

## **STRUCTURAL SUBVERSION OF PSYCHOANALYSIS**

Graciela Berraute

I want to say that this is not an ideological matter. In principle, it makes the function of the subject depend on the articulation of the signifier, which implies that it is not a being. But rather, it is in a fundamental relationship with the body. The Other is the body. And it is the unconscious. This is why the Freudian imperative proposes that, as a subject, I must come into the field of the Id, the grammar of drive (where sexuality participates in psychic life). This reveals the incapacity of any signification to encompass what concerns sex. Because, through our alienation to language, the harmonious perfection of copulation has been lost. Freud discovered in his neurotics that “something is wrong with the real”: an essential lack in the junction between sexual relations and their subjective realization, which installs dissatisfaction. He initially names this as the structure of desire in its causation by a lost object, in the dynamics of the pleasure principle. But then he comes to meet with its beyond, and can open the dimension of *jouissance* and the field of repetition, as a revolutionary principle of contradiction between pleasure and life: he was able to grasp that the symptom entails a certain kind of satisfaction. Because it is a discourse that does not submit to the principle of contradiction, and from there it introduces a truth. It is defined in a half-saying, because on the other side it does not say: it hides castration. In this dimension, male or female must manage there, where sexuality is reduced to enduring a lack, the phallic lack. Where the detumescence of the penis brings a lesser evil, and even promotes in both sexes the assumption of another *jouissance* than the phallic one... Already in the "Three Essays..." Freud transgresses all moral conceptions of sexuality by affirming that the Oedipus Complex imposes bisexuality as a determination; and its polymorphous perverse fabric: explicit in infantile sexuality and in the *jouissance* of the perverse; phantasmatic in the neurotic. Lacan says that he finds the fertility of Psychoanalysis “where Freud was only able to conceive of human sexuality as perverse.” That is why it is clear that he does not yield to his discovery, because there is a dimension of truth about the symptom that would not hold outside of what daily life revealed to him: “Jung, one must cling to that

theory to avoid the mire of occultism.” How did he get there? In the seminar “From an Other to the other,” [page 271, Paidós Press/page 257, Polity Press], Lacan reads in Freud that his position constitutes the articulated mutation of a disjunction between knowledge and power, in relation to what was considered by ancient science and all the empires as an equivalence (he who knows how to count can distribute). How does he place this mutation? In Freud’s position as a patient, which he testifies to in the construction of his discovery. “There it is read that he himself is the patient, by his effort, his work, and his discourse.” That is why this discourse is sustained in the separation between the Ideal and the *a*, as the reverse of the mass bond. That is why he first renounced hypnosis. And on another level, he continues to question us with the affirmation that individual psychology is also social psychology: a recognition of the otherness that inhabits us. That is why, we can also say that castration is at the center of the psychoanalytic act and its transmission.