

# THE FIRST REPRESENTANCE<sup>1</sup> AND ITS PSYCOPATHOLOGY

Translation by Maria Gabriella Pediconi, revised by Brandy Barry and Luca Flabbi (agosto 2015)

Our daily life, individual not less than social, is representance. Without representance we can neither walk nor speak.

Every human debate – news cycle including – is only and always a debate about representance. It lies “normally” in the conflict caused by the hostility against representative thinking.

We introduce the concept of representance in a lively, even comic form.

The cover shows the picture of human coitus by Leonardo da Vinci. The impossible, in nature, is represented by this painting.



One can easily see that Leonardo was not familiar with the act that he's painting. He had absolutely no idea because he is giving us a mechanical portrayal of male and female as screw and bolt.

The representation is possible only *via* representance: the legal form of that portrayal.

We can easily comment that in the same way he could have drawn the two hindquarters of an animal i.e. a bull. The picture by Leonardo comes close to the animal because the woman's body is only half sketched like the mythological body of the cow-whore-Pasiphae in which the bull had no interest except in the guise of such a beast.

---

<sup>1</sup> We follow the Freud of the *Vorstellungs-repräsentanz* in translating *rappresentanza* with *representance*. Representance is usually defined as an obsolete noun synonym of representation. We use it here to distinguish, as Kelsen does, *Representanz* from *Vorstellung*: we translate the first with representance and the second with representation. The lack of this distinction in the English language is a loss: we do not judge representance as obsolete, albeit its use may actually have been repressed.

This myth says much about Greek thought, specifically about the voids of that thought.

Nature, i.e. anatomy-physiology, does not provide bodies with sexual drive or other motion. Nature does not supply a law of motion or any idea about motion. Thinking is an arrangement, a rule, an availability of bodies to motion. That is not natural, but meta-natural compared to the nature of the body. The body itself has no law in nature. The body itself is not predisposed to anything or anybody. Psychopathology gives one of the form of motion to the body which is still without an established form. For example, we can observe this in the hysterical psycho-pathological symptoms of fainting, that is, “I want to see – *nobody*.”

In other words, where bodies are concerned there is no natural law since the law comes from a different source. It's a law that attach itself to the bodies as their representance. In this way, the law gains among other effects, the peculiar and contingent relationship which is the sexual relationship. Sexes do not make the relationship, not even in a sexual intercourse.

Generally speaking, since birth – and with a precocity we can only infer - thinking assumes representance of the body in all its motions so that the body does not end up being as void as its anatomical representation. A void body is a naked body as in the portrayal given in an anatomical manual. Only in its natural representation the body is a *corpus vile*. It becomes *nobilis* - that is juridical - thanks to its representance.

The *corpus vile* soon becomes cannon fodder (or matter for mass psychology).

Starting from thinking as the representance of the body, the body is no longer the one of scientific anatomical portrayal. Medicine - although so helpful - does not represent the body.

Independently from Leonardo's comical portrayal, the body remains susceptible to reasonable representation only based on its thinking as representance, that is juridical meta-physics or the meta-physics of deeds.

Science does not measure up to mankind. The “Human Sciences” are a servile idea. Medicine is not a human science. It is like a natural science that it is helpful to us.

Once again, we find the renewed concept, the one from which we started twenty years ago, the one that Freud called “drive” defining it as *Vorstellungs-repräsentanz*. It is representance of the representation of the body, the one of the natural body in order to reshape it starting from Nature.

This thinking as representance provides the natural body with the law of motion which is not a natural disposition. This law of motion is the thinking itself. Each thought is law of motion, for better or for worse.

The law of motion means that thinking has collected an organism in order to generate a body as a matter of satisfaction or aim or good term, both physical and logical. (The body cannot be spiritualized nor sublimated if not by psychopathology.)

“Miracle!” We can legitimately exclaim, since it happened without natural causality and with no need of divine invocation.

Even all of Plato's thought can be relate to the law of motion, although we are the only ones to say so. All of Plato's work is legislative. It has assumed on itself the representance of humanity for thousands of years (That is why Freud was right in calling him “The Divine Plato”). Even for people lacking any cultural knowledge: it is enough to harbor the absurd and false idea of “Good” to be Platonic. The idea of “Good” opposes the fact that good is produced only by acts and movements with and through others (by means of substance and work).

Thinking as the representance of the body is the individual *Constitution* or *Charta* with an individual seat. An individual Constitution with an individual seat. As a third party it has the universe of all others as all possible partners in the negotiations with the subject.

It is from the newly-issued “Chair in Thinking” that the individual constitution was enunciated by video (The Individual Constitution) of which the individual (body) is the singular seat, but not the particular universal one because a constitution is always universal and sovereign. (The Individual Constitution is always universal and sovereign.)

Take a standard definition of representance: it is "an institute that implies the substitution of a subject with another subject when declaring will". In the first representance, the body does not yet have a subject that can be *substituted* by somebody else. The subject is *constituted* by the act of thinking as the representance representing the body. From this moment on, "subject" will mean nothing else than representance of the body.

The Ego which ensues will come across his/her own thinking as an external reality, (“psychic reality” or Freud’s *psychische Realität*), which the Ego will either recognize or not. Loss of reality is loss of thinking.

This constitution of the individual is the necessary condition for the ordinary concept of representance: the well-known political, economic, legal representation. That is why the first representance discussed here is not a simple analogy but the condition of any representation.

The body cannot and does not want to engage in any trade or business if not by virtue of its representance, and without having to give it power of attorney. We could speak of primary adoption. Let's move in here the adjective that Freud used about Plato: This is really ... divine! Once this representance is established, we cannot conceive a superior one (“*superiorem non recognoscens*”), either in the State or in God.

The word “mankind” defines none other than this representance.

For human beings there is a “relationship” only between representations. The relationship is always mediated. There is never a “naked” relationship, not even in love effusions (pornography is an illusion). Satisfaction does not immediately come from the satisfaction of a satisfied need or a demand. But it is mediated by the supply and then the demand of the other.

The “psychical” Constitution is well-structured on the law that establishes the examination and the judgment of the proposal of law encountered in the other. The Constitution is the template, guide and direction of my thinking and acting.

Freud noted in his *Moses* that the hate of Saxon Christians did not originate from their having been baptized, but from having been *badly*-baptized, that is they were *not* baptized in the form and name of their autonomous representance.

This *same* concept is called “drive”, composed by four articles, the thinking itself as such in each and every variations, whether elegant or crude, even in its negative pathological or criminal variations. This same concept was given the ambiguous name “unconscious” by Freud – Freud himself complained about the ambiguity of the term – but only when it is marked by contradiction which in turn is indicated by anxiety. The Unconscious is the act of thinking when (as we have said) fleeing the anxiety bombs.

Let me signal here the lexical innovation with respect to the traditional Freudian lexicon. “Drive” becomes the law of motion, “The Unconscious” becomes the act of thinking: the language innovation extends beyond this, but very few practice it.

The psychopathology – neuroses, perversions, psychosis, precocious psychopathology – is omnipresent in this debate.

In our political uncertainty – that of Civilization and Culture and that of Psychopathology – the individual defense lies primarily in the appeal to our own initial first representance. If needs be the individual defense can appeal to a Defender of representance or one of its Friends. The

psychoanalyst is an application of this representation since in analysis there is a return to the first representance. The psychoanalyst should learn from this call the modesty and meekness of his own universal position. A position that corrects the psychical provincialism of the psychopathologies.

It should be remembered that we have recently launched the category of “Defender of Health”, including, precisely, the psychoanalyst.

Each thought or discursive system - constitutional, political, philosophical, literary, religious – has only to *knock* at the door of the first representance in order to put together and come together pacifically with it. The only bad alternative is to “knock it down” in order to humiliate it, to deform it, to mislead it, to discredit it, to break it down, to deny it, to repudiate it.

Knocking at the door applies to “God” too, if this word has any meaning. We subscribe to the biblical sentence “in the image and likeness of God”: that is, the representance itself of the body achieved by thinking.

It is not possible to talk about the *re-surrection* of bodies before their “*surrection*”, which is already a transfiguration of nature.

There is no religion that has taken note of the “surrection”. Freud has written a truly new *Genesis* as observing and descriptive science – “drive” as thinking-law of motion.

*Giacomo B. Contri, Milan, August 2013*