociales en Colombia, marcadores espectrales del horror e intensificadores espectrales de resistencia. *La Deleuziana*, 1(nº especial), 84-111. <http://www.ladeleuziana.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/11.Arcila.pdf>
- Arellano-Escudero, N. & Castro-Serrano, B. (2022). *Entrelazamientos deseantes. La intervención en lo social y sus puntos de referencia*. Nadar Ediciones.
- Berardi, F. B. (2019). *Futurabilidad. La era de la impotencia y el horizonte de la posibilidad*. Caja Negra Editora.
- Bolados, P. & Sánchez, A. (2017). Una ecología política feminista en construcción: El caso de las 'Mujeres de zonas de sacrificio en resistencia', Región de Valparaíso, Chile. *Psicoperspectivas*, 16(2), 33-42. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5027/psicoperspectivas-vol16-issue2-fulltext-977>
- Braidotti, R. (2015). *Lo posthumano*. Gedisa.
- Campana, M. (2021). Crítica y resistencias: ¿cuáles son las trincheras posibles? *Propuestas Críticas en Trabajo Social – Critical Proposals in Social Work*, 1(1), 12-27. DOI: 10.5354/2735-6620.2021.61228.



Chignola, S. (2014). A la sombra del Estado. Governance, gubernamentalidad, gobierno. *Utopía y praxis latinoamericana*, 19(66), 37-51. <https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=27937089005>

Deleuze, G. (2005). *La isla desierta y otros textos (1953-1974)*. Pre-textos.

Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1978). *Kafka; por una literatura menor*. Ed. Era.

Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1980). *Mille Plateaux. Capitalisme et Schizophrénie 2*. Les Éditions de Minuit.

Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (2008). *Mil Mesetas. Capitalismo y Esquizofrenia*. Pre-Textos.

Deligny, F. (2017). *Semilla de crápula. Consejos para los educadores que quieran cultivarla*. Cactus y Tinta Limón.

Didi-Huberman, G. (2017). *La supervivencia de las luciérnagas*. Abada Editores.

Didi-Huberman, G. (2018). *Pueblos expuestos, pueblos figurantes*. Manantial.

Donzelot, J. (2007). *La invención de lo social. Ensayo sobre la declinación de las pasiones políticas*. Nueva Visión.

Faleiros, V. de P. (1993). *Trabajo Social e Instituciones*. Hvmánitas.

Foucault, M. (1995). ¿Qué es la crítica? *Daimon Revista de filosofía*, 11, 5-25.

Foucault, M. (2014). *Del gobierno de los vivos*. Fondo Cultura Económica.

Gago, V. (2015). *La razón neoliberal: economías barrocas y pragmática popular*. Tinta Limón.

Gago, V. (2019). *La potencia feminista o del deseo de cambiarlo todo*. Traficantes de sueños.

González-Saibene, A. (2014). El Mito del 'Objeto' en Trabajo Social. *Revista Rumbos-ts*, 10, 10-37. <http://revistafacso.ucentral.cl/index.php/rumbos/article/view/93>

González-Saibene, A. (2021). El impacto de las producciones filosóficas y teórico/

epistemológicas en la constitución de la disciplina. *Propuestas Críticas en Trabajo Social - Critical Proposals in Social Work* 1(1), 101-122. DOI: 10.5354/2735-6620.2021.61238

Guattari, F. & Rolnik, S. (2005). *Micropolítica. Cartografías del deseo*. Traficantes de sueños.

Lapoujade, D. (2011). *Las potencias del tiempo: versiones de Bergson*. Cactus.

Lapoujade, D. (2016). *Deleuze, los movimientos aberrantes*. Cactus.

Lapoujade, D. (2018). *Las existencias menores*. Cactus.

Moscoso-Flores, P., Castro-Serrano, B. & Fernández, C. (2022). La devastación como fuerza del pensamiento. Consideraciones metodológicas para una intervención menor. *Revista Universum* (UTAL).

Moscoso-Flores, M. & Fuster, N. (2018). *Fragmentos del sujeto moderno. Crítica, poder identidad*. Editorial Cuarto propio.

Pérez Soto, C. (1997). *Sobre la condición social de la Psicología*. LOM Ediciones y Universidad Arcis.

Sauvagnargues, A. (2016). *Armmachines. Deleuze, Guattari, Simondon*. Edinburgh University Press.

Souriau, É. (2017). *Los diferentes modos de existencia*. Editorial Cactus.

Stengers, I. (2019). *Cómo pensar juntos. Dos conferencias sobre ciencia, política y desastre*. Editorial Saposcat.

Villalobos-Ruminott, S. (2018). *Heterografías de la violencia*. Ediciones la Cebra.



Acknowledgments

This work is part of the FONDECYT/ANID Regular Project n°1210033, “Critical cartographies of intervention for an institutional invention: for other knowledge and other politics”. We are grateful to the National Doctorate Grant/ANID folio 21211050 and 21200611.

About the author

Cristian Fernández Ramírez Graduate in Philosophy, Universidad de Chile (Chile). Master in Philosophy, Universidad de Chile (Chile). Adjunct Assistant Professor of Social Work, Faculty of Education and Social Sciences, Universidad Andrés Bello (Chile).

E-mail address: cfernandezramirez@ug.uchile.cl

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2971-7833>

Cristián Ceruti Mahn Veterinarian, Universidad Mayor (Chile). Master in Regional Development, University of Queensland (Australia). PhD Candidate in Interdisciplinary Studies, Universidad de Valparaíso (Chile). Adjunct Assistant Professor of Social Work, Faculty of Education and Social Sciences, Universidad Andrés Bello (Chile).

E-mail address: cristian.ceruti@gmail.com

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9915-8032>

José Miguel Garay Rivera Psychologist, Universidad de La Serena (Chile). D. Candidate in Critical Theory and Current Society, Faculty of Education and Social Sciences, Universidad Andrés Bello (Chile).

E-mail address: J.garayrivera@uandresbello.edu

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4109-9575>



Borja Castro-Serrano Psychologist, Universidad Diego Portales (Chile). Master in Philosophy, Universidad de Chile and PhD in Philosophy, Universidad de Murcia (Spain). Academic and researcher at the Faculty of Education and Social Sciences of the Andrés Bello University, being a permanent professor of the Social Work career and member of the faculty of the Doctorate in Critical Theory and Current Society (Chile). Primary Researcher of FONDECYT/ANID Regular Project n°1210033.

E-mail adress: francisco.castro@unab.cl

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7422-3205>

<https://unab.academia.edu/BorjaCastro>

