

3

Abstract

This essay critiques physiotherapy's dogmatically held ontology of transcendence through both the essay's content and its stylistic form. I resist representational thought and transcendence, creatively experimenting with the generative potential of Viktor Schlovosky's concept of making strange. I attempt to make physiotherapy strange and escape its habituation of thought by 1) intentionally plugging into disciplines outside of physiotherapy, and 2) using unconventional and unfamiliar language throughout this essay. Specifically, I draw lines of similarity between physiotherapy's ontology and that of Christian fundamentalism. I argue that physiotherapy, like fundamentalism, dogmatically conforms to limited, uncontroversial Truths upheld by the profession. Using this confluence, I illustrate how betraying physiotherapy becomes necessary in order to escape its conformist ontology. Inspired by Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari's philosophy, this essay reimagines physiotherapy and its ontology as one of immanence and difference. By betraying the comfort of transcendence, affirming difference and unfamiliarity, I experiment with what else physiotherapy might do and could become.

Keywords Deleuze, physiotherapy, making strange, betrayal, transcendence

The Church of Physiotherapy: The Necessity for Betrayal

EDUAN BREEDT

Introduction

Nothing interesting begins with knowing, but with not knowing (1). The pursuit of not knowing, however, is largely not an appropriate pursuit for the physiotherapist. The entire profession is steeped in an ontology which presupposes that every dimension of being is derivative of a permanent and concrete unified foundation. There exists an ultimate Truth which lies outside the world - a transcendent ontology of being.

There is a way to be a physiotherapist

- an identity to apprehend.

There is an Ideal Body which everyone ought to strive

to embody

- the white, male, hard, able body.

There is a transcendent Form of Health

- to be an autonomous, rational, self-contained, independent, individual who contributes to the capitalist machine.

Transcendence demands that we head in the "correct" direction, even if we never arrive. We must become one of them, recognize what everyone recognizes, hold the opinion that everyone holds - conform. Transcendence relies on representation. Faithfully represent the world, how it ought to be represented, how we decided it should be represented. Transcendence demands we know what physiotherapy is, we know what health is, we know what the body is, and that we know what to do, ahead of the doing.

"Representation has only a single centre, a unique and receding perspective, and in consequence a false depth. It mediates everything, but mobilises and

moves nothing." (1, pp55-56)

An ontology of transcendence has largely gone unquestioned in physiotherapy. It is given to us by the profession's dominant flow of opinion (2-3, p45). The constant flow of opinion can erode away at thought, creating a path, a rut, a ditch, a trench - closed off to the outside. Most of us have learned to float on our back quite comfortably while being carried through its tributaries. We forget that this "European disease," (4, p16) this 'Man' made stream, has been constructed and its construction then forgotten. It is so taken for granted that what I am referring to is nearly imperceptible; transcendence is the darkness surrounding the enlightenment (5)

"One of the moral diseases we communicate to one another in society comes from huddling together in the pale light of an insufficient answer to a question we are afraid to ask" (Thomas Merton)(6)

For French philosopher Gilles Deleuze, the deepest dimension of being is not sedentary, but mobile. Not composed of a scaffold of identities, but by an ocean of difference (1, p41). In an ontology of difference, nothing is but everything is becoming. There are no beings, only doings: "Representation fails to capture the affirmed world of difference." (1,p55). The seduction of unified identities, those which are familiar and recognizable, produces the automatization of perception where the familiar devours the vitality of things (7). Inspired by Deleuze and Russian literary critic and writer Viktor Shklovsky, my task then is to escape familiarity and transcendence - to get outside of it. To escape, we need thought which is the result of outside forces. Thinking depends on forces which take hold of thought, outside forces (8). Thought is when "something in the world forces us to think." (1,p139).

Art as Escape

An appropriate response to physiotherapy's sedentary ontology appears to me to be the adoption of an artful predisposition - the assumption that every supposed unity has within itself the surprise of difference - its own foreign (7,9). The difference within a thing produces its unfolding (5), that which differs from itself is in agreement (9). There is always the possibility for the unfamiliar, a "surprise", or something new. Art presupposes that being is not exhausted, there remains the possibility to bring the non-existent into being. Therefore, everything at the deepest dimension of being is unrecognizable before it is recognizable. We are compelled to engage in genuine thought and genuine creation when we betray what we recognize and try to think that which is unrecognizable.

"Art is fundamentally ironic and destructive. It revitalizes the world"(Viktor Shklovsky) (7)

Shklovsky explored what might happen when art is thought of as a device that makes the familiar strange (7). A device to invoke difference (1). A painter, sculptor, writer, poet, or philosopher are no longer merely artists, but opticians. Philosopher Baruch Spinoza, a prominent "optician," demonstrated the potential of art. He was an optical lens grinder, designing microscopic and telescopic lenses both practically and theoretically that altered philosophy's ontological terrain. Opticians increase the duration and complexity of perception, not to recognize or represent "Truth," but to perceive differently. Not representing what already exists, but inventing, giving being to what did not exist (10). Thought outside the purview of what everybody sees, something that could not previously be imagined, cannot be replicated, and takes us by surprise (11). Repressive forces force us to express ourselves, fortifying opinion and producing consensus (12,p129; 13,p6). Making the familiar strange, outside of signification and language, produces the relief of no longer having anything to say. A vacuole of ex-communication (5) or "gaps of solitude and silence", (12,p129) that obstructs the flow of opinion and constant chatter of what they say. Providing us the possibility of eventually finding something worth saying (12,p129).

What might art do in physiotherapy if we choose to define art as Shklovsky did? Our familiarity with concepts which are embedded in an ontology of transcendence and taken for granted, such as the clinic, the patient, the physiotherapist, movement, and the body, are thrust into a new milieu, driven through a new context so that it is no longer recognizable, and we are no longer speaking in the name of physiotherapy. My task, then, is to break from the flow of opinion and make the familiar strange. Art, making strange, is a means of escape. Exteriority opens out to a new milieu "like cracking the window in a house" (5,p44) to let in some "free and windy chaos." (13,p204). Or it might allow us to draw a line of flight, crash through the window and land flat on our back. Winded, not having anything to say. Blinded, but able to perceive.

This article on one level is a critique of physiotherapy's ontology, but at another level is an academic act of defiance. It asks, "what might happen if a paper intervenes and resists representation using artfulness at the level of content and form?"

Writing as Resistance

In regard to the latter, 'form', I choose to betray my entanglement with academia and its dominant representational expectation of what an academic physiotherapist is and how they

should write. Speaking as a physiotherapist or representing physiotherapy renders me complicit in an ontology of transcendence, fortifying opinion and consensus. Therefore, this paper, in some ways, resists academia and is not intended to be interpreted and understood. As Deleuze and Guattari say, there are two ways of reading a book or paper:

"[Y]ou either see it as a box with something inside and start looking for what it signifies... Or there's the other way: you see the book as a little non-signifying machine, and the only question is 'Does it work, and how does it work?' How does it work for you? If it doesn't work, if nothing comes through, you try another book. This second way of reading is intensive: something comes through or it doesn't. There's nothing to explain, nothing to understand, nothing to interpret. It's like plugging into an electric circuit." (12,pp7-8)

Through experimenting with writing, I hope to produce divergence, a multiplicity of meanings which might help us escape representation. Misread and mistranslate me, "...all mistranslations result in beauty. This is a good way to read: all mistranslations are good" (14,p5). A staccato, "roughened" rhythm in writing makes what is written unfamiliar, removes automatism in thought, increasing the difficulty and duration of perception (7). This style creates a straining in knowledge between what is known and not known: "a straining of one's whole language toward something outside it." (12,p140)

"We go toward the most unknown and the best unknown, this is what we are looking for when we write. We go toward the best known unknown thing, where knowing and not knowing touch, where we hope we will know what is unknown. Where we hope we will not be afraid of understanding the incomprehensible, facing the invisible, hearing the inaudible, thinking the unthinkable, which is of course: thinking." (Hélène Cixous) (15)

Only there might we escape opinion and have nothing to say.

"How else can one write but of those things which one doesn't know, or knows badly? It is precisely there that we imagine having something to say. We write only at the frontiers of our knowledge, at the border which separates our knowledge from our ignorance and transforms the one into the other." (1,pxxi)

This is an attempt at bilingualism, a minor use of language, a stammering: "being like a foreigner in one's own language. Constructing a line of flight." (14,p4). With enough resistance and friction, I hope "...a spark can flash and break out of

language itself, to make us see and think what was lying in the shadow around the words, things we were hardly aware existed." (12,p141)

Machines

At the level of content this paper attempts to make the familiar strange and produce new orientations for thought by creating what Deleuze and Guattari call a machine, one which plugs into outside thought (4,16).

"Place thought in an immediate relation with the outside, with the forces of the outside." (4,pp376-377)

The outside puts motion back into thought, not through internal movement, but by leakages to the outside. To reinstitute movement into sedentary thought requires "a plurality of centres, a superposition of perspectives, a tangle of points of view, a coexistence of moments which essentially distort representation." (1,p56). A steam engine plugs into other machines, captures energy and redirects its flow, to be productive of something. In the same vein, "when one writes, the only question is which other machine the literary machine can be plugged into, must be plugged into in order to work." (4,p4). This paper is a machine. Through experimentation and plugging into machines on the outside, disrupting flows, irrigating energy, working and reworking it, unplugging and replugging, detaching and reversing it, I find out what can be destroyed, what can be produced and what else physiotherapy might do (17).

One might even say we "steal" from the outside, where stealing is not the same as "plagiarizing, copying, imitating, or doing like." (14,p4). Stealing is propagation and grafting in botanical terms. Or splicing, sampling and mixing in audio engineering terms. I might plug into and steal from music, art, science, philosophy, geology, biology, sociology, religion, my environment, something I hear, something I remember, something I read, something which affects me, and so on. I plug it in to disrupt the intolerability of the present and produce something more tolerable. This harnessing of outside thought produces flows which escape and destroy the banality of the present, cutting off the physiotherapy flow of opinion to reorient thought in the hopes that for a moment I might "...bring some things to life [...] free life from where it's trapped [...] trace lines of flight." (12,p141).

I specifically choose to plug physiotherapy into fundamentalist Christianity. On the one hand, bringing together two disparate fields (religion and physiotherapy) further makes both strange. On the other hand, this essay is an ode to a younger me, wielding an adolescent, polemic, punk anger. A polemic

that does not endeavor to fortify a particular opinion and consensus but escapes it.

This essay is an expression of a time where my religious upbringing and my physiotherapy education both followed a similar trajectory: Transcendence to immanence; identity to difference; being to becoming; capture to escape; exclusivity to inclusivity; negation to affirmation; finding solutions to posing problems; and; and; and...

This paper is me asking questions and posing problems, problems which become my truth, the answers of which are always already untrue. No doubt, there will be those who say that this paper has too many internal inconsistencies. To that I respond:

“Do I contradict myself?

Very well then I contradict myself,

(I am large, I contain multitudes.)”

(Walt Whitman) (18)

Betrayal

Every field needs a bit of betrayal - a bit of Judas - if it desires to have movement (19). Complacency, conservatism, and dogmatism oppose change and the new. Writer Jorge Luis Borges imagined a Judas who he describes as intuiting the necessity of the divine plan and thus the crucifixion to incite a rebellion (20). He describes Judas as sacrificing his own reputation for the divine plan. God became fully incarnate, not through Jesus, but through Judas.

Thought is imperceptible to dominant regimes of truth and stable identities. “[W]e have to counter people who think ‘I’m this, I’m that’... arguments from one’s own privileged experience are bad and reactionary arguments.” (12,pp11-12). “The self is only a threshold, a door, a becoming between two multiplicities.” (4,p249). We are always becoming, not “subjects developing into more of themselves,” (5,p24) but identities which “undo the stabilities of identity, knowledge, location, and being.” (21,p3). We are undoing ourselves - “[t]here is no terminus from which you set out, none which you arrive at or which you ought to arrive at [...] The question ‘What are you becoming?’ is particularly stupid. For as someone becomes, what he is becoming changes as much as he does himself.” (14,p2). To be able to think starts by breaking the habit of representing the dogmatic image of physiotherapy (1). Betray one’s sedentary Identity.

My betrayal is an intentional repealment of my discipleship, no longer being a follower of Physiotherapy as it currently stands. Betraying the sedentary physiotherapy identity is not an act of hate but an act of love, desiring a new avenue with greater movement and greater potential.

“For, by believing passionately in something which still does not exist, we create it. The nonexistent is whatever we have not sufficiently desired, whatever we have not irrigated with our blood to such a degree that it becomes strong enough to stride across the somber threshold of nonexistence.” (22,p434)

This critique elucidates why radically cutting ties with the profession’s transcendent ontology and becoming a traitor prophet might be necessary for physiotherapy.

The evangelical fundamentalist physiotherapist

Believers in “Evidence-Based Practice” have discussed at length how a relatively sizable proportion of the profession practices using outdated modalities and rituals despite overwhelming evidence that many of these interventions are no better than a placebo (23). Snake oil salesmen insist “I see it work!” as they continue their faith healing, their muscle imbalance training, their myofascial release, their transverse abdominis activation.

Thank you, Plato, for your world of forms! The profession’s ontological obsession with transcendent identities that it takes for granted has led us to this cul-de-sac of thought.

The fundamentalists pose motionless in the physiotherapy family photo, awkwardly holding a strained smile for a lifetime, waiting for God knows who to take their picture hoping they fill the empty frame.

With their identity comes their healing hands and magic treatments. The fundamentalists present problems as simple and provide universalizing, complex solutions shrouded in pseudoscience. They evangelize by performing dazzling sleight of hand, correcting misalignments, and obliterating taut myofascial bands. They embody a kind of guruism proclaiming “if you follow me you can achieve transcendent wholeness and health.”

On their mound of meta-analysis, randomized control trials, and Cochrane reviews, the post-positivist denomination points and laughs. “How narrow-minded!” they remark contemptuously: “if only they could examine their own fallacious human nature and flawed fundamental beliefs.” (23).

While the post-positivist, evidence-based therapist disentangles the transcendent claims of the fallacious trigger point therapist with one hand, the other hand is behind their back holding onto their own God. In a reactionary movement they, the post-positivists, become fundamentalists themselves. Ontologically doomed, they maintain and reinforce transcendence.

The Snake Oil Salesman is to the Evidence Based Practitioner what Satan is to the fundamentalist. Not the absolute antithesis of the divine but something much more dangerous - the

demonic simulacrum, “the Same, the perfect double, the exact semblance, the Doppelgänger, the angel of light.” (24,p13). A deception so complete that those who do not have eyes to see and ears to hear cannot “tell the imposter (Satan, Lucifer) apart from the “reality” (God, Christ).” (24,p13).

In retaliation, the disinterested scientist-clinicians prophecy “science is the Way to Truth! We can all achieve enlightenment, just give up your sinful flesh, your false perceptions, your ways in the world, your biases, so that you can see clearly.” (25).

Truth, pure Truth, is thought of as having asymptotic fidelity which we can approximate when we exorcise our sinful corporeal selves with the double-blind randomized controlled ritual. It will wash away our “faulty subjectivity” and lived experiences so we can get at “the things in themselves.” (26). Truth is omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent, all hail.

How much easier would it be if humans stopped making the world filthy with their lived experiences, ugh.

A new king

We constructed a hierarchy, an ontology of transcendence, and rendered ourselves subordinate to God who we placed on an imaginary throne. Having become enlightened, now a scientific people, we thought God a figure much too archaic and primitive for our taste. We overthrew the king but left the phantasm of the throne. Once empty, Truth crept onto the already warm comfortable seat. So familiar and recognizable, we let Truth stay.

Although the symbols have changed, our underlying belief apparatus has remained much the same.

Scientism is the new Being of God. “With enough inquiry we will eventually discover how things are in themselves” it insists. Through our ontology of being, we view Truth, Morality, and Justice as eternal, unchanging, and objective; out there somewhere and merely needing to be uncovered.

The evidence-based practice denomination, with their essentialist agenda, asks, “what are human bodies actually and essentially like?” bringing with it the assumption that there exists a normal and ideal body we ought to strive for. Healthcare providers have the power to be the arbiters of bodies and minds (27). We sort the ideal from the non-ideal. The normal from the abnormal. The compliant from the deviant. The Christ-like from the not Christ-like. With a transcendent ontology come hierarchies of Truth, knowledge, and power.

We’re told we can know the world if we granulate it and study its little bits. Bodies and their bits. We can fix it once we find out where the screw fell out. To stop and measure, we need a world

that stands still, and we need concepts which can contain the world. But concepts solidify reality; they fix between rigid outlines like a camera freezes reality on the surface of the paper. To define is to confine. Concepts deform reality; reality, in its continuous movement, is richer than any concept. To quantify we need to create immobilities of the fundamentally mobile. We solidify flows (28). When we ask wave-like questions we get wave-like answers and when we ask particle-like questions we get particle-like answers.

To fix life in place, to hold it down, sedate it and stop its wriggling is very pragmatic indeed. However, we should not mistake the taxidermied specimen arranged in a life-like pose for the wild animal. But devoted to our models of health, we are enamored. Sat gnawing at the menu having mistaken it for the meal.

This is our prerogative - qualifying the qualitative. We all swim in the waters of post-positivism, but no one knows they are wet. The same form, different content. Verifiability, falsification, and replicability are the new commandments and Cochrane reviews are the books of the bible. We follow our Messiah, Evidence-based Practice, he will lead us to Truth, and it is only in Truth that we can ever be whole. From John 8:32 to John et al, 2008. As long as there is an ontology of Being and transcendence, every generation will have its religion.

Atheism is not so different from theism. It is a matter of preference for a God Being or a Truth Being

“God is dead. God remains dead. And we have killed him. Yet his shadow still looms.” (Nietzsche) (29)

God’s not dead; He wears a different crown.

(I feel compelled to defend myself and explain that I am not “anti-science”. (Why do I feel compelled to assure you I am not “anti-science”? What repercussions do I fear? Is this what self-regulation looks like? The panopticon perhaps, Mr. Foucault (30)? What I am, however, is anti-fascist. An ontology of transcendence, currently epitomized by evidence-based medicine, has a pernicious kind of micro-fascism that holds us captive (27). But I guess that is the nature of the beast. Categories and identities make us comfortable.)

Enough Socrates!

Needing a body (a host) to do physiotherapy to, the profession dehydrated and dissected the patient’s and the clinician’s body and embalmed it with the physiotherapy “regime of truth” (30). But, this taxidermied body did not sit well with those still living, so physiotherapy responded with “person-centered care”. Do not be deceived by its holism; person-centered care is a trojan horse that also infiltrates patients with the physiotherapy

agenda and same sedentary ontology.

Transcendent physiotherapy has convinced the therapist that they are priests - conduits of the divine - both in mind and body. The therapist, a scientist (which is another word for Descartes' rational "Man") (31), is seated in the heavens. With the knowledge of the Ideal body they are perched on the very top of the tower of Babel, given a clear vantage of the ultimate goal: incorporeality, to approximate God. That is, striving towards having no body, a convenient body, a smooth body. A body which we no longer notice, on the periphery of experience.

(Dis)embodiment.

Through this intellectual authority, the therapist carves out 'his' praxis. This is the prerogative of the physiotherap(r)i(e)st - to exorcize the body. To "correct" it and make it unproblematic. Make it Ideal, make them a (no)body, make them "Man" (31).

If we obtain "buy-in", if we lead the proverbial horse to water, maybe they will drink the stupeficient. We Socratically question, listen, foster trust, empathy, and care, so that we can lovingly show them and motivate the Truth. Educate them into submission. Tender fascism (27). And when they don't like our flavor of ideology, we remark "You win some and you lose some. You can't fix (read convert) everyone, we can only do our best. They might come back in a few years with greater readiness for change."

Love the sinner, not the sin!

Not only Man's mind, but his body too. Watch a physiotherapist closely.

"Like Sartre's Waiter with Bad Faith, we act inauthentically, by yielding to the external pressures of society to adopt false values and disown our own innate freedom as sentient human beings. As a physiotherapist our movements and conversation might be a little too "physio-esque". Our voice oozes with an eagerness to inform, correct, and educate; we demonstrate exercises rigidly and ostentatiously; our movements a little too precise, a little too certain. It is a clear give away, our exaggerated behaviour illustrates that we are play acting as a physiotherapist, as an object in the world: an automaton whose essence is to be a physiotherapist." (p.329)

To be a Physiotherapist is something one is rather than something one does. A therapist performatively takes up the Ideal Body by embodying him (33); Protagoras' Man; the Vitruvian Man; Descartes' Man (34).

The physiotherapy body, the proper body is "clean, neat and tidy." (35,p235)

It is a hard body, a body under control (35,p235).

It is the ontologically immobile body and the body which immobilizes other bodies.

It excludes the body of difference, the flabby impermanent body.

It is "grasping for stasis, it says 'NO' to the difference that the movement of life presents." (35,p168).

"The cult of the tight body is the cult of a body that does not give way to the other. Jiggly flesh is obscene, ugly because it gives flesh to the body's malleability, its lack of sovereignty when it is prodded or even when it moves." (35,p235).

Intellectually taking up Man's mind gives physiotherapy something to do. Embodying Man has given physiotherapy something to be.

When the clinician speaks, words percolate through the husk of the person whom the dogmatic image of physiotherapy has emptied out. The clinician provides only that which benefits the profession: sick bodies and healthy bodies, predictability and conformity. The promotion of "more medicine, even if this means less health." (36,p85).

The therapist is blind to itself, zombified conduits of the physiotherapy regime of Truth cloaked in altruism. Physiotherapy has given all of its therapists the identity of "being a physiotherapist" to conform to. As a result, physiotherapy does not disturb thought. It keeps us very busy engaging our faculties in activities that refer back to objects of recognition (1). Thought is filled with no more than an image of itself and its own internal logic; it recognizes itself the more it recognizes things (1).

Deleuze insists that conformism of thought wed to representation and recognition has left us virtually no tools to break with that which everyone already knows. "The exercise of thought thus conforms to the [...] dominant meanings and to the requirements of the established order." (14,p13). Physiotherapy thinks for physiotherapists. It gives us norms, rules, and complicity. An image of thought (1).

An immanent creator

An antidote to transcendence is immanence and its perpetual escape, interruption, asymmetry, and coalition with the outside (5).

To be a creator is a "process of 'becoming' – the what might/

could be – the creation of what is not yet, is achieved through thinking in new, perhaps previously unimagined, modes of thinking.” (37,p128). The creator “will be destructive, will affirm difference, and will exist in chaos. They will reach into the unknown and produce what is unrecognizable.” (38,p88).

Immanence is everywhere, without it being a universal - “It’s a ‘differentiator,’ a ‘differential.” (12,p156). Don’t mistake immanence for a new transcendent category, for then we are no better than the post-positivists. Immanence, at its foundations, is not populated by identities or an Ideal but by a field of difference. Difference detached from identities and so always already having the possibility of pressing new identities into form. Therefore, immanence holds no animosity towards identities but acknowledges that no identity is eternal, and all should be deterritorialized.

Thought, on the plane of immanence, is never like writing on a blank page. There are always sedentary identities to be destabilized. We are always struggling “against the “cliches” of opinion” (13,p204). The page “is already so covered with preexisting, preestablished cliches that it is first necessary to erase, to clean, to flatten, even to shred, so as to let in a breath of air from the chaos” (13,p204). We can create only by first destroying the conventions of opinion.

“The conditions of a true critique and a true creation are the same: the destruction of an image of thought which presupposes itself and the genesis of the act of thinking in thought itself” (1,p139).

Necessary, creative destruction, overturns “all orders and representations in order to affirm Difference in the state of permanent revolution.” (1,p53).

For thought to move, we require an exercise of intolerance for the present, calling for the destruction and death of our sedentary ontology, announcing it as insufficient, critiquing those who still believe in it, and demanding its removal (5).

““No artist tolerates reality.” (Camus’ Nietzsche) (39,p222)

A creator who is the same, creating nothing new, is no creator at all. The true Creator is never the same but always different. Being has not been exhausted - bring something incomprehensible, something that did not previously exist into the world (10). Existing on a single plane, the creator operates from a theology of radical inclusion and affirmation.

“To affirm is not to bear, carry, or harness oneself to that which exists, but on the contrary to unburden, unharness, and set free that which lives.” (40,p185)

Let go of “oughts” and “shoulds” and let us experiment with not yet, and what might be.

After all, it was Paul, who, in a moment of lucidity denied an ontology of identity (transcendence) for one of difference (immanence) allowing the possibility for the “new”: “Do not lie to each other, since you have taken off your old self [transcendence] with its practices and have put on the new self, which is being renewed in knowledge in the image of its Creator [Difference in itself]. Here there is no [identity] Gentile or Jew, circumcised or uncircumcised, barbarian, Scythian, slave or free, but Christ [Difference] is all, and is in all” (Colossians 3:9-11(NIV)) [author added in brackets].

Where is the new to be found? (1)

Making the familiar strange

“Habitualization devours objects, clothes, furniture, one’s wife, and the fear of war. . . Art exists to help us recover the sensation of life, it exists to make us feel things, to make the stone stony. The end of art is to give a sensation of the object as seen, not as recognized. The technique of art is to make things ‘unfamiliar,’ to make forms obscure, so as to increase the difficulty and duration of perception.”(Viktor Schklovsky) (7,p162)

The familiar identities which we are all expected to recognize blind us and make our fingers numb. We need poets, writers, and painters to help us see things as they are sensed and not as they are known (recognized). In this way, they are more accurately defined, not as artists, but opticians. We are forced to look again, to see for the first time, from the outside (11). Seeing, in this sense is forgetting the name of the thing one sees (41).

Sometimes we need an optician to lead us by the hand out of the village into terra nullius, outside the city walls. What if “there’s something wrong in the village” (42)? This is the function of the last guru (43) The Outsider(11,44): to reveal not their universal perspective, but betray any universal perspective. To spit in its face.

“He took the blind man by the hand and led him outside the village. When he had spit on the man’s eyes and put his hands on him, Jesus asked, ‘Do you see anything?’” (Mark 8:23 (NIV))

Now outside the city gates – between territories – we are provided a perspective that was not afforded to us when we were complicit with the order of things. Becoming Moses, a stammerer and nomad, always ready to deterritorialize, having “a small plot of new land at all times.” (4,p161) Go to “the far side of the wilderness” where we might encounter the “strange”

(Exodus 3:1-3 (NIV)), even if only for a moment. This is the value of getting lost and not knowing where to go.

“To move from A to B, we have to go from A to not A. We do not go from certainty to certainty, but from certainty to uncertainty, from stability to instability.” (45)

Betray comfort – break the boundaries of a thing to create new limits and explore alternatives previously hidden by the city walls. Enter the transitional space between thought and unthought, no longer having “their” opinion, not knowing what might appear, not knowing what to do next, like eyes before they open (46). The liminal spaces allow us to find new becomings. An ethics of betrayal demands a radical movement away from our faculties of memory, and reflection, rejecting the comfort of the status quo.

What we need is “something in the world” to force us to think not the recognizable (that which can be recalled, imagined, or conceived), but a “fundamental encounter.” (1,p139) Physiotherapy is political – and so is betrayal. We all need some betrayal, something to spit in our eyes. Circumvent the imperative of oppressive forces to assimilate our thought into common sense and discourse of “everybody knows, no one can deny.” (1,p130).

We require an outside thought which violates the conventions of physiotherapy that violates us, that attempts to think on our behalf. Thinking takes place out of reach of physiotherapy’s agenda. Thinking takes place when we draw a line of flight across art, poetry, philosophy, science, symptomology, and... What forces us to think is imperceptible to “the physiotherapist” and is only available to the traitor prophet if they choose it: “the truth is not revealed, it is betrayed.” (47,p95). So that we might become “...someone – if only one – with the necessary modesty [of] not managing to know what every [physiotherapist] knows, and modestly denying what everybody is supposed to recognize. Someone who neither allows [them]self to be represented nor wishes to represent anything.” (1,p130).

Physiotherapy’s ontology – its deepest dimension of being – should no longer be sedentary. Rather, it should be active and mobile. Resist Being a physiotherapist, Being is only a matter of becoming.

We must be vigilant for problems which are given to us. The clinical problems and their solutions physiotherapists encounter do not exist out in the world waiting to be solved and resolved. We cannot know or recognize the solutions to clinical problems a priori. Rather, problems and knowing is bound up in the process of resisting, interrupting flows, escaping, and posing problems (5). Not through contemplation and

reflection, but through active, engaged, experimentation we find out how else we might intervene so that a body’s capacity for movements and actions might increase and flourish.

Looking at physiotherapy long and hard enough allows it to recede and lose meaning. What was once familiar (physiotherapy) becomes strange. The name is the same, but its character warps and becomes dissonant the further we walk from it. The word is now charged as if it both hungers for what it was and anticipates what it might become – a strange pulsing of both past and present. Bodies that were and bodies yet to come. Physiotherapists that were and physiotherapists that are yet to come. There is another world out there we don’t know – beyond the recognizable.

“Do you see anything [new]”? (Mark 8:23 (NIV))

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Erin Tichenor and Duarte Breedt for their critical feedback and ruthless editing.

References

1. Deleuze G. *Difference and Repetition*. Columbia University Press; 1994.
2. Sur Leibniz. *Webdeleuze*. Accessed May 19, 2023. <https://www.webdeleuze.com/textes/50>
3. Ahmed S. *Living a Feminist Life*. Illustrated edition. Duke University Press Books; 2017.
4. Deleuze G, Guattari F. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. First edition. Univ Of Minnesota Press; 1987.
5. Culp A. *Dark Deleuze*. Univ Of Minnesota Press; 2016.
6. Merton T. *No Man Is an Island*. First edition. HarperOne; 2002.
7. Shklovsky V. *Art, as Device*. *Poet Today*. 2015;36(3):151-174. doi:10.1215/03335372-3160709
8. Deleuze G. *Two Regimes of Madness, Revised Edition: Texts and Interviews 1975-1995*. (Lapoujade D, ed.). *Semiotext(e)*; 2007.
9. Shklovsky V. *Bowstring: On the Dissimilarity of the Similar*. Dalkey Archive Press; 2011.
10. Deleuze G. *Bergsonism*. Zone Books; 1988.
11. *The Beautifully Strange World of Outsider Music*; 2021. Accessed December 23, 2022. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CVks07UgVQQ>
12. Deleuze G. *Negotiations, 1972-1990*. Columbia University Press; 1995.

13. Deleuze G, Guattari F. *What Is Philosophy?* Revised ed. edition. Columbia University Press; 1996.
14. Deleuze G, Parnet C. *Dialogues II*. Rev. ed. Columbia University Press; 2007.
15. Cixous H. *Three Steps on the Ladder of Writing*. Later Printing Used edition. Columbia University Press; 1994.
16. Deleuze G, Guattari F. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Penguin; 2009.
17. Jackson AY, Mazzei LA. *Thinking with Theory in Qualitative Research*. 2nd ed. Routledge; 2022. doi:10.4324/9781315667768
18. Whitman W. *Song of Myself: And Other Poems*. Counterpoint LLC; 2011.
19. Jagodzinski J, Wallin J. *Arts-Based Research: A Critique and a Proposal*. Sense Publishers Rotterdam; 2013.
20. Borges JL. *Three Versions of Judas*. In: Kerrigan A, ed. *Ficciones*. Grove Press; 1994.
21. Grosz E. *Becoming Undone: Darwinian Reflections on Life, Politics, and Art*. Illustrated edition. Duke University Press Books; 2011.
22. Kazantzakes N. *Report to Greco*. Simon & Schuster; 1975.
23. Hartman SE. *Why do ineffective treatments seem helpful? A brief review*. *Chiropr Osteopat*. 2009;17:10. doi:10.1186/1746-1340-17-10
24. Smith DW. *The concept of the simulacrum: Deleuze and the overturning of Platonism*. *Cont Philos Rev*. 2006;38(1-2):89-123. doi:10.1007/s11007-006-3305-8
25. Emery CA, Napier C. *On the bright side of PhD life: the perspectives of physiotherapist clinician–scientists*. *Br J Sports Med*. 2021;55(12):654-655. doi:10.1136/bjsports-2021-104124
26. Kant I. *Critique of Pure Reason*. Revised edition. (Weigelt M, ed.). Penguin Classics; 2008.
27. Holmes D, Murray SJ, Perron A, Rail G. *Deconstructing the evidence-based discourse in health sciences: truth, power and fascism*. *Int J Evid Based Healthc*. 2006;4(3):180-186. doi:10.1111/j.1479-6988.2006.00041.x
28. Bergson H. *Creative Evolution*. Unabridged edition. Dover Publications; 1998.
29. Nietzsche F. *The Gay Science: With a Prelude in Rhymes and an Appendix of Songs*. This translation based on second edition of *Die frohliche Wissenschaft*, published 1887. Vintage; 1974.
30. Foucault M. *Discipline & Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Vintage Books; 1995.
31. Wynter S. *The Ceremony Must be Found: After Humanism*. *Bound 2*. 1984;12(3):19. doi:10.2307/302808
32. Breedt E. *Kitsch*. Euan Breedt. Published September 2021. Accessed December 15, 2022. <https://eduanbreedt.com/blog/kitsch/>
33. Doran B, Setchell J. *Performative acts of physiotherapy*. In: *Manipulating Practices: A Critical Physiotherapy Reader*. Cappelen Damm Akademisk/NOASP; 2018:125-149.
34. Le Grange L. *The Notion of Ubuntu and the (Post)Humanist Condition*. In: *Indigenous Philosophies of Education Around the World*. Routledge; 2018.
35. Pronger B. *Body Fascism: Salvation in the Technology of Physical Fitness*. University of Toronto Press; 2002. doi:10.3138/9781442671485
36. Ioannidis JPA. *Evidence-based medicine has been hijacked: a report to David Sackett*. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2016;73:82-86. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2016.02.012
37. Jeanes EL. *“Resisting Creativity, Creating the New”: A Deleuzian Perspective on Creativity*. *Creat Innov Manag*. 2006;15(2):127-134. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8691.2006.00379.x
38. Jeanes E. *Questioning the common sense of creativity and innovation through Deleuzian thought*. *Quaderni*. 2016;(91):79-91. doi:10.4000/quaderni.1013
39. Camus A. *The Rebel: An Essay on Man in Revolt*. Reissue edition. Vintage; 1992.
40. Deleuze G. *Nietzsche and Philosophy*. Columbia Classics edition. Columbia University Press; 1985.
41. Weschler L. *Seeing Is Forgetting the Name of the Thing One Sees: Expanded Edition*. First Edition, Over Thirty Years of Conversations with Robert Irwin. University of California Press; 2009.
42. Wrabel S. *The Village*. Epic Records; 2017. Accessed December 23, 2022. <https://open.spotify.com/album/1tVsOrPK4fwQB6kN7jJZxy>
43. *The Last Guru*.; 2021. Accessed May 19, 2023. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qT_H6Y1IIPU
44. Camus A. *The Stranger*. Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group; 1989.
45. Breedt E. *Sublime*. Euan Breedt. Published October 2021. Accessed December 23, 2022. <https://eduanbreedt.com/blog/sublime/>
46. Fogale L. *Every Colour*. Amelia Recordings; 2020. Accessed December 23, 2022. <https://open.spotify.com/>

33. Doran B, Setchell J. Performative acts of physiotherapy. In: *Manipulating Practices: A Critical Physiotherapy Reader*. Cappelen Damm Akademisk/NOASP; 2018:125-149.
34. Le Grange L. The Notion of Ubuntu and the (Post)Humanist Condition. In: *Indigenous Philosophies of Education Around the World*. Routledge; 2018.
35. Pronger B. *Body Fascism: Salvation in the Technology of Physical Fitness*. University of Toronto Press; 2002. doi:10.3138/9781442671485
36. Ioannidis JPA. Evidence-based medicine has been hijacked: a report to David Sackett. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2016;73:82-86. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2016.02.012
37. Jeanes EL. "Resisting Creativity, Creating the New". A Deleuzian Perspective on Creativity. *Creat Innov Manag*. 2006;15(2):127-134. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8691.2006.00379.x
38. Jeanes E. Questioning the common sense of creativity and innovation through Deleuzian thought. *Quaderni*. 2016;(91):79-91. doi:10.4000/quaderni.1013
39. Camus A. *The Rebel: An Essay on Man in Revolt*. Reissue edition. Vintage; 1992.
40. Deleuze G. *Nietzsche and Philosophy*. Columbia Classics edition. Columbia University Press; 1985.
41. Weschler L. *Seeing Is Forgetting the Name of the Thing One Sees: Expanded Edition*. First Edition, Over Thirty Years of Conversations with Robert Irwin. University of California Press; 2009.
42. Wrabel S. *The Village*. Epic Records; 2017. Accessed December 23, 2022. <https://open.spotify.com/album/1tVsOrPK4fwQB6kN7jIZxy>
43. *The Last Guru*.; 2021. Accessed May 19, 2023. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qT_H6Y1IIPU
44. Camus A. *The Stranger*. Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group; 1989.
45. Breedt E. *Sublime*. Euan Breedt. Published October 2021. Accessed December 23, 2022. <https://eduanbreedt.com/blog/sublime/>
46. Fogale L. *Every Colour*. Amelia Recordings; 2020. Accessed December 23, 2022. <https://open.spotify.com/track/0uPkf15Rz7OgwwUg9TnYF9>
47. Deleuze G. *Proust and Signs: The Complete Text*. First edition. Univ Of Minnesota Press.

To contact the author:
Ed Breedt
Faculty of Rehabilitation Medicine
University of Alberta
116 St & 85 Ave.
Edmonton, AB T6G 2R3
Email: eduanb@gmail.com