HISTORY, SUBJECTIVITY AND ARCHIVES IN MICHEL FOUCAULT, GILLES DELEUZE AND PAUL VEYNE [1]

Flávia Cristina Silveira Lemos[2]
Assistant Professor IV, DE, in Social Psychology/Federal University of Pará (UFPA), Brazil. Researcher on productivity at CNPQ-PQ2.
Dolores Galindo
Assistant Professor IV in studies of contemporary culture, Federal University of Mato Grosso (UFMT), Brazil.
Paulo de Tarso Ribeiro de Oliveira
Associate professor I Social Psychology, Federal University of Pará (UFPA), Brazil.

ABSTRACT. The article presents some tools for the realization of history through archeology, genealogy and cartography with Foucault, Deleuze and Veyne. Working with documents and files from the perspective of the subjectivity production of the story is relevant to research in psychology. The text aims indeed propose general procedures on historical studies and point out some recommendations to those who want to manage sources, present in public and private archives. The historical writing permeates important concepts to the criticism of the naturalization of social practices and thus lets you operate spaces of freedom which seemed to be evidence. Foucault was named, so the evidence destroyer as outlined hammered from Nietzsche of petrified layers of knowledge, power and subjectivity, which make up governance arrangements of pipelines, at present. Thus, it is possible to analyze the historical events in the game, and in a mobile field of heterogeneous forces. The history of truth is a questioning which enables denature the knowledge, power and move move subjectivities. Historicizing is to create cracks and other spaces.
Keywords: History; Subjectivity; Documents; Research; Psychology.

HISTÓRIA, SUBJETIVIDADE E ARQUIVOS EM MICHEL FOUCAULT, PAUL VEYNE E GILLES DELEUZE

RESUMO. O artigo apresenta algumas ferramentas para a realização da história por meio da arqueologia, da genealogia e da cartografia com Foucault, Deleuze e Veyne. O trabalho com documentos e arquivos, na perspectiva da história da produção da subjetividade, é relevante para as pesquisas em Psicologia. O texto visa, com efeito, propor procedimentos gerais sobre os estudos históricos e apontar algumas recomendações aos que desejam manejar fontes, presentes em arquivos públicos e privados. A escrita histórica perpassa conceitos importantes para a crítica à naturalização de práticas sociais e, assim, permite operar espaços de liberdade onde pareciam existir evidências. Foucault foi nomeado, por isso, do destruidor de evidências porque delineava marteladas, a partir de Nietzsche das camadas petrificadas dos saberes, poderes e subjetividades, os quais compõem dispositivos de governo das condutas, no presente. Assim, é possível analisar historicamente os acontecimentos em jogo, em um campo móvel e de forças heterogêneas. A história da verdade é uma problematização, a qual possibilita desnaturalizar os saberes, mover poderes e deslocar subjetividades. Historicizar é criar fissuras e espaços outros.
Palavras-chave: História; Subjetividade; Documentos; Pesquisa; Psicologia.

HISTORIA, SUBJETIVIDAD Y ARCHIVOS EN MICHEL FOUCAULT, GILLES DELEUZE Y PAUL VEYNE

RESUMEN. El artículo presenta algunas herramientas para la realización de la historia por intermedio de la arqueología, la genealogía y la cartografía con Foucault, Deleuze y Veyne. Trabajar con documentos y archivos desde la perspectiva de la producción de la subjetividad de la historia es relevante para la investigación en psicología. El texto tiene como objetivo proponer de hecho procedimientos generales sobre los estudios históricos y señalan algunas recomendaciones para aquellos que quieren gestionar las fuentes, presentes en archivos públicos y privados. La escritura de la historia impregna conceptos importantes a la crítica de la naturalización de las prácticas sociales y por lo tanto le permite operar espacios de libertad, que parecía ser la evidencia. Foucault fue nombrada, por lo que el destructor de pruebas tal como se indica martillado de Nietzsche de capas petrificados de conocimiento, poder y subjetividad, que constituyen mecanismos de gobernanza de las tuberías, en la actualidad. Por lo tanto, es posible analizar los acontecimientos históricos en el juego, y en un campo de fuerzas móvil heterogéneos. La historia de la verdad es un cuestionamiento que permite desnaturalizar el conocimiento, el poder y mover subjetividades. Historización es crear grietas y otros espacios.
Palabras-clave: Historia; Subjetividad; Documentos; Investigación; Psicología.

Introduction

This article aims at collaborating with people interested in thinking the work with archives, from Foucault, Veyne and Deleuze. A central objective of the text is to address some tools that help to carry out a history with conceptual elements of: archeology, genealogy and cartography. For this purpose, we start from what Veyne (1998) outlines as conceptual history, based on management of sources, present in the documental search.

> Certainly, history is part of the Foucault's method. However, he never became historian. Foucault is a philosopher who invents with history a relationship entirely different from those of the philosophers of history. History according to Foucault, surrounds and delimits us; it does not tell what we are, but what we are in the process to differ; it does not stablishes our identity but dissipates it in favor of the other that we are (Deleuze, 1992, p. 119).

Archeology, subjectivity, history and documents

Foucault analyzed historically the political production of truth, which allowed thinking the production of differences today. The history of truth was woven more specifically in the archeology of knowledge as a description of the archive without resorting to the sovereignty of the subject and temporal continuity because the sovereign subject and the linearity of history correlated with the conscience of a supposed essentialist object.

History would be, in archeology, constructed by discontinuous breaks and not by origins and finalistic totalities as in the linear version and sovereignty of the subject. For this reason, in order to highlight the boundaries of distinction between traditional and archaeological history, Foucault (2009) emphasized how a history of archives, present in archeology, operates in terms of discontinuous perspectives, institutional places, positions of subject, constitution of themes and objects, creation of discursive formations through distinct and intertwined series. Thus, "the archive supposes the archivist" (Farge, 2009, p. 11). In this aspect, "the archive taste undergoes this artisan act" (Farge, 2009, p. 23).

> Perhaps, the archive does not tell the truth, but it tells about the truth, as Michel Foucault understood, that is, in the unique way that he had to expose the thinking of the other, pressed by power relations and himself, relations in which he was subjected, but that he also concretized by verbalizing them. What can be seen, in these sparse words, are elements of the reality that, for its appearance, which is necessary to be worked on, this, is what should be tried to decode (Farge, 2009, p. 35).

Archeology allowed the expansion of the levels of analysis, the displacements of the traditional concepts of totalizing history, for the benefit of a discontinuous history. The research questions assumed a relevant bias for history as a problematization of documents, composed of archives of the multiplicity of excerpts of singular, heterogeneous and disperse knowledge. The proposal of breaking with the history of consciousness formed by writing and analytical of continuities was one of the main axes of the movement of French New History, in the sixties of the 20th Century.

To Deleuze (2005) and Foucault (2009), archeology is the problem history of an archive, is a diagram of forces, intertwined. This analysis project aimed to make proliferate distinctions, recurrences, intertwining of discursive series, identify dispersions, mark updates, and problematize conditions for the possibility of appearance of an object. In this respect, the document ceases to be inert and starts to operate by the movement of the forces. The archaeological history started to describe the monument as event due to its rarity. Foucault (2004) proposes that we shut ourselves off from the illusion of the search for an essential origin, from the concern with a near future of teleological perfection in order to implement the materiality of concrete practices that constitute the objects dated, without essence and without a purpose to achieve and restructure.

Archeology is relevant for the historical analysis of the relationship between subjectivity and truth, because, the production of the difference as a differentiation is possible only insofar as the discontinuity is presented as dispersion between truth and creation of existence. The manufacturing of the archive of forms of life operates a correlation between subjectivities and knowledge that it is not a mere reductionist casualty and nor a nature, after all, there is a history of subjectivity and truth of the order of the perspectivism, in time and space, which destroys the notion of essence of the subject and knowledge.

An important question to delineate is that the archive; in this analysis, would not have an oneness and nor a wholeness to be sough, because, this was the program of studies of the traditional history school, based on a work and on the influence experienced by a intentionality of authorship. In the French New History, the archive gained the status of a dispersive set of events, which were related arbitrarily and should be read as wordings and processes of enunciation and not as performative acts, prepositions or from the sentences by the semantic (Foucault, 2009).

Other archaeological procedure of prominence, in New History, was the analysis of collateral spaces between wordings, in the formation of an archive. There is a coexistence of events that should be described and analyzed (Deleuze, 2005; Foucault, 2009). As a result of this procedure, Foucault (2004) proposes that the archeologist follows with attention the order of the discourse that was created, in a disperse temporality, in his allocation system, describing the concepts without seeking coherence between them.

On the bulge of these practices mentioned until now, visualized in the archeology of knowledge, Veyne (1979; 1998) affirmed the importance of not making the concepts and methodologies ideal types, universalized. To this historian, it was crucial for us to work with a history that would not let to work with concepts, but displace them forever from the places of essence and; thus, historicize them as a possibility of making resistance. In this way, it is worth observing the tip of Cardoso Jr. (2001), when recommending to scholars on the documents that they think the network of intrigues that is present in a scheme of heterogeneous and multiple forces of the update/displacement of the historical-conceptual events.

The archeologist recommended to avoid the word knowledge, because it would not be conducted an epistemology of science as archeological practice. The archive is not carried out by a subject of the knowledge but within the multiple networks between cultural, social, political, economic, subjectivist and historical practices. The archive is formed by wordings that have correlatives, referring; that is, they are referent to a theme, in a space of correlation. These, in turn, are linked to the conditions of emergence of the objects, in terms of possibilities of appearance and limitation. Wordings have supports, places and dates, they can be repeated; although, the enunciations is not repeated (Foucault, 2009).

In this complex exercise, in which faces appear – even they are only sketches –, they insinuate themselves similarly to the fable and fable making, and perhaps the capacity by one or another to transform everything into legend, to create a history or make of his life a fiction. The archive also

informs about this transformation, and the models adopted, once identified, add more meaning. Narrative and fiction intertwine themselves; the network is dense and does not allow to be read so easily (Farge, 2009).

Discourses are a set of wordings organized in a system of discursive formation, in which the analysis should not be interpretative, nor start from linear inferences, but from positions of the subjects, formation of the objects, enunciative modalities, institutional places, strategic places, formation of concepts and themes (Foucault, 2004). "Discourses are elements or tactical blocs in the field of the correlations of forces; there may be different discourses and even contradictory within a same strategy; they can, conversely, circulate with no change of form between opposite strategies" (Foucault, 1988, pp. 112-3).

The archeologist does not seek general and abstract concepts but analyzes them in a game of appearance and displacement. It is important to demarcate what would be the correlations between the themes and the transformations occurred, as well as raise the common space between the concepts and the themes that were related. It is relevant for an analysis of the historical discontinuity and to break with any idea of identity of an object continued in time, to ask about the formation of the objects under the conditions of possibility of their emergence (Foucault, 2009). Subjectivity is not identity but disperse and multiple, rare and singular, constructed in time and space by correlated practices without an original root, which would determine it in a causal and linear way.

There is an exteriority of the discourse and not an internal logic based on intentionality. Discourses are practices and who speaks is positioned through a statute, a place from which is spoken, which is articulated to the institutional places occupied. On the other hand, the enunciative modalities are linked to the discourse orders in terms of comment, discourse and doctrinal societies, etc. To Foucault (2004), analyzing the principle of the comment is important in terms of making a critical ontology of ourselves, because the repetition of wordings works by the logic of a group of authors categorized by the discursive controls. Other relevant point is the questioning of the formation of the disciplines and how this organization of knowledge, in a disciplinary way, aims to create an idea of discursive unit for what in fact is dispersed.

> The knowledge of history is linked to the period of its production, to the present of the historian, which is always new. If the present is always new and reinterprets the past in a new way, the truth of the past will always be new, because is dominated by the novelty of the present... History does not see invariant; there is not an engine of the history... The sources of the historian are incomplete... (Reis, 2014, pp. 150-1).

In addition, it is worth noting the tactic presented by Foucault (2004) of questioning of the controls exercised by the doctrinal and dogmatic societies of the discourse. Both, would select some discourses and would interdict others, would censor some and would qualify others. In this sense, there is a set of practices of rarefaction/filters and surveillances, which aim to prevent the variation and differentiation of wordings. In fact, Foucault (2009) highlighted how important it was to point out if there was translation in the analysis of enunciative modalities, techniques used to enunciate, manner in writing the wordings and rewriting the same, systematization and synthesis of wordings, performed in a document.

Foucault (2004), in the analysis of the order of the discourse consolidated a system of movement/distribution of knowledge, in the form that the wordings are organized by the editorial practices, in the functioning of libraries, in the re-editions and references; in a curriculum, in the publishing formats of articles and in the periodicity of journals. The rules of the discourse gained materiality of control of bodies, of knowledge and could create systems of authorization and veto to speeches and publication. "Now this will of truth, as the other exclusion systems, rests on an institutional support... by the way in which the knowledge is applied in a society, in which it is valued and distributed, shared and somewhat attributed" (Foucault, 2004, p. 17).

In this way, making use of the principle of the local character of criticism, proposed by Foucault, allows acting with an obtuse empiricism, that is, the task of the research gains the notoriety of a criticism, being located and armed with descriptions as an analytical act and of historical-documentary

writing, refined and dense, made with rigor and courage of truth to interrogate the sources in favor or against time, as taught Nietzsche (2003).

In this methodological pathway, Deleuze (2005) stressed that analyzing the positions of subject is not activating a "primordial me from whom the wording would derive" (p. 19). The author and his work should be historically interrogated by the criticism of Foucault to personality and to the being of language, in the approach of a cartography of forces, in archive, in the network of intrigues of wordings of the documents, analyzed. Therefore, this is why Blanchot created a field of difference production in the style of Deleuze and Guattari (2013), by rejecting the figures of subject and consciousness as a prohibitive of singling out. For this reason, Blanchot was important for Foucault to think about the fragmentation of a subjective unity through the criticism to the author function and to the invention of men, in modernity. This dispersion is crucial to think about subjectivity and truth, in history from a research policy in which the discipline Psychology can never legitimize the unity of its object because the knowledge of psychologies arise from the discontinuity itself in which subjectivity is produced.

Foucault also places the interrogation of the work in check, in this sense, because it would be read as always, linked to the author who would have produced it, in a will of truth. History as narrative, is produced by operators of time and space, associating the events scattered by perspectivism. A pragmatic of the relationships is constitutive of writing and historical fiction, according to Veyne (1998). The creation of the links does not implies to naturalize forces in fixed diagrams. The dynamics of the intrigues and disputes does not cease and can never be paralyzed by practices of archiving. Thus, the archive is linked to the archivist, as well as the document is linked to the hand that handles and analyzes it, in which narrative and fiction are intertwined in a dense and multifaceted network (Farge, 2011).

It is apparent here, the importance to address relationships between archive, document and subjectivity, in history. For this reason, a text has rules of production, circulation, receiving and is not clear and impartial.

Discourses are linked to the powers that authorize them or not, legitimate them in certain spaces and silence them in others. A text belongs to a discursive formation and cannot be analyzed individually, because it has relationships of social belonging and political orientations, not being work of a single author (Albuquerque Jr., 2009).

There are cases in which the researcher only accesses the archive by mediation of an employee that brings a box with dossiers, reports and does not allow the researcher to access the place of their storage. There are also situations in which the documents are digitalized in documentation centers, in which are organized and well preserved. The documents are results of concrete practices, that is, of historical doings that had date and place defined. The object is result of what was made by men in history, marking the singularity of the historical events. Once again, it is possible to stress that processes of subjectivation, that is, creation of subjectivities, is accompanied by the practices of objectivation, or rather, of production of truth. Thus, there is a rarity of the events because they do not repeat themselves; they are at most updated. The relationships between several practices help to problematize doings, in a non-natural nor linear causal coexistence (Veyne, 1998).

Genealogy, subjectivity, history and documents

Genealogist would be a lover of libraries and their documents; studying the footnotes and paying attention to details; reading the dusty texts, which nobody consults or read. Foucault (1979) already stated that the historical genealogy is patiently documentary and that every knowledge is a local criticism, that is, the historical writing is a narrative of the singularities of events, because, there are not laws of history nor original and ultimate meaning for the same (Cardoso Jr., 2001). Genealogy allows making the policy of the research without original essence and finalisms to reach, breaking with the utilitarianism of the studies, which intend to merge beginning and end by mechanistic deduction, in problematizing subjectivity and truth.

Genealogy is also concerned with the knowledge that is disqualified. In the words of Foucault (1979), genealogy opens space for the knowledge to be able to fight and dis-discipline the subjected knowledge. Thus, genealogy aimed to move the knowledge disqualified the traditional History and rarely

accessed by society; mobilizing archives, analyzing and describing them, patiently, to operate historical writings of the concrete practices (Foucault, 1979).

Genealogy acts with documents, doing this with patience and meticulousness. The power relations are practical and non-discursive strategies, a true policy, delimited by games that do not cease. The powers that seize and appropriate discourses are interconnected in diagrams, operating through breaking and heterogeneities. One methodological principle of genealogy is to punctuate the resistances as part of the games of power, knowledge and subjectivation, because where there is power always there is scope to resist. The historical emergence of an object with the political manufacturing of difference through the provenance (discontinuous subjectivity).

A second warning is not to locate the power within the State and social class or in someone seen as holder, since power is action on action, force driven with many other forces, mobile and gathered to the hazards of meetings (Foucault, 1988). The break of centrality and location of power helps to displace the subjectivity and truth of reductionist logics from the economic and/or political determinisms.

Other methodological precaution, the third, would be not thinking power only as repression and oppression, domination is only the effect of the dynamic relationships, articulated in crystallizations of practices. Power circulates between bodies and can only operate in places of freedom. In some situations, it can result in processes of nationalization and, still be limited by violence and slavery, when practically there is no longer how to resist (Foucault, 1996). This circulation creates opening for the creation of freedom between bodies, practices of research, permanently without an ingenuous notion of impartiality by the researcher and, at the same time, without falling into Manichaeism of manipulation of the studies by intentional practices of a supposed sovereign subject.

Genealogy aimed dissipating identity and its supposed roots, linked to the traditions of the past. In this sense, it concerns about the emission of singularities, introducing the discontinuous in its own being, as affirmed Deleuze (2005). Antiquarian History, according Foucault (1979) was focused on the search for original roots of language, city, culture, family religion. In this analytical aspect of a genealogical methodology of Foucault is that, Deleuze (2005) constitutes a reading of archeogenealogy as a composition between archeology of knowledge and genealogy of power, in the formation of a diagram of forces, aligned with the difference and singularity of archives of the network. The diagram enters into consonance with the same weaving of the correlation of lines of the wordings and with the policy of truth, historicized.

Other aspect of genealogy lies in criticizing the Monumental History and all system of veneration linked to this, since it prevented the differentiation in the present. "The veneration of the monuments becomes parody: the respect to the ancient continuities becomes systematic dissociations" (Foucault, 1979, p. 37). Idolatry of everything that would be material and immaterial heritage of the so-called humanity would be a trap, which would make the forces of being enlisted impossible, in the bet on living the present. Subjectivity and truth can be transformed precisely because there is affirmative history of live in the present, in favor and against time, instead of a fetish of the tribunal history and idolatry of past.

To Veyne (1998), in conversation with Foucault, history is made of events and these do not possess totality, origin or teleology; concepts such as progress and evolution; grounded in the idea of a subject of conscience and history as linear line of chronological time while a thread in straight line signalizes to the future read as social progress. This act brings the possibility to make discontinuity a history, which can tell the intrigues, networks, plots, which were marked by dated practices, singular and that occurred in a specific place and time.

It is opened then the breach for implementing the history of present without falling into the trap of intentionality and causalities of search in the first motors or any type of hidden and mechanistic logic of writing of history. Both archive and document are produced by tensions, marked by games and disputes; constituted by practices of sharing and confrontations. History is the writing of intrigues, formed by singular events. Thus, it is the effect of practices, of what is being done. The object of history does not exist in advance, it is produced by doings, only being materialized through practices that forge it (Veyne, 1979).

The genealogist vision would be focused on the filigree of the archive, on the singularity of the events. Genealogy is one way of writing history. According to Veyne (1998), the historian or apprentice

historian can describe and analyze the concrete practices through problematizing the relations of power and knowledge, intertwined in each document. Historian finds history in each object and doing. It is only possible to observe and demarcate the rarity of the objects by the exercise of the refinement of the analysis.

Foucault (1979) stressed that the specific intellectual is who acts in the present in which he lives and in the local criticism, to implement a history without prophecies that operate predictions of the following future, besides not remaining mired in the past as a tradition to be repeated and imitated by a culture supposedly homogeneous of a people to be preserved. Studying history is a form of differing from what we are and forging passages for being.

The historical crystallization of forms of life conducts to resentments and hatreds to differences. The affirmation of the powers of meetings gains in breaking with repetitions that weakens the history in its effective condition of transformation of the existences. Foucault emphasized the importance of working with documents for the struggles of the present and affirmed that carried out researches with themes with which he was politically committed (Artières, 2014). With the intention of problematizing this question about power relations that cross the cultural field, it becomes interesting to observe some reflections carried out by Foucault (1996) in his inaugural lecture to the *Collége de France*, in which he presents his hypothesis about the materiality of discourse.

One principle of exclusion for the discourses described in this text refers to the interdiction of the words: taboo on the object, ritual about circumstance and exclusive right of the subject who speaks. These are aspects that are seen as the three forms of interdicting that relate to each other, revealing its power, mainly in the fields of sexuality and policy (Foucault, 2004). Based on the exposed above, it becomes interesting to think culture from the knowledge-power relationship (Foucault, 1999), once its legitimation depends on aspects of social acceptance and qualification of what is produced. Therefore, when problematizing the knowledge through cultural manifestations implies, necessarily, in reflecting on the power networks in which this knowledge is found and that control it based on a logic of domination. It is thinking in this practice, such as the doing of men within the history, that the question of power appears as fundamental to think the objectification and subjectivation processes, from an ontology of the present, that is, a history of the present time. Besides, this text of Kant, according to Foucault (2010), gives rise to other type of question and interrogation in philosophy than that linked to the conditions in which a true knowledge is possible:

> It is a tradition that considers the question of: what is actuality? What is the current field of our experiences? What is the current field of the possible experiences? In this case, this is not an analytical of truth. It is a question of what we might call an ontology of the present, an ontology of the present time, an ontology of modernity, an ontology of ourselves (p. 21).

This genealogical history is a result of the struggle undertaken by memories, in the attempt to remain alive, putting into question a confrontation of forces undertaken by multiple practices that will forge the subject himself within this historical plot. It is about the form in which Foucault will think history and how he will conduct his works in the attempt to think the present in an ethical-political posture.

Cartography, subjectivity, history and documents

The archive becomes a map and each society has its fluid and mobile diagrams, in network of alliances, devices constituted by singling and differences, updated in visible and utterable. Therefore, "there is a history of mediations, as well as there is a becoming and diagram mutations" (Deleuze, 2005, p. 51). One has to run across a serial method, analyzing curves, cuts, multiplicities of levels and correlations between discursive and non-discursive practices, "The thinking operates in the interstice … there is only centers and inter-centers ... mutation … becoming, change, mutation, concern to the constituent forces and not to the composed forms" (Deleuze & Guattari, 2000, pp. 93-94).

In the face of the relationship between archeology and genealogy, the invention of problems is linked to the execution of questions, which allow interrogating events. Most researches called action, for instance, generally, respond the orders of applying knowledge, of presenting known solutions as

innovation in technology. Deleuze and Foucault were worried in creating questions and displacing the answers already done and provided, which make us to repeat theories and techniques. Documents can be taken as diagrams of the present, in schemes of visibility and speakability and can be read through descriptive and analytical tactics, mapped in their mobility, in the practices of visibility and speakability of the device document, in a certain archive. Thus, it is necessary to weave plots, map intrigues and trace the forces that compose the events as object of concern.

> I concern myself of making law. I try, before, to raise problems, work them, show them in their complexities in such a way that they can silence prophets and lawmakers, all those who speak by others, before the others. It is then that the complexity of the problem may appear in its tie with the lives of people; and that, consequently, may appear the legitimacy of a common elaboration, through concrete questions, of difficult cases, revolt movements, reflections, testimonies (Foucault, 2010, p. 338).

Deleuze (2005), after Michel Foucault's death, writes honoring his friend. One text is the book *Foucault*, in which he emphasizes that the historical studies would be a diagonal between levels and in the way of making operate visibilities and speakabilities. Thus, according to Deleuze (2005) a new mapmaker appeared, Foucault. The analysis of the power allows the attentive reading of the forces, in its minutiae and relationships, mobility and intertwined dynamics, which forges effects. There is a political investment in the body, which becomes matter of study, in cartography.

There are precautions of method cited by Foucault that Deleuze (2005) reiterates and calls postulates of the power to be aim of attention, in the production of the research. The possibilities of life as artwork and stylistic of the existence in fields of problematization become openings from the imminence between power, knowledge and subjectivation (Deleuze, 1992). "Between power and knowledge, there is difference of nature, heterogeneity, but there is also mutual presupposition and mutual catches and there is, finally, primacy of one over other ..." (Deleuze, 2005, p. 81).

The documents and history that narrate are fragments of the past and cannot be analyzed as they have a coherence and a linear sequence. They are remains and possess gaps, breaks and interruptions. For this reason, the historian works at the limit of writing and operates on the threshold between past and present, achieving an analytical perspective of the institutional place and subjective position that it holds.

Despite these discontinuous spaces, they can offer indications about the sociability on habits and values, bring narratives of subjectivities lived, such as the diaries and letters, personal e-mails, family portraits, blogs, pages in social networks, postal cards sent, furniture of a house, clothes of an epoch, ways of eating, pleasures and smells, resentments and rivalries, housed in supports of the memory, the archives (Cunha, 2009).

Their historical narratives and doings configure multiple and multifaceted experimentations, discontinuous, but intertwined in maps that forge differentiate writings and receive methodological treatments related to the disciplines, objects and specific knowledge to each field in which the documental sources are driven (Cardoso Jr, 2001). "... This is about activating local knowledge, discontinuous, disqualified, and non-legitimized, against the unit theoretical instance that would intend purify, rank, and order them in the name of a true knowledge." (Foucault, 1979, p. 171). In conclusion, knowledge is driven in devices, formed by laws, architectures, subjectivities, documents, archives, dossiers, disciplines, varied controls and accurate concrete practices of power, which are multiple.

Analyzing historically knowledge, powers and formation of the subjectivations implies in acting with date and place, time and space, without fixing in chronology and static geography of the closed maps. It is a question of carrying out diagrams and think history by temporal discontinuities, materialized in a certain space, in a specific society.

Deleuze and Guattari (2014) designated this practice as a stuttering in the language itself to undertake a strangeness of it in order to open to the foreign view and detach from the naturalizations that adhere to the bodies and subjectivities. According to Sforzini (2014),, in the documental research it is fought a battle in the body, marked by the history, in order to make the writing of the other histories opened to the multiplicities of the forms of living and being. The problematizing history aimed to

interrogate the documents, place them lurking around through questions that would demonstrate the plot of the monument produced piece by piece, in an archive.

This was about a critical attitude as a work of the rigorous thinking on the historical events (Gros, 2014). Thus, the problems can vary as much as the questions are expanded, that is, there is not a solution for this concern of the researcher, only analytical scopes fragmentary in the descriptions and analyses carried out in a way that the sources and questions never are depleted in a work (Lemos & Cardoso Jr., 2008). To Gros (2014), making questions is to problematize. In addition, to Foucault (2004, 2009), analyzing practices through interrogations is exhaust documents, patiently, in question-problem comparisons. The questions that concern forge subjectivities, in their intertwining with the policy of history of the perspective truth.

The art of constructing a problem is very important: it is invented a problem, a position of the problem, before to find a solution (Deleuze, 2004). Veyne (1998) stressed that the historical analysis of practices is an inventory of differences, within exactly the possibility of the opening to the strangeness of what, previously was seen as an object treated naturally, given to the crystallization of the eyes and speaks - practices to see and say, according to Deleuze (2005).

Final considerations

The historical documental research helps in problematizing social practices, their denaturalization and rupture with crystallizations. This is a questioning and critical look of the present time that produces a questioner thinking and established in the astonishment, in the strangeness, in a constant exercise of demolition of evidences (Lemos & Cardoso Júnior, 2008). In this aspect, the document is not a proof of truth but a cultural and historical artifact and can be stored in archives, libraries and museums. Something becomes document through relationships between values, memories, temporalities and specific spaces (Castro, 2008).

Problematization as critical thinking of documents, in history is a relevant proposal for the movement of the so-called new history (Rabinow & Rose, 2003). Foucault (2014) affirmed how it was worthwhile by history to make an art of the existence in favor of a life that could be experienced such as an artwork. To that end, it is operated the creation of a history of our relationships with the truth and the rules that constitute them. Conducting an a analysis of the multiple and heterogeneous relationships in which we are experiencing and for which we resist, is a work about ourselves and with the others in history and in psychology and means certain form of being attentive to life and how something is looked and said to face the adverse situations of life and of the relationships of dispute by the exercise of the care of ourselves and the others, in a dealing with the misfortunes of life. Thus, history, according to Foucault, "surrounds and delimits us; it does not say what we are, but that under which we are in the processes of differing; it does not establishes our identity, but dissipates it in benefit of the other that who are" (Deleuze, 1992, p. 119). Therefore,

> ... the logic of a thinking is not a rational system in equilibrium. Even the language would seem to Foucault a system far from the equilibrium, in contrast to the other linguists. The logic of a thinking is like a wind that impels us, a series of gusts and shocks. It was thought to be in port, and again it was thrown in the sea, as Leibinz says... (Deleuze, 1992, p. 118).

History allows to perform struggles and create breaches for the new cultural and social practices and invention of subjectivities besides offering procedures that allow thinking and problematizing what is made to the others and to ourselves in time and space in which we lived and live. For this reason, aiming to collaborate to break with the hierarchizing movements of values and bodies, which operated disqualifications and some in the face of the others, Foucault (1999) sought to use history to break with these practices. In this sense, he asked in the inaugural lecture of his course *In defense of society* of 1976:

What types of knowledge do you want to disqualify in the moment in which you say that this knowledge is a science? What speaking subject, what discoursing subject, what subject of experience and knowledge do you want to minimize when you say: 'I, who make this speech, Do I make a scientific discourse and am I a scientist'? What theoretical-political avant-garde do you want to enthrone, to highlight it from all solid, circulating and discontinuous forms of knowledge? (p. 11).

Foucault (1999), when talking about the "knowledge subjected", that is, about the non-qualified knowledge, seen as insufficiently elaborated, addresses the importance to rescue them through initiatives that valorize the "knowledge of people". In this sense, thinking culture as this local knowledge can potentiate the valuation process of the social productions in rationalities opened to the processes of differentiation and creative of singularities.

To interrogate knowledge and powers, genealogically, it is fundamental to carry out an analysis and historical description of the crystalized and naturalized cultural practices. Thus, when thinking culture in this way, it is noticed the importance to observe the specificities of the production in singular and heterogeneous processes. To Veyne (1979), the conceptual history helps to search concepts for the analysis without making them universal to replicate as key for reading to all historical researches. The concepts of popular culture, erudite culture, folklore, for instance, would be among the events, to be dislocated in order to perform analytical gaps with the intention to denaturalize practices.

This is not about only to make distinctions, but to think about the forms of access to the spaces and disqualification of the production based on the social values that are created from the distancing between the groups. For that reason, it is important to think in the production of the difference that allows the transit and the possibilities of existences, in a process of cultural trans-valuation, being the analytical keys proposed by Gilles Deleuze and Michel Foucault a contribution whose presence in Psychology can contribute, significantly, to the research with documents in this field of knowledge.

References

Albuquerque Jr., D. M. (2010). Discursos e pronunciamentos: a dimensão retórica da historiografia. In Pinsky, C. B. & Luca, T. R. (Orgs.), *O historiador e suas fontes* (pp. 203-25). São Paulo: Contexto.

Artières, P. (2014). Les trouvailles de l'archéologue. In J-F. Bert, & J. Lamy (Orgs.), Michel Foucault. *Un heritage critique* (pp. 89-96). Paris: CNRS editions.

Cardoso Jr., H. R. (2001). *Tramas de clio*: convivências entre filosofia e história. Curitiba: Aos quatro ventos.

Castro, C. (2008). *Pesquisando em Arquivos*. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Ed.

Cunha, M. T. (2009). Diários pessoais: territórios abertos para a história. In C. B. Pinsky & T. R. Luca (Orgs.), *O historiador e suas fontes* (pp. 251-280). São Paulo: Contexto.

Deleuze, G. (1992). *Conversações*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora 34.

Deleuze, G. (2004). *Diálogos*. Porto: Relógio D'Água.

Deleuze, G. (2005). *Foucault*. São Paulo: Brasiliense.

Deleuze, G.; Guattari, F. (2000) *Mil platôs III: capitalismo e esquizofrenia*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora 34.

Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (2013). *Mil platôs I*: capitalismo e esquizofrenia. Rio de Janeiro: Editora 34, 1996.

Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (2014). *Kafka*. Por uma literatura menor. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica.

Farge, A. (2009). *O sabor do arquivo*. São Paulo: EDUSP.

Farge, A. (2011). *Lugares para a história*. Rio de Janeiro: Autêntica.

Foucault, M. (1979). Microfísica do poder. Rio de Janeiro: Graal.

Foucault, M. (1988). *História da Sexualidade I*: a vontade de saber. Rio de Janeiro: Graal.

Foucault, M. (1996). *A verdade e as formas jurídicas*. Rio de Janeiro: Nau.

Foucault, M. (1999). *Em defesa da sociedade. Curso no Collège de France* (1975-1976) (3a. ed.). São Paulo: Martins Fontes.

Foucault, M. (2004). *A ordem do discurso*. São Paulo: Loyola.

Foucault, M. (2009). *Arqueologia do Saber*. Rio de Janeiro: Forense.

Foucault, M. (2010). *O governo de si e dos outros:* curso no Collège de France (1982-1983). São Paulo: Martins Fontes.

Foucault, M. (2014). Ditos e Escritos IX. Rio de Janeiro: Forense.

Gros, F. (2014). Problématisation. In J-F. Bert & J. Lamy (Orgs.), *Michel Foucault.* Un heritage critique. (pp. 125-126). Paris: CNRS editions.

Lemos, F. C. S. & Cardoso Jr, H. R. (2008). A Genealogia em Foucault: Uma Trajetória. *Psicologia e Sociedade, 21* (3), 353-357.

Nietzsche, F. (2003). *Considerações intempestivas*. Rio de Janeiro: Relume Dumara.

Rabinow, P. & Rose, N. (2003). *The essential Foucault*. New York: The Word Press.

Reis, J. C. (2014). *História & teoria*. Historicismo, Modernidade, Temporalidade e Verdade. Rio de Janeiro: Editora FGV.

Sforzini, A. (2014). *Michel Foucault*. Une pensée du corps. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Veyne, P. (1979). *O inventário das diferenças*. História e Sociologia. São Paulo: Brasiliense.

Veyne, P. (1998). *Como se escreve a história*. Brasília: Editora UNB.

Flávia Cristina Silveira Lemos: Psychologist/São Paulo State University, UNESP. Doctor in History, São Paulo State University, UNESP. Researcher on productivity at CNPQ-PQ02. Professor at the Department of Psychology of the Federal University of Pará, UFPA.

Dolores Galindo: Psychologist/Federal University of Pernambuco, UFPE. Master and Doctor in Social Psychology/Pontifical Catholic University of São Paulo, PUC-SP. Professor at the Department os Psychology of the Federal University of Mato Grosso, UFMT.

Paulo de Tarso Ribeiro de Oliveira: Psychologist/University of the Amazon, UNAMA. Master and Doctor in Collective Health/National School of Public Health, ENSP. Doctor Professor, Associate I, in social psychology of the Federal University of Pará, UFPA.