

CROSSING OVER THE PUBLIC POLICIES: WHEN THE INTERSECTORIALITY BECOMES RHIZOMATIC¹

Roberta Carvalho Romagnoli²

Pontifícia Universidade Católica de Minas Gerais (PUC-MG), Belo Horizonte-MG, Brazil.

ABSTRACT. This text discusses intersectoriality in public policies, a social protection network that links different sectors to serve the population more effectively. Based on Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari's ideas and the intersectoral practice thought in the transversality of macropolitics and micropolitics, we propose a theoretical discussion of intersectoriality as a rhizome, a network of relationships that can be travelled in several directions, possessing strata and various inventions. Among the strata, we give evidence of the excess of procedures, the lack of evaluations of the joint actions after referrals, the lack of response from the sector, the lack of knowledge and work overload of technicians, among others. In the possibilities of the invention, which are unique, there are some points that favour agencying: the commitment from the part of professionals; the knowledge of the tasks of the sector itself and other sectors of the equipment; and the knowledge of the territory. We conclude that the intersectorial practice is done through connecting differences in a plane of immanence.

Keywords: Public policies; institutional analysis; social issues.

TRANSVERSALIZANDO AS POLÍTICAS PÚBLICAS: QUANDO A INTERSETORIALIDADE SE TORNA RIZOMÁTICA

RESUMO. Este texto discute a intersectorialidade nas políticas públicas, rede de proteção social que associa diversos setores para tornar mais eficaz o atendimento à população. Propomos, a partir das ideias de Gilles Deleuze e Félix Guattari e da prática intersectorial pensada na transversalidade da macropolítica e de micropolítica, discutir teoricamente a intersectorialidade como um rizoma, uma rede de relações que pode ser percorrida em diversas direções, possuindo estratos e invenções diversas. Entre os estratos evidenciamos o excesso de trâmites, a falta de avaliações das ações conjuntas após os encaminhamentos, a ausência de resposta de setores, a falta de conhecimento dos técnicos e a sobrecarga de trabalho. Nas possibilidades de invenção, que são singulares, encontramos alguns pontos que favorecem agenciamentos: o compromisso dos profissionais, o conhecimento das atribuições do próprio setor e dos outros setores do equipamento e o conhecimento do território. Concluímos que a prática intersectorial se faz pela conexão de diferenças em um plano de imanência.

Palavras-chave: Políticas públicas; análise institucional; problemas sociais.

TRANSVERSALIZANDO LAS POLÍTICAS PÚBLICAS: CUANDO LA INTERSECCIONALIDAD SE CONVIERTE EN RIZOMÁTICA

RESUMEN. En este texto se examina las políticas públicas intersectoriales, red de protección social que vincula diferentes sectores para servir más efectivamente a la población. Proponemos, a partir de las ideas de Gilles Deleuze y Félix Guattari y de la práctica intersectorial pensada en la transversalidad de la macro-política y de la micro-política, discutir teóricamente interseccionalidad como un rizoma, una red de relaciones que se pueden seguir en distintas direcciones, teniendo los estratos y las varias invenciones. Entre los estratos destacamos el exceso de procedimientos, la falta de evaluaciones de las acciones conjuntas después de las indicaciones, la falta de respuesta de los sectores, la falta de conocimiento de los técnicos y la sobrecarga de trabajo. En las posibilidades de la invención, que son únicas, hay algunos puntos que favorecen los ensamblajes: el compromiso de los profesionales, el conocimiento de los deberes del propio sector y de otros sectores y el conocimiento del territorio. Llegamos a la conclusión de que la práctica intersectorial se realiza por conexión de las diferencias en un plano de imanencia.

¹ *Support and funding:* Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq)

² *E-mail:* robertaroma@uol.com.br

Palabras-clave: Políticas públicas; análisis institucional; problemas sociales.

Introduction

This text presents the theoretical discussion on intersectoriality that is part of the research "Intersectoriality, families and processes of subjectivation" financed by the CNPq. It is an intervention research whose objective is to analyze the intersectoriality based on the relationships established in the Technical Regional Intersectorial Nucleus (RIN) of the Barreiro Regional of the Municipality of Belo Horizonte, emphasizing the way of managing social work between sectoral policies, within the teams and with the families, with the intention to favor the invention of new forms of expression in these groups. Intervention research operates as a tool that supports the complexity and the processes, making inquiries, seeking the collective of forces in situations experienced in the field. In this process, it has its own vision about the researcher and the encounter of the researcher with his field, since interventions are carried out at the same time that knowledge is obtained. Thus, the researcher collaborates, in fact, with what he proposes to study. Amador, Lazzarotto and Santos (2015) show that this is a "strategy of production of combative knowledge to the model of the modern science project, aiming at the dichotomization of the subject-object, reason-reality" (p. 231). In this way, Passos & Barros (2012) point out that the field of research provides the formation of connections, through which knowledge emerges as a plane of forces that compose reality, which in certain circumstances acts for the benefit of the instituted, but in others, contributes to the emergence of the instituting, of productive agencying, in a procedural and singular way.

The Technical RIN of the Barreiro Regional aims to create an intersectoral space for discussion of serious cases of violation of rights, articulating the Municipal Secretaries of Health, Social Assistance and Education, in order to streamline and qualify the delivery of public services to the applicant population. It is composed by three professionals, each from a sectoral policy, and this space is also intended to strengthen the interlocation between regional sectoral policy managements, understanding and delimiting the role of each one in the treatment of the cases presented. From the interventions carried out with the core team in the first year of the research, which happened through weekly informal contacts, follow-up of monthly meetings, discussion groups and four initial semi-structured interviews with professionals, the need arose for a theorization of intersectoriality based on the Deleuze and Guattari's ideas. In this direction, we study the following texts of *Mil Platôs*: "Introduction: rhizome" and "Micropolitics and Segmentarity" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1995; Deleuze & Guattari, 1996). Through the experience with the field and the concepts discussed, we analyze the concept of rhizome exploring the possibilities of its use in the study, and articulating to other concepts pertinent to the discussion, among them transversality, macropolitics and micropolitics. Thus, correlations were made for the understanding of the complexity that encompasses this practice, as well as studies about the intersectoriality itself carried by qualified journals. This analysis is made below.

About intersectoriality

In the second half of the 1970s and throughout the 1980s, social movements in Brazil demanded a more egalitarian society, and part of their appeal resulted in the Federal Constitution of 1988, a document that changes the current conception of public policies in our country. With this constitutional charter, the tripod is formally established: social security, health insurance, and a social security system. This recognizes the right to democratic structures and social protection for the entire population (Constituição da República Federativa do Brasil, 1988). The social rights guaranteed by the law in the constitution are concretized through public policies, which, based on the constitutional text, are now responsible for proposing and strengthening actions (plans, programs and projects) that enable improvements in the living conditions of citizens.

Yamamoto and Oliveira (2010) emphasize the presence of psychologists and the need to create new knowledge and postures to face the challenges of working in these sectors when studying the insertion of Psychology into public health and social care policies. One of them is certainly the

complexity of the cases that call for the construction of new tools to intervene in this situation and sustain the intersectoral practice, contributing to the formation of professionals who can deal with this heterogeneity and carry out actions of articulation between public policies, in an attempt to ensure the fundamental rights. This is because the sectoral definition of policies, the segmented and sectoral management, shows an inefficiency resulting from the absence of integrated actions and no longer responds adequately to current challenges, as indicated by Custódio and Silva (2015). According to Yamamoto and Oliveira (2010), it is still difficult to insert psychologists in public policies, and so we can also infer in the practice of intersectoriality, since there is still a great emphasis on the subjects, with actions still centered in the traditional clinic, as synonymous with psychology. In fact, the insertion of psychologists in public policies calls for a non-separation of Psychology in areas neither in antagonistic polarizations, and also promotes the destabilization of our "certainties" (Romagnoli, 2012)

In defense of intersectoriality, Monnerat and Souza (2011) analyzed the social security through the recent trajectories of health and social assistance policies. They also point to the structural limits of Brazilian society, especially in relation to population service, evidencing the need for an intersectoral confrontation, through the formation of a social protection network with the construction of interfaces between sectors and governmental institutions (and non-governmental organizations). The purpose of this network is to combat the complex social problems that go beyond the scope of a single sector of the government or public policy area, almost making an imposition of integration between policies. In this sense

the idea is that the population, through intersectoriality: a) be assisted in all its social, economic, cultural and other aspects; b) improve the quality of life and well-being; c) be stimulated to seek new knowledge and alternatives to solve their own problems (Góes & Machado, 2013, p.629).

In order to achieve these goals, we can define intersectoriality "... as the articulation of knowledge and experiences with a view to the planning, realization and evaluation of policies, programs and projects, in order to achieve synergistic results in complex situations" (Inojosa, 2001, p.105). For an effective exercise, this articulation presupposes much more than the aggregation of sectors, claiming integrality as an intervention strategy to overcome the problem in question. Intersectoriality demands a set of innovations in the public management scope, demanding new organizational responses, the overcoming of hierarchical and vertical structures and the creation of new institutional arrangements with horizontal structures of work, as Bronzo (2010) points out.

Intersectoral action involves changes in both the dynamics and institutional processes, as well as in the design and content of sectoral policies, not just by joining the sectors of the different public policies, such as health, education and social assistance. Thus, in addition to these institutional changes, intersectoriality must also act in the daily life of services as a:

...tool to foster encounters, listening and alterity, as well as to help to explain divergent interests, tensions and seek (or reaffirm the impossibility) of possible convergences. And, it can also avoid duplication of actions and seek the integration of budget for priority projects, to articulate resources, ideas and talents. (Akerman, Sá, Moysés, Rezende & Rocha, 2014, p.4293).

In this direction, intersectoriality walks along with the notion of territory, which is circumscribed locality, a space, a microterritory, with administrative political decentralization, and understood as the transference of decision power to a closer instance to the citizen. Nascimento (2010) reminds us that the territory is a privileged place to carry out the articulation between sectors. It should be noted that the territory does not only refer to physical and material space; it represents much more than the municipality or the region in which the public policy apparatus is installed. That is, it also consists of the connections established between subjectivities; they are relational spaces of life, of exchanges, of sustenance and rupture of daily bonds that construct directions and meanings for those who live and circulate in it. Knowing the territory does not mean to homogenize social conditions and realities in a country with immense diversity, but to approach it through the appropriation of situations that present there, in search of the net of social relations that confront each other in the situations lived. Thus, the territory emerges as an eternal make-and-break, forming a network of relations, as Haesbaert (2006) points out, and the relationship with the territory is essential for the implementation of public policies.

Work with the complexity and processes of both the territory and the intersectoriality has challenges in its daily life, as we have noticed in our research. In this context, this text discusses the intersectoriality and the difficulties of concretizing intersectoral practices in their macropolitical and micropolitical dimensions as well as their association with the concept of rhizome. Such an analysis, in our opinion, is necessary, not only for the guarantee of social rights, but also for the promotion of inventive actions of this kind in the daily services.

Difficulties and challenges of intersectoriality

Public policies need to meet the assumptions of intersectoriality in order to sustain common tasks for confronting social problems, as we have seen above. While the documents of these policies guarantee in their texts the intersectoral action as a strategy for a better service to users, as defined in the field of macropolitics, the guarantee of their practice, in the day to day of the services, in the field of micropolitics, does not happen in a harmonic way. In the text "Micropolitics and Segmentation", Deleuze and Guattari (1996) affirm that "Everything is political, but every politics is simultaneously macropolitical and micropolitical" (p.90), when presenting the functioning of reality by connections and production, focusing both molar and molecular as juxtaposed dimensions. Macropolitics and micropolitics coexist and are procedural. The two dimensions, despite eventual conflicts in some circumstances, as suggested above, are indivisible, since micropolitical actions are also present in the documented strategy of intersectoriality and the day-to-day of the service is also crossed by macropolitical issues. In this way, they operate immanently in the intersectorial action plane of forces. According to Godinho (2007), in the deleuzian perspective, sustaining the plane of immanence is indispensable to think, since this plane places, in a juxtaposed and inseparable way, the tension of the heterogeneous lines of reality that have different functions. Thus, the distinction between the dimensions that coexist in all realities occurs in their modes of functioning and not in their size. Macropolitics works by overcoding, by classification and exclusion, in the quest to segment the movement of life. On the other hand, micropolitics operate to produce displacements, insist on what escapes from overcoding in order to invent. The segments produced by macropolitics to manage life are visible and instituted and they organize the intersectoriality in the orientations present in the documents, and in the activities of each sector. In turn, micropolitics has an invisible nature and can act both to oppress, as in microfascisms, and to support agencying with unprecedented forces. This is because the segmentation process, the formation of homogeneous strata that classify and act as models, acts in the molar/macro way and also in the micro/molecular segmentation by thin segments, which act as territories that quiet and accommodate us to the known facts. Thus, the flows become microfascisms when the desire wants its own repression, since it becomes agency not only to the new, but also to microformations that seek to equalize, compare, exclude and free itself from difference. That is, in the case of intersectorial actions, one of the points in which these microfascisms emerge in the difficulty with the alterity, with the form of dealing of each sector, insisting on the model of its policy. Microfascisms emerge from fear and insecurities and emerge as a reactive micropolitics, as Rolnik (2016) names it. However, this segmentarity may be temporary and dependent on the situation and the external forces that accompany it, the life can be released by becoming a difference again. Gaps in the segment allow abandoning it so that connections with the heterogeneous are made and scape lines formed. These active and no longer reactive micropolitics actualize virtual nodes of forces that circulate in certain circumstances from agencying that produce connections and passages between segments and scape lines. In these circumstances, alterity is sustained so that connections occur in common areas, articulating subjects, sectors and responsibilities.

The juxtaposition of macropolitics with micropolitics produces friction, tension, as is the case of intersectorial practice. By examining the integration between social policies in Brazil, Monnerat and Souza (2011) indicate a strong impediment to its concretization: the very difference between the sectors delineated in their macropolitical dimension by their different histories. For the authors, while Health, with its already consolidated historical trajectory, discusses the multiple determinations of the health-disease process in health promotion, investing in intersectoral action, Social Assistance still has a fragile institutionalization, difficulties in the implantation of its apparatus and low percentage of

technical staff due to their clientelistic historical legacy. In Health, intersectoriality has been thought as a fundamental strategy to deal with structural problems in our society that affect the health-disease process, since many of the actions necessary for health promotion involve instances that are outside the health sector. The same is true of Social Assistance, which, when seeking to promote social inclusion or to improve the quality of life by solving the concrete problems that affect the population of a given territory, deals with multifaceted demands that require responses beyond the sectorial distribution with actions coordinated by different sectors of the State. In our field experience we perceived that these differences are sustained by microfascisms that appear in the teams with the superiority of Health in the handling of the cases, because of its historical consolidation, and the complaint of the excessive demands from Social Assistance, as a consequence of the lack of knowledge of its action, since it is a relatively new policy. Microfascisms can be sustained on the premise that one sector is more important than the other, in power relations among professionals, in the lack of communication, among others.

Besides the differences between the sectors, obstacles also occur in the field of management. Azevedo, Pelicioni and Westphal (2012) believe that intersectoriality has the potential to strengthen public policies that have health promotion in their guidelines. However, this potentiality is thwarted by the lack of political and technical knowledge of managers and health professionals to take on intersectorial actions and administrative issues that hinder the integrated execution of actions. Furthermore, there are bureaucratic difficulties and lack of financing of intersectorial actions to materialize them. If, on the one hand, in the daily routine of services, micropolitics is restricted to segments, due to the lack of knowledge of the activities of each area, although it is assumed that the teams know the works of the other sectors, on the other hand, the bureaucracy and the financing coming from macropolitics are also obstacles that reproduce and insist on sectorial practices, since the fine segmentations of bureaucracy and financing generate micropolitical effects of demotivation and impotence, as we see in the RIN team studied.

In order to promote intersectorial actions, management still has to deal with the need for a change in labor relations, that is, the sectors that traditionally have decision-making power in the referrals should collaborate with themselves to make collective decisions, usually directed against professional corporatism, frustrated by the microfascisms of each formation. In this context, Azevedo et al. (2012) defend the interdisciplinary formation, the valorization of the territorial dimension and the social networks, favoring participatory processes in an attempt to highlight the need for collective dynamics. Regarding the change in traditional attitudes, Dias, Parente, Vasconcelos and Dias (2014) also emphasize the need to overcome the reductionist model by managers and health professionals in the daily micropolitics to advance intersectoriality. When studying the Health in the School Program as an intersectorial policy, between the health and education fields, Silva Junior (2014) concludes that the lack of articulated and integrated actions between the sectors produces restrictions. Among these limitations, the author highlights the bureaucratization of services, the waste of time of financial and human resources and the duplication of actions, which leads to non-fulfillment of the program objectives and intersectorial practice.

Ckagnazaroff and Mota (2003) also argue that the complexity of the work process in the intersectoriality generates divergences among professionals ranging from conflicts between different types of knowledge to the delimitation of priorities of each region that generate the same effects. These conflicts occur both forming molar segments, regarding the formations and attributions of each apparatus and each profession, as well as molecular, regarding the difficulties with the relationships in the team, including the differences between the performances and the formations, and the attempt to equate things that are different. The authors emphasize the importance of addressing these conflicts, supported by the perspective of modernization of public management. On the other hand, when studying intersectoriality in the field of education, Góes and Machado (2013) emphasize that the services themselves are subject to disputes and conflicts, presenting a series of power relations that disrupt this association, which denounces the presence of these segments, of hard lines that prevent connections. While examining social protection in Brazil, Sposati (2013) reveals signs of discontinuity, incompleteness, fragmentation, non-equality of access and recognition that still persist in this field, contributing to its invasion by competition and self-interest. In this way, it unveils a confrontation between the public policy of social protection, which has egalitarian and solidary principles, and the

values of the capital society, which insists on individualism and fragmentation. Coexistence of the macropolitical with the micropolitical dimension of lines that combine, exclude, violate judgments and ways of functioning in the institutional sphere, in the visible organization that manages intersectoriality, and in meetings between teams, with microfascisms that impede connections, collective associations so that, in fact, intersectoriality occurs.

We understand that the difficulties described above can act as totalitarian processes that make inventive agencying impossible and powerful meetings to take place. Moving the issue that is collective and institutional to the individual and personal scope makes the teams regress and the intersectorial practice distances itself from its effectiveness in the micropolitical plan. Cavalcanti and Lucena (2016), when reflecting on the articulation between health and education policies, reveal as one of the obstacles to the materialization of intersectoriality the predisposition to assign to the professionals the responsibility to undo the intersectoral logic and translate this proposal into concrete actions. In addition, the authors point out that it is common for these professionals to have an overload of obligations in their own sectors, which contributes to the maintenance of conservatism of the actions developed, inserting the desire in hard lines that distance themselves from the cracks of the segments, through of which agencying is made. According to Deleuze & Parnet (1998), these lines are part of the juxtaposed rhizome, sometimes homogenizing, forming segments, hardening reality, sometimes joining, going through other paths, as we shall see below.

Adding to this propensity for individualization of problems, Afonso, Vieira-Silva, Abade, Abrantes and Fadul (2012) studied the insertion of psychology in the public policy of social assistance and denounced the lack of a network that has integration and articulation of services, which contributes for the models of each sector to prevail and prevent joint actions and the approximation between citizenship and subjectivity. Dimenstein and Liberato (2009) point to this same deficiency in the area of mental health, evidencing that the lack of the social apparatus network promotes the reproduction of the sectorial logic, homogenizing relations, the practice of bureaucratization among professionals and the overload of health professionals. They also point out that the precarious articulation between the CAPS and the basic care network is linked, among other factors, to the resistance of the CAPS teams, because they understand this as further work, which is already excessive, and not as a possibility of exchange and joint work. In this direction, intersectoriality is experienced as a nuisance, in a routine already daily full of tasks, as examined by the authors.

According to Andrade (2006), intersectorial actions evade the endogeneity of the sectors involved and not only demand their initiative, but above all require responsiveness between sectorial policies, a property not always easy to be achieved. The intersectorial action is based on the construction of intervention objects that are common to different sectors, for an integrated planning to face the problems identified. However, as we have seen, what it has been observed in practice is a high level of conflict and political dispute between the different areas and actors involved in the process. As a result of all these problems, intersectoriality, in its search for more effective results, calls for the transversality of actions in the social field, in its articulation of several sectors, as Monnerat and Souza (2011) argument.

This transversality is called to try to avoid the risk that services remain centralized, privatized and distant from the real needs of the Brazilian population in the practice,. The transverse movements are defined by Guattari (1987), based on his experience at La Borde Clinic, as opposed to movements of verticality, provoked by the introjection of norms and the instituted demands present in the subjected groups, and the movements of horizontality, which consist in associating distinct sectors without establishing a relationship between them. "The transversal approach tries to subvert the binary structural oppositions and contributes to keep the machine device always functioning" (Dosse, 2010, 61), by betting on the displacement necessary for the group to be a productive device of new realities, associating sectors, supporting novel processes and opening up for the invention. In this sense, the group becomes a subjected group, owner of its own creation, in the constant tension between verticality and horizontality. Through our field experience, we understand that intersectorial actions are done in the coexistence of movements of verticality and horizontality with transversality, in the entanglement of these processes present in the teams and between the sectors and the territories, and they cross the practices in this domain.

In this context, we intend to approach this transversality through the concept of rhizome, understood by Schizoanalysis as a network. According to Deleuze and Guattari (1995), this network is self-engendered by agencying with the most varied elements of reality, to which it connects and reconnects at all times, not referring to a single combination. This dynamics of self-production is incessant, referring to forces/flows that have no predetermined form and limits. Such a conception allows for inventive displacements that are liberated from the crystallized structures based on norms and reproductive patterns, both at the macropolitical and micropolitical level, and which impede the creation necessary for the implementation of intersectorial action. Rhizomatic dimensions that act through immanent processes, sometimes precluding expansion, variation and connections, and sometimes making ruptures and sustaining multiplicities.

Intersectoral practice, rhizomatic practice

Based on the presented challenges, namely, differences between sectors, lack of political and technical knowledge, changes in work relations, need to overcome the reductionist model, conflicts between professionals, difficulty with networking, among others, we insist on the immanence of micropolitics and macropolitics and we focus on transversality, to be pursued in the daily practice of intersectoriality, and for this we propose a dialogue with the concept of rhizome created by Deleuze and Guattari (1995). As we have seen above, the transversal movements present between the teams and the sectors produce the difference and do not reject it; on the contrary, they bring together heterogeneous elements, breaking up the identity of the sectors, which generally prevents sectorial action, and producing outputs between knowledge and disciplines.

However, transversality is exercised in the tension between what is established and the emergence of the new, leading to a disordered juxtaposition of different modes of functioning of reality, also supported by the ideas of Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari. These authors think by immanence, through a productive and procedural chaos that escapes the "disease" of transcendent models, as Jacques (2014) emphasizes. For them, thinking is inseparable from movements, unstable and not made through reductionist procedures. In this way, the plane of immanence is indispensable for thinking, when seeking the escape from the domain of representation and go to the realm of experimentation. According to Schopke (2004), the Deleuzian thinking breaks with the paradigm of representation that understands knowledge as recognition, the thinking with a selective instance that must seek to fit into specific models. To break with representation means that the power of thought lies in its association with life, with the support of difference and creative activity. Its challenge is precisely to get rid of the models of representation. For this, one must seek the plane of immanence, not of similarities; one must experience and not recognize.

According to Godinho (2007), experimentation defines what is to think, invents new possibilities of life and results from the tension of the lines of reality. The rhizome corresponds to this new image of thought that aims to combat transcendent formulas, secular trees that associate our thinking with reductions and homogenizations. Thus, this proposal of thought is exercised in the interweaving of bifurcations and unpredictable encounters, which spreads from effects and in no way *a priori*, not fitting to models. According to Jacques (2014), this body of knowledge corresponds to a principle of apprehension of the real, a method of organizing knowledge, which works with a vector of heterogenesis, insofar as it assiduously produces the intensive continuity between multiple different elements, belonging to different areas. In this way, "rhizome is a principle according to which everything is produced with everything: it does not matter what works with what, multiplicity gains consistency when it does not matter which point connects with what other point" (our translation) (Jacques, 2014, p. 142)³.

This idea was taken by Deleuze and Guattari (1995) from botany, in which the rhizome is a kind of root, a mobile network of stems, with diffuse internal and external boundaries. This network can be traversed in several directions, not having a fixed point of entry and exit. To slide through a rhizome

³ Originally: "le rhizome est le principe selon lequel tout se produit avec tout: n'importe quelle chose peut fonctionner avec une autre, la multiplicité prend consistance lorsque n'importe quel point se connecte avec n'importe quel point".

means to make reinvented paths in each trip and by each person that explores it. This does not refer to a unit, but opposite to a tree, which contains a central axis, hierarchies, roots, trunks and branches. Thus, the rhizome is not a model, but acts as an immanent process. To think of intersectoriality through this network is to think of it in its transversal relations, in the singularity of connections made between the sectors in each case, to sustain the heterogeneity of referrals, interpretations, the innumerable problems, risks and precariousness of families, technicians and the own public policies. Fragments that are networked, differences that intertwine and produce effects, now reproductive, stratified, sometimes inventive, fugitive.

This philosophical concept developed by Deleuze and Guattari (1995) allows both the understanding of the sectorialization and its segments as well as the assemblages produced, since the rhizome acts through distinct and immanent processes. The rhizome is composed of hard or molar lines, flexible or molecular lines and lines of escape. According to Deleuze and Parnet (1998), the hard lines hold the binary division of sector, profession, social class, among others, and organize our life within a historically and visible time. In the case of this research, they delimit the performance of the policy of each sector, each professional in its specialty, each service with its problems, each case in its vulnerabilities and risks, among others. These lines act by classifying and overcoding the disordered flows of reality, producing large segmental cuts and ensuring the homogenization of the rhizome, which is heterogeneous in itself. By giving a certain order to reality, these lines make up the organization plane, also called stratum or segment, in which a certain relational consensus is won, so that the inherent difference in life equals or becomes similar. Horizontal and vertical relations are present between the teams and between the sectors and are part of the intersectoriality. "There are arborescence knots in the rhizomes, rhizome buffings in the roots. Moreover, there are despotic formations, immanence and channeling, proper to the rhizomes" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1995, p.31).

On the other hand, the flexible lines are responsible for the affections that occur in the relations, creating conditions for the establishment of zones of indetermination and agencying. In the flexible lines, the vectors of difference, the strata are more diluted, representing a conjugation of diverse and heterogeneous flows that were once consensually homogenized in the segments, as in the sectors that integrate public policies. In this way, different lines are drawn in the hard lines, in the organization plane, making cracks in these often hardened and crystallized strata, and contributing to the formation of escape lines, that are made in the exits of the territories.

"The rhizome refers to a map that must be produced, constructed, always detachable, connectable, reversible, with multiple entrances and exits, with its escape lines" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1995, p.33). However, in the complexity of these forces, these lines also bring their dangers: fear, clarity, power and passion for abolition (Deleuze & Guattari, 1996). Fear of the loss of security as a great molar organizer that sustains us, from the dilution of the arborescences to which we cling, from the system of domination that dominates us. Clarity, evidenced by the understanding of the breaches of hard segmentarity that flexibilize it, which also makes us hesitant given the dangers of black holes that may appear, of the dimensions in which the production ceases. Power, by the attachment to life in hard lines. Passion of abolition in what regards the dangers of the own escape lines, in its risk of destruction, because this one, instead of acting to connect to other lines and to potentialize, can destroy itself, setting its own extermination and producing grief.

The escape lines that create zones of indetermination between the sectors, between the teams and between the subjectivities. An escape that destabilizes, disarticulates, composes processes of subjectivation that now do not produce connections, but rather displeasure, and sometimes do not produce agencying, allowing the emergence of the collective and converging in nomadic and no longer sedentary processes, since these combine movements of destratification, they affirm the difference; they generate inventive processes and form the plan of consistency. In our point of view, these are necessary movements, for intersectoriality to take place and to make displacements.

It should be pointed out that the strata and the zones of indetermination - the organizational plan and the plane of consistency - are immanently juxtaposed, formed by the same matter present in relations, that is, the flows, but with different functions: dissociative and homogenizer in the stratum, in the organization plane, and fluid and connective in the zone of indetermination, in the plane of consistency. The agencying, which supports intersectoriality in the dialogue with this philosophical

perspective, occurs between these two planes and between these two regimes of functioning. Agencying means to connect transversally whenever there is a coupling of a set of relations, combining elements of the most varied orders: material, subjective, collective, procedural; bringing together heterogeneous dimensions and throwing us into the rhizomatic fluidity. That is, agencying removes the professionals from the different apparatuses, the interiority of their sectors, the sectorial policies, the fixity of the hard lines, and throw them in the collective and the processuality, associating the plans of organization and of consistency.

The processes of totalization and the processes of invention occur in a rhizome. The former capture the differences, the heterogeneity of life in a model, in a rigid mode of existence, insisting on a single form, in a single pattern, on strata that are made by horizontal chains of linear causality and by vertical groupings of power. In this way, they interrupt the intensive, which happens to inhabit minorities, to take refuge in smaller states, understood as what escapes the dominant and supports its heterogeneity. The second appear with vectors of disorganization of a stratum, of a totalization and occur when the smaller states of this intensive gain power through heterogeneous connections that lead to the unprecedented; they lead to the collective expression. In this sense, the strata are diluted, they vary, and when they do not lead to a passion for abolition, they associate with each other transversally in their complexity, produce power of transformation, of invention. They empower teams and users, beyond norms, rules and models.

In processes of totalization that usually prevent intersectoriality from taking place in their day to day, the lines are hard, stratified, formatted in the established representations of social assistance, health, education, poverty, roles and places of each professional, extremely vulnerable families that make up the serious and complex cases discussed by the teams. These representations are sedimented and repeated without making any difference, in a relationship of standardization and crystallization.

The production of a totalization in the rhizomatic network appears when there is a heterogeneous relationship of power that sustains a primacy, a hierarchy or a reductionism that always operates by overcoding. They are compositions of these stratifications, for example, as emphasize Dias et al. (2014): the excess of bureaucratic procedures so that the other sectors are called to act together; the lack of assessment of the joint actions after referrals; the absence of response of the sectors to the demands that are sent to them, understood as disinterest. The authors also say: "... punctual actions that are developed in an unsystematic manner and, therefore, end up compromising, in the medium and long term, the involvement and co-responsibility of the various actors and institutions" (Dias et al., 2014, p. 4378).

In addition, difference between sectors is part of these strata, punctuated by Monnerat and Sousa (2010); lack of funding, reported by Azevedo et al. (2012); difficulty of articulation between managers and professionals, brought by Silva Junior (2014); the conflicts between professionals, examined by Ckagnazaroff, and Mota (2003) and Góes and Machado (2013); The teams overload, evidenced by Cavalcanti and Lucena (2016) and Dimenstein and Liberato (2009), among others. All these points form nodes, arborescences that make the collective construction unfeasible, since arborescent systems are hierarchical and have centers of significances that reduce reality to certain interpretations and representations. It is necessary to remember that these strata are maintained by molar and molecular lines, by macropolitics and by totalitarian microformations.

These obstacles make us think that we should not have trees in our heads, transcendent models to guide us since nature itself is not arborescent, has no origin, no end, does not allow itself to be fixed in a representation, does not have a model. It is worth remembering that the lines that make up the rhizome do not allow themselves to be completely captured in the strata, precisely by the immanence, and cracks appear in these strata, ruptures that let streams of continuous variation flow, nomadic forces that look for connections. Being a rupture, the rhizome in this mode of operation does not make dualisms, does not produce fixed segments and territories, but gives itself to processuality, produces agencying:

A mechanic agencying assemblage is directed to the strata that make it, no doubt, a kind of organism, either a significant totality, or a determination attributable to a subject, but it is no less directed to a *body without organs*, which does not stop of undoing the organism, of passing and circulating by

meaningful particles, pure intensities, and not ceasing to attribute itself to the subjects to whom leaves nothing but a trace of an intensity. (Deleuze & Guattari, 1995, p.11).

Understanding the organism as a stratum, a process of totalization and the Body without Organs as a plane of forces open to connections, a zone of indetermination, we can emphasize the character of coexistence of these two functions in the proposal of intersectoriality, which we try to show throughout this text. The question is to trace in the micropolitics of everyday life under what circumstances the rhizome "Proceeds by variation, expansion, conquest, capture, connecting certain multiplicities and the world will not seem more tripartite - field of reality, field of representation, field of subjectivity" (Godinho, 2007, p. 78). Public policy sectors that operate in a given case will not be separated, segmented in the area of health, social assistance or education. In this agencying of worlds, vectors of forces, produces differences. Dias et al. (2014) point out the commitment of professionals with public policies, the knowledge of the own attributions of the sector and of the other sectors of the apparatus and the knowledge of the territory in which they work as intercessors of this rupture. In our view, these are visible but still stratified points, but they can produce agencying by putting the power at stake, connecting professionals from different sectors, with their different interventions and with vulnerable users. These points get entangled in escape lines that may not want their own destruction, but bring the collective, produce enunciations and make intersectoriality effective.

Final considerations

We believe that intersectorial actions take place in a rhizomatic perspective and would also be the place of experimentation of associations, creation of conditions in which arborescent rationalities can become rhizomes. In this process, well-defined and delimited territories in which little exchange of knowledge happens, operating through hierarchies and centralizations, may give rise to articulation with different sectors, knowledge and practices, constructing creative and innovative forms of intervention. In our view, intersectorial practice is generated at the border of sectorial boundaries, producing a new subject/object relationship and a collective questioning zone in which the problematization is a constant, but not always produced.

In this sense, the teams that propose an intersectorial confrontation need to dialogue in the difference, need to have joint actions, to seek collective solutions. This is because intersectoriality can be a connection space that operates to dominate, overburden, but also bring with it the possibility of revolutionizing, and promoting events. Network power supports the connection that can derive both a reproduction and an invention. In the direction of the invention, the intersectoriality consists in gathering the fragments of the sectors involved in the case discussed to multiply affections and sustain inquiries that produce other paths, as Lee (2014) points out when studying the rhizome in writing. We believe that the creation of new relationships between the sectors, between the technicians themselves, between technicians and services, and between users and the apparatus and the technicians, is done by connecting differences in a plane of immanence, by the tensioning of vertical and horizontal movements. Undoubtedly, this is not an easy task, because dealing with all the complexity present in the social field requires effort. This is the movement of transversality that calls us to make rhizome as experimentation.

Insisting on experimentation means to bet on a relational logic and designate the "between" as the determinant of that relationship. This dimension is sustained by sectors, professionals, families and territories, in their macropolitical and micropolitical aspects, and welcomes destabilization by linking to certain forces and movements. Thus, the work of the professionals in intersectorial actions is crossed by different functions, that put in articulation professional identities, beliefs and hardenings, but these can still serve to favor the production of new realities, when betting on the creation of zones of inquiries, and in a collective effort to problematize the issues present in the daily routine of public policies.

References

Afonso, M. L. M., Vieira-Silva, M., Abade, F. L., Abrantes, T. M., & Fadol, F. M. (2012) A psicologia no Sistema

Único de Assistência Social. *Pesquisa e práticas psicossociais*, 7(2), 189-200.

- Akerman, M., Sá, R.C., Moysés, S., Rezende, R., & Rocha, D. (2014). Intersetorialidade? Intersetorialidade! *Ciência, saúde coletiva*, 19(11), 4291-4300. Recuperado em 05 abril, 2015 de http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1413-81232014001104291&lng=pt&nrm=iso.
- Amador, Fernanda S., Lazzarotto, Gislei D. R. & Santos, Nair I. S. Pesquisar-agir, pesquisar-intervir, pesquisar-interferir. (2015). *Revista Polis e Psique*, 5(2): 228 – 248. Recuperado em 07 março, 2016 de http://seer.ufrgs.br/index.php/PolisePsique/article/view/58180/pdf_26.
- Andrade, L. O. M. (2006). *A saúde e o dilema da intersectorialidade*. São Paulo: Hucitec.
- Azevedo, E, Pelicioni, M. C. F., & Westphal, M. F. (2012). Práticas intersectoriais nas políticas públicas de promoção de saúde. *Physis: Revista de Saúde Coletiva*, 22(4), 1333-1356. Recuperado em 07 março, 2016 de http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0103-73312012000400005&lng=en&nrm=iso.
- Bronzo, C. (2010). Intersetorialidade, autonomia e território em programas municipais de enfrentamento da pobreza: experiências de Belo Horizonte e São Paulo. *Planejamento e Políticas Públicas*, 35,120-159.
- Cavalcanti, P. B. & Lucena, C. M. F. (2016). Dificuldades na promoção da saúde por meio da intersectorialidade entre as Políticas da saúde e educação. *Polêmica*, 16(1), 24-41. Recuperado em 10 de janeiro, 2017 de <http://www.e-publicacoes.uerj.br/ojs/index.php/polemica/article/view/21332/15435>.
- Ckagnazaroff, I. B. & Mota, N. R. (2003). Considerações sobre a relação entre descentralização e intersectorialidade como estratégias de modernização de prefeituras municipais. *Economia e gestão*, 3(6), 23-41.
- Constituição da República Federativa do Brasil (1988). (1988). Brasília: Senado.
- Custódio, A. & Silva, C. R. C. (2015). A intersectorialidade nas políticas sociais públicas. In *Anais Seminário Nacional Demandas Sociais e Políticas Públicas na Sociedade Contemporânea, I Mostra Nacional de Trabalho Científicos*. Santa Cruz do Sul, RS: UNISC. Recuperado em 15 agosto, 2016 de <http://online.unisc.br/acadnet/anais/index.php/snpp/article/view/14264/2708>
- Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1995). Introdução: rizoma. In G. Deleuze & F. Guattari. *Mil Platôs: capitalismo e esquizofrenia* (v. 1, pp. 11-37). Rio de Janeiro: Ed. 34
- Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1996). Micropolítica e segmentaridade. In G. Deleuze & F. Guattari, *Mil Platôs: capitalismo e esquizofrenia* (vol. 3, pp. 83-115). Rio de Janeiro: Ed. 34.
- Deleuze, G. & Parnet, C. (1998). *Diálogos*. São Paulo: Escuta.
- Dias, M. S. A., Parente, J. R. F., Vasconcelos, M. I. O., & Dias, F. A. C. (2014). Intersetorialidade e Estratégia Saúde da Família: tudo ou quase nada a ver? *Ciência & Saúde Coletiva*, 19(11), 4371-4382. Recuperado em 10 de novembro, 2015 de http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S141381232014001104371&lng=en&nrm=iso.
- Dosse, F. (2010). *Deleuze e Guattari: biografia cruzada*. Porto Alegre: Artmed.
- Dimenstein, M.; Liberato, M.T. (2009). Desinstitucionalizar é ultrapassar fronteiras sanitárias: o desafio da intersectorialidade e do trabalho em rede. *Cadernos Brasileiros de Saúde Mental*, 1(1), 1-10. Available from: <http://stat.ijkem.incubadora.ufsc.br/index.php/cb-sm/article/view/1016/1142>.
- Godinho, A. (2007). *Linhas de Estilo: estética e ontologia em Gilles Deleuze*. Lisboa: Relógio D'Água.
- Góes, F. T. & Machado, L. R. S. (2013). Políticas educativas, intersectorialidade e desenvolvimento local. *Educação e Realidade*, 38(2), 627-648. Recuperado de http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S217562362013000200016&lng=pt&nrm=iso.
- Guattari F. (1987). *Revolução molecular: pulsações políticas do desejo*. São Paulo: Brasiliense.
- Haesbaert, R. (2006). *O mito da desterritorialização*. Rio de Janeiro: Bertrand Brasil.
- Inojosa, R. M. (2001) Sinergia em políticas e serviços públicos: desenvolvimento social com intersectorialidade. *Cadernos FUNDAP*, 22,102-110.
- Jacques, V. (2014). *Deleuze pas à pas*. Paris: Editions Elipses.
- Lee, C-W. (2014). Le concept de plateau chez Deleuze et Guattari: ses implications épistémologique et éthique. *Kriterion: Revista de Filosofia*, 55(129), 79-97. Recuperado em 10 de novembro, 2015 de http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0100-512X2014000100005&lng=pt&nrm=iso.
- Monnerat, G. L. & Souza, R. G. (2011). Da Seguridade Social à intersectorialidade: reflexões sobre a integração das políticas sociais no Brasil. *Revista Katálysis*, 14(1), 41-49. Recuperado em 12 agosto, 2015 de http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1414-49802011000100005&lng=pt&nrm=iso.
- Nascimento, S. (2010). Reflexões sobre a intersectorialidade entre as políticas públicas. *Serviço Social e Sociedade*, 101, 95-120. Available from: http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0101-66282010000100006&lng=pt&nrm=iso.
- Passos, E. & Barros, R. (2012). *Pistas do método da cartografia: pesquisa-intervenção e produção de subjetividade*. Porto Alegre: Sulina.
- Rolnik, S. (2016). *A hora da micropolítica - Entrevista Suely Rolnik*. Recuperado em 15 setembrmo, 2016 de <https://www.goethe.de/ins/br/pt/kul/fok/rul/20790860.html>.
- Romagnoli, R. C. (2012). O SUAS e a formação em psicologia: territórios em análise. *ECOS: estudos contemporâneos da subjetividade*, 1(2), 120-132. Recuperado em 20 de outubro, 2014 de <http://www.uff.br/periodicoshumanas/index.php/ecos/article/view/683/662>.

- Schopke, R. (2004). *Por uma filosofia da diferença: Gilles Deleuze, o pensador nômade*. Rio de Janeiro/São Paulo: Contraponto/EDUSP.
- Silva Junior, A. J. (2014). Programa saúde na escola: limites e possibilidades intersetoriais. *Interface - Comunicação, Saúde, Educação*, 18(51), 799. Recuperado em 15 agosto, 2016 de http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1414-32832014000400799&lng=en&nrm=iso. aqui também
- SPOSATI, A. (2013). Proteção social e seguridade social no Brasil: pautas para o trabalho do assistente social. *Serviço Social e Sociedade*, 116, 652-674. Recuperado em 26 de janeiro, 2016 de <http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0101-66282013000400005&lng=pt&nrm=iso>.
- Yamamoto, O. H. & Oliveira, I. F. (2010). Política Social e Psicologia: uma trajetória de 25 anos. *Psicologia: Teoria e Pesquisa*, 26, (n. sp.), 9-24. Recuperado em 08 março, 2015 de http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0102-37722010000500002&lng=en&nrm=iso.

Received: Mar. 09, 2017

Approved: Jul. 04, 2017

Roberta Carvalho Romagnoli: Psychologist, Master in Psychology in Psychology, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais (UFMG), PhD in Clinical Psychology from the Pontifícia Universidade Católica of São Paulo (PUC/SP), Post doctorate from the Université Cergy Pontoise, Graduation in Psychology from the Pontifícia Universidade Católica of Minas Gerais (PUC-Minas).