

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Posture, motion and therapeutic relationship: Physiotherapy and Philosophy

Luís Coelho ¹

¹ Escola Superior de Saúde do Alcoitão

✉ Luís Coelho. Rua Actor Vale 10,
r/c esq., 1900-025 Lisboa
coelholewis@hotmail.com

KEYWORDS: Posture, Movement, Therapeutic relationship,
Physiotherapy, Philosophy

The heraclitean duality of “Posture vs. Movement” emerges from the Body to show us how paradoxical the relationship it establishes with Philosophy itself, as well as with Epistemology. But this polarity has an interesting parallel with what the theme of “Postural Reeducation” conveys to us as an epistemic movement “ad infinitum”.

The fact that movement emerges from posture, and that posture allows movement, does not prevent an inadequate understanding of how the muscles of the posterior region of the body work. Organized as a “muscular chain” (which should be better called “neuromyofascial chain”), they require a minimum muscle length, adequate stretching, to support the work of the anterior, “liberal” muscles 1-3 Strengthening the posterior muscles, when excessively “tonic,” has the effect of fueling hegemonies, making movement difficult, which, in turn, implies more contraction (anterior and posterior). And yet, hegemony also translates into an excess of the intrinsic re-educative method, the invitation to helpful stretching, which also results in contraction, in defense. And this manifests itself “positively” in the empirical symptom, in pain 4.

The body’s areas evoke the therapeutic relationship. A balanced stretch invites a “therapist vs. patient” depolarization; excessive dogma distracts from this relationship, empirically polarizing it. From a monistic equilibrium, we devolve into a “Subject-Object” dualism. The Subject/therapist produces another Subject, the former patient, and this dualizes (itself) into the former therapist. Tension increases the imbalance, the “pathos”. Each pole will strive



“

The paradox is that there are two faces: “Determination” and “Freedom”, “Reason” and “empiricism”, “Spirit” and “matter”, “Subject” and “Object”, “Posture” and “movement”, and the inability to unite what time continually recreates in the game of illusion, of existence, which is being in the body, a monistic “duel”.

to attract the “dual” elements of the System, conquering Reality, attempting a new Reason-Reality relationship. Defensive polarization attempts depolarization through a “rational” conquest of the System, and this is an attempt at phenomenal pacification. The more scientific relationship, the one with the greatest support from the real “a priori”, will perhaps win, but any gain will defeat the entire System, because the defense is appeased.

Absolute balance would kill Subject and Object; it is the logic of life that reason composes the approximation, but simultaneously prevents fusion. The state of “incompetence” portrays the “normal” duality of Reality, the necessary, obligatory distancing from rational objectivity. The Object kills reason, Ethics kills morality. A compensation brings closer; if it is plausible, it increases the likelihood of being unbalanced by physicalist Reality. If, however, the dominant Reality can be constructed, this implies that the “a priori” Truth does not necessarily have the final word, and also implies that the “eternal return” can occur, and only tolerance can depolarize, bringing them closer to impassivity. The Object, Truth (unbearable and improbable, of course), kills the relationship of lovers with Love. Not without the risk of mortal polarization due to fear of fusion.

A tolerant stance grows in stature and better resists adversity; it fosters depolarization, pacifying, and diluting “pathos”. This is created by threat; it is here that movement becomes “tense” and equilibrium falters. Tension creates compensations, and these mimic the childish stance/reason, just as “pathos”, movement, is a threat to equilibrium. Defense seeks to recreate Unity, but this is thwarted by desire, just as “free will” impedes indeterminacy, Freedom, which is a matter of destiny.

The paradox is that there are two faces: “Determination” and “Freedom”, “Reason” and “empiricism”, “Spirit” and “matter”, “Subject” and “Object”, “Posture” and “movement”, and the inability to unite what time continually recreates in the game of illusion, of existence, which is being in the body, a monistic “duel”. But to see, to prove, we must die; we are condemned to not fully be, and this is the condition of an ever-provisional science, and the only dogma is movement. And it is from this that the dogma of pseudoscience is nourished, which seeks in circularity the foundation of necessary contradiction, when science, in its “reduction” tries to secure doubt. Placebetarian pseudoscience seems like a misstep, but the paradox is knowing that future science can come from it, but this too can be a “misstep”, an unbalanced movement. The greatest hygiene is the balance that is generated spontaneously, and this can never be a matter of “life or death.”

REFERENCES

1. Mézières F. La révolution en gymnastique orthopédique. Paris: Vuibert; 1949.
2. Souchart Ph-E. Le champs clos. Paris: Maloine; 1981.
3. Coelho L. O anti-fitness ou o manifesto anti-desportivo. Introdução ao conceito de reeducação postural. Quinta do Conde: Contra-Margem, 2008.
4. Coelho L. A dor da fisioterapia (e filosofia). Revista Dor da APED. 2021;28(2):91-93. doi: 10.24875/DOR.M21000010.