

Colloque Convergencia « Crise dans la culture »

Paris le 28-29 - septembre 2019

Politics, ethics and perversion

Norton Cezar Dal Follo da Rosa Jr¹

Good afternoon, everyone,

Initially I would like to thank the colleagues of the organizing committee of the Convergence Colloquium and to talk about the importance of maintaining these spaces that give room to the transferences of works between psychoanalysts of different languages, cultures and styles, as this, besides reviving the formation, renews the possibilities of transmission of psychoanalysis in culture.

The crisis in culture is always a theme relevant to the psychoanalyst's practice. In this sense, both the impasses in social ties and their discursive variants question the clinic and the conditions of support of its ethics. Aware of this, it is common to remember Lacan's observation that *any analyst who fails to achieve the subjectivity of his time must renounce the practice of psychoanalysis*. Therefore, it is up to the psychoanalyst to take a position, which implies recognizing the subjective effects of the crisis, especially in the context in which he exercises his practice.

At this moment in Brazil the word “crisis”, when witnessing our sad political, legal and social reality, seems to be insufficient to tell of the state of affairs. As the international press is aware, since the perverse parliamentary coup of 2016 that ousted President Dilma Rousseff from power, we are living a very delicate moment with regard to the guarantees of a democratic rule of law. Dark times: violent statements against human rights, successive attacks on the press,

¹ APPOA member psychoanalyst and APPOA institute.

continuing incitement to hate differences, shameful homage to torturers and murderers, systematic acts of repudiation of minorities, and blatant disregard for the constitution are just some of the evidence of how much is at stake. check our democracy. Beyond a simple dichotomy between left and far right, there is evidence of a fascist regime.

Our proposal at this Congress of Convergence aims to articulate ethics, clinic and politics, putting into discussion the subjective consequences when the *show of jouissance* invades the public sphere in *pornocracy*. We are aware of how much the extreme right discourse has become evident in different countries, as it is a complex and multifactorial theme. However, we understand that one of the ways to contribute to this discussion is to rescue the debate among psychoanalysts around the field of perversions.

Pornocracy: When the obscene invades the public scene

When the obscene invades the public scene democracy loses. But when it is propagated by a president of the republic, becoming an act of State, we are in *pornocracy*, that is, the *jouissance* is acted out with apparent legitimacy. This has happened in many ways, whether through systematic persecution of the LGBT community, insults to African descendants and total neglect of the country's native population, not to mention the devastation of the environment, the destitution of scientific knowledge and the loss of the workers historical rights. In the face of so much outrage, the nation's mandatory denies the harmful effects of the military dictatorship and demonstrates a total lack of empathy for the suffering of families tortured by the regime. The systematic trivialization of the suffering of others highlights both the lack of dignity and any political virtue.

In *pornocracy* there is no responsibility for the word, everything can be said without consequences. These apolitics only seek to shock, scandalize, break into, deny, and propagate hatred through a paranoid rationality that only sustains

itself through refusal of difference through widespread perversion. It is striking that there is not the slightest notion of place, responsibility and liturgy of office, when reaching the decency of others, the *show of jouissance* is put on the scene. Therefore, if the obscene invades the State, then the offense, the persecution, the humiliation, the destitution of the enemies, and the force of the law are left to the proper.

By following the daily news it is possible to read the presence of a significant that until then was rare to hear in different media, but nowadays it has become daily, namely: refusal. The president himself constantly denies, refuses, what he himself has said, as well as, every week, they have been categorically refused. However, nothing changes in his position, since everything is said as if he had knowledge with the status of truth, or even as if there was no disjunction between knowledge and truth.

The statement "but still" became commonplace in the speech of the nation's mandatory: "The blacks of quilombos are not even for breeding", but even so, puts one by his side to make political propaganda; expresses hatred of gay men, but still says he is not homophobic; speaks at school without ideology, but defends fascism; supports the reduction of demarcated land for the Indians, but nonetheless calls on an Indian to be part of his government; does not recognize human rights but refers to the constitution; says it is not a military government, but winning the elections he and his followers said: "Winning the elections is not enough, we must wipe out the leftists and wipe out the opponents as groups, organizations and even individuals."

Lacan (1953-54) since his earliest seminars noted that perversion lies at the limit of the register of recognition. This will have its implications for the social bond, because in denying otherness, the similarity of its condition of subject is removed. I think that from the political events in our country, we are warned about this issue. Since then, perversions have shyly begun to gain ground in our debates. This fact should be noted, especially if we consider that in the last 20 years, the

theme has been almost unnoticed in both psychoanalytic institutions and the university.

Why so much disinterest? Is the low incidence of people seeking treatment enough to justify the scarcity of publications and events? What do we understand from the psychoanalytic standpoint by perversions? To what extent are we so immersed in a perverse gear that it keeps us from recognizing it? In the face of so many questions, one can conclude: the silence about this did not contribute to the formation of psychoanalysts, especially because it is a field marked by moralism, prejudice and absolute truths. More than that, the questions concerning perversions are taken as if they were something outside ourselves.

Possibilities of the psychoanalytic clinic with the perversions

It is common to find categorical positions that state that perverse do not seek analysis, because they do not suffer, only enjoy due to the pain caused to their victims. And yet, the rare ones they would seek would be only in search of some gain to make use in biased manipulations. In this sense, either the subject in perversion does not recognize the analyst in the place of supposed knowledge, for he holds the knowledge of how to make the other enjoy, *jouir*, or he would come to the analyst to make him an accomplice of his obscenities, *voyeur* of his performative enactments. But would that be enough to close the door of our offices? Despite acknowledging the relevance of these clinical evidences, I think it would be more interesting to question the possibilities of reading perversions.

As Lacan (1968-69) observed, in perversion *the subject becomes an instrument for the restoration of the Other*. This will certainly have its implications, as the destitution of the other as a subject is brought into play, taking him as an inanimate object. However, merely assuming the perverse as master of the art of *jouissance* can lead to the misconception that his mode of *jouissance* would place a total contempt on the other and, consequently, there would be no

opening for an analysis. On the contrary, Lacan introduces something new when he says that it is not contempt, for the wicked will be condemned to uphold the joy of the Other. Thus he will be enslaved by a rigid law: letting the other complete.

In the lesson of March 26, 1969, when addressing the scopic and invocative drives, regarding the question of the look, Lacan places the difference between the position of the exhibitionist and the *voyeur* and, in relation to the voice, highlights the particularities of the sadist in detriment of the masochist. He will say that for the exhibitionist the essential thing is to *make the eye appear in the Other's field*. Soon the exhibitionist watches over the jouissance of the Other, making himself seen. The position of the *voyeur* is not symmetrical, as the *voyeur* will *peek in the Other what is not to be seen*. Concerning masochism, it is pointed out that domination is the significant orderer of the relationship between the master and his disciple from the effect of the former's voice over the other, because *the masochist will respond to the Other's voice like a dog*. In contrast, *the sadist seeks to complete the other by stealing his speech and imposing his voice*.

Freud ([1905] 2005), since the Dora case, already warned: *It has to be possible to speak without being indignant of what we call sexual perversions*. Also in the *Three essays on sexuality* he will say that perversions are not something outside ourselves. Despite the warning, the concept of “perversion” is treated as a kind of label: “perverse”! This, in addition to being used to pejoratively condemn someone, is easily conceived from phenomenological categories. Often by recognizing in the other a persuasive potential through the pursuit of limitless enjoyment, or even due to intolerable behavior.

Lacan ([1966] 1998), criticized the interpretation in relation to Freudian aphorism *hysteria is the negative of perversion*, because it would be wrong to suppose that the repressed in neurosis would be open in perversion. In this sense, it is not enough to state that in perversion the subject requires transgression at any

cost, as if in perverse *jouissance* only the full satisfaction of the drive is concerned. The turning point for Lacan is how the subject puts himself by making himself an instrument of the Other's *jouissance*. This is an important detail, otherwise it is easily perverted by the behavioral bias. Therefore, the analyst can only formulate the hypothesis of perversion by reading the transference addressed to him. Thus Freud and Lacan set a new paradigm about perversion, conceiving it beyond a deviation, or a psychopathological anomaly. They laid the groundwork for reading perversions from their language perspective, or as a singular position of the subject in relation to castration.

We return to the question, perverse seek analysis? The principles on which possible demands could be legitimized would be the intense anguish resulting from the failures in the scripts responsible for capturing their fixed modes of *jouissance*, or even because of the depersonalization that engulfs the subject in his actions to such an extent that he does not recognize himself as an agent of his acts. Considering these aspects, it can be said that it is only from the effects gathered in his analysis that the psychoanalyst can deal with the anguish, repudiation and fascination implicit in perverse transference. This is the radical question about the analyst's desire, either for the constant challenge to assume a position of master, or for the imperative to make him an accomplice of the instrumentalization of the other, thus depriving him of his ethics.

Although the joy in perversion refuses pertenance, love, difference, the feeling of debt to the other and tries at all costs to locate the analyst's subjective division, would there be any possibility of betting on this clinic? Answering this question requires the analyst to recognize some trace of suffering, of subjective drama; otherwise there are no possibilities for a psychoanalytic reading.

In reading the challenge implicit in perverse transference, the right to speak is stressed, an indispensable condition for the subject to talk about the images and the scripts by which their modes of *jouissance* are alienated through the imperative of locating the subjective division of the other at any given cost. This

situates the subject's particular position on the father's theme and the refusal of sonship, so the embodiment of knowing about *jouissance* will go hand in hand with the inability to love. Lacan (1974-75) in R S I situates the father as responsible for introducing castration into discourse, as recognition of his castration enables children to idealize him in love.

As we have seen, there are many limits to this clinic. However, for an analysis to operate the analyst will be challenged at all times to lend the word to the subject. The transfer in question therefore requires relaunching the desire of the analyst to enable the subject to speak before the imperative to *show jouissance*, so the challenge will be to overcome our resistances and enable free association. Otherwise, on the one hand the analyst will feel his body being manipulated in the face of a stubborn transference to instrumentalize himself; on the other, it may incur an adaptive moralistic imposture.

Therefore, our ignorance regarding the desire to know about perversions may contribute to the formation of psychoanalysts, because their ethics will be radically questioned in the face of the challenge of reinventing new forms of *jouissance*. To conclude, I would like to highlight four formulations by four authors: Freud, Lacan, Sade and Masoch, because the logical foundations that support the following theses may help to transpose and broaden the prevailing conceptions regarding perversions.

- Freud - *In perversion the subject recognizes and simultaneously denies castration,*

- Lacan - *The perverse becomes an instrument of jouissance of the Other*

- Masoch - *It is truly masochistic one who supports everything of the other, but does not support to loses him.*

- Sade - The categorical imperative of *jouissance* in the face of the refusal of the symbolic inheritance of the generations that precede the subject and the refusal of responsibility with the transmission to the new generations.

Thank you!

References:

DUFOUR, D-R. *La cité perverse: libéralisme et pornographie*. Paris: Éditions Denoel, 2009.

Freud, S. [1905 (1901)]. Fragmento de análisis de un caso de histeria: Dora. *In: Obras completas*. v. 7. Buenos Aires: Amorrortu, 2005.

_____. [1905a]. Tres ensayos de teoría sexual. *In: Obras completas*. v. 7. Buenos Aires: Amorrortu, 2005.

_____. [1927]. Fetichismo. *In: Obras completas*. v. 21. Buenos Aires: Amorrortu, 2003.

LACAN, J. [1958]. A direção do tratamento e os princípios do seu poder. *In: Escritos*. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar, 1998. [1953-54].

_____. *O Seminário, livro 1: os escritos técnicos de Freud*. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar, 1996.

_____. [1963]. Kant com Sade. *In: Escritos*. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar, 1998.

_____. [1968-69]. *O seminário, livro 16: de um Outro ao outro*. Rio de Janeiro: 2008. Tradução Vera Ribeiro. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar, 2008.

_____. (1974-75). *R.S.I. Séminaire*. Éditions de l'Association Freudienne Internationale. Publication hors commerce. Texte établi sous la responsabilité de Henri Cesbron- Lavau. Document interne à l'Association Freudienne Internationale et destiné à ses membres. Paris, 2002.

MANNONI, O. *Clefs pour l' Imaginaire ou l' Autre Scène*. Le Champ Freudien. Col- lection Dirigée par Jacques Lacan. Paris: Éditions Seuil, 1969.

POMMIER, G. *O amor ao avesso: ensaio sobre transferência em psicanálise*. Tradução Sandra Regina Felgueiras. Rio de Janeiro: Companhia de Freud, 1998.

SACHER-MASOCH, L. [1870]. *A vênus das peles*. Tradução: Saulo Krieger. São Paulo: Hedra, 2008.

SADE, M. [1795]. *A filosofia na alcova, ou, os preceptores imorais*. SP: Iluminuras, 2008.