



PERVERSION AT THE CROSSROADS

by Giacomo B. Contri ¹

There is hostility to the act of thinking. The hostility which doesn't promote thinking, ends up negating it as economic or juridical act and defining it only as ontological entity.

This Course follows last year's Course titled *The Tree and its Fruits* and it is devoted to the economic rectitude or *recht*-itude which makes the individual an Institution amongst Institutions without subjection nor reciprocal *superbia*.

The hostility to the act of thinking hints at the unproven but invincible premise (like the presupposition of love) that the Law (no matter which one) is already given, presupposed and not established. As a result, the act of thinking has no access to the truth that *ius semper condendum* in each act of everyday life.

This truth frees from the most ancient of dogmas - the platonic dogma which wants language as a relationship between words and things - opening to the thought of language as a relationship between words and acts. Therefore the individual, the Ego, is immediately implicated and things take a non-problematical position.

The catatonic schizophrenic is a radically platonic philosopher right up to abolishing the act.

In a law which is a *presupposed* law, the individual is left with:

1. Either unconditional subjection;
2. Or rebellion which is always defeated like every *jacquerie*;
3. Or perversion as denial-repudiation of each assertion as a positive act, i.e. a act that posits.

Within perversion everything is Baroque, theatre, nothing is real ('Life is a dream'). Today we would say 'everything is an interaction'. Amongst the crisis in the history of Christianity, the Baroque - which was proposed as a solution but it was a crisis itself - has been the most serious one because it rendered perversion indiscernible (from blessed *putti* to paedophilia).

But let's start over. Perversion is not a state, a way of being, a paradigm or a genre. It results from a shift. It is a conversion which is neither hysterical nor devout. Perversion is a Culture, a Discourse which comes before all Discourses (allusion to J. Lacan).

Through the centuries, one and only one person has said something precise and well defined about perversion: Freud. Even though it was there for everyone to see.

¹Milan, September 2010. Courtesy translation by Luca Flabbi and Vivienne Prescott.



This says something about the history of thought and introduces the imputability of not seeing and not hearing: not seeing and not hearing has been followed by the full obliteration of Freud.

Let's retrace immediately the fundamental concepts:

1. Neurosis is distinguished by perversion just as repression (*Verdrängung*) is distinguished by disavowal (*Verleugnung*);
2. We can add Freud's words "Neurosis is the negative of perversion": as an example, consider that the altruistic love of the obsessional neurosis is the reaction-formation of sadism.

Perversion is not a state, it is rather a path actively and positively taken *after* a crossroad, the crossroad described by Freud as:

«analysis does not set out to make pathological reactions impossible, but to give the patient's Ego *freedom* to decide one way or the other.» (SE XIX p. 50)

Freud's grace has made possible that freedom can be achieved *also* as perversion. Perversion as an alternative to neurotic compulsion:

After Freud, there is more perversion in the world than before, more instigating "obscene and ferocious" (J. Lacan) Super-Ego.

There is no practical, i.e. moral and intellectual, equivalence between the two paths after such a crossroad, the crossroad between health (health as healing not as *restitutio ad integrum*) and perversion. There is no Manichaeism or equivalence between good and bad.

Perversion rides as regressive progress the freedom of thinking as opposed to thinking as freedom. Thinking as freedom is the novel, ground-breaking, never-before thought Freudian innovation.

Notwithstanding the perversion's delirious arrogance and presumption, there is not more or deeper thinking in perversion than in neurosis or psychosis. Within the perversion, the censure remains intact in all the scenarios, alternating between obscene contemplation and mystical contemplation.

The pervert with his discursive action is the cause (trauma, detrimental action) of the neurosis, as well as his master and missionary.

The path taken by the perverse is from the neurotic inconclusiveness to the anti-conclusiveness of attacking the social bond that results from thinking as freedom.

Perversion fails. It can only be left with the arrogance of promoting failure as its final aim: the personal failure, the failure of the social bond.

It is the intelligence of the idiot (the age-old 'devil').

In the perversion, as in the neurosis, it is the Ego that is always and in any case at work, even in the worst compromises or solutions, and it is never beyond the conflict. Freud was right and the *Ego psychology*, and everyone using it to denigrate Freud, wrong: the imputability is never absent.



The pervert denies the distinction fear/anxiety, a distinction the neurotic is still capable of making, and must elude anxiety as the signal of the unknown threat to thinking in the object which actually is.

A clarification about the crossroad, so as not to concede anything to the already perverse theme of freedom as the pure-abstract freedom of *choice*. Indeed, the worst error and offence that one can commit against the naive or defenceless, starting with the child, is to expect him to give any justification of why he eats, that is why he is choosing to eat or not to eat. It is a pretence which censures the fact that there was already a *reason*, not an instinct, in eating (the reason being the judgment “I already liked it” and “I already knew that I liked it”).

We can illustrate this error using an example of correct grammatical incorrectness. If in describing the act of eating I say “I am *for* eating”, I am saying that “I am eating” but also that I am in favour (“for”) of eating. Being “in favour of” means working for it, building conditions for it, giving permission and consent to that specific act. It is not causal. (This is exactly what the anorexic is opposed to.)

Indeed, this is also the case of the Freudian’s crossroad: the patient who is healing would say “I am *for* healing” (but then someone will try to stop him: each analysis finds an enemy of his analysis).

The pervert turns back from a road already taken: he eliminates the consent and approval from the act of “healing”. By subtracting the “for” from “I am *for* healing” he is effectively disavowing the possibility of healing. Already Antigone used to say “it’s hate/ no it’s not hate, but love”.

It is an error to limit perversion to sexual perversions. These are just the miseries of “poor devils”, as Freud called the sexually depraved. Perversion is first of all the Discourse which incapacitates the act of thinking, depriving it of the “pleasure principle” as sovereignty of judgement.

The pervert disowns the Unconscious, in as much as this word designs the act of thinking (not a part of it), but it is the disowning of the fugitive Ego under the bombs of anxiety.

About the perversion, one must distinguish between the instigator and the agent.

The world of perversion remains as master-command with the prevalence of the instigator operating from a higher level (always the poor, but subjugated Devil). A contemporary example, the instigator teaches and points at the same paedophile for whom he expresses horror: it will be the lower agent who goes to prison.

The ‘higher’ instigator hates the act and he abolishes it (similar to the schizophrenic). S. Kierkegaard declared this openly.

In a sense it was easy for J. Lacan to predict something he was already observing, “the world market of lies”: the entire work of J. Lacan is a journey through perversion (“object *a*”, “semblance”, “pervert child”).



(Max Ernst, *La Vierge corrigeant l'Enfant Jésus devant trois témoins*, 1926)

The paedophilia-pedagogy drawn up by Max Ernst (see above) reveals as obvious the in-teaching of perversion (paedophilia, in this case), making it difficult to discern the wheat from the chaff.

Perversion has a preference for education: educating educators is a perverse programme. It is a programme that trans-forms in poor devils, poor christs; including Christ, first crucified then Platonised.

Is Perversion the agent or the Theory? Answer:

Perversion is the agent of the Theory which, without its loyal agent, would just end up in a Wax Museum, in the 'horror' section, as the Memorial of how bad we were, Auschwitz included. It would be a lace to show the children (as in the 'catharsis' of Ancient Greek Theatre).

This Course proposes the exploration of the field, or world, or reality of perversion both in the single individual and in the Cultural forms. The explorations will be in permanent confrontation with the other, and primary field: the field of thinking as freedom, or the field of psychic life as juridical life:

it is the field in which the subject plays in anticipation – *ius semper condendum* - on decreed law that the subject does not mind because he has the 'marshalling of appointments' in his hand. Antigone, however, continues the civil war by other means, so that the peace we know is the prosecution of war: but the Palestine of today represents us more than Thebe.

The list or index of topics treated in the Course will be vast but limited because only the act of thinking without censure is truly unlimited: without the confines of the 'stupide siepi' (silly fences). [Leopardi]

We will find philosophical, literary, economic and juridical perversion (which is always psychological perversion too, since Psychology is not a separate field in itself). Everywhere will find the supremacy of the Theory (the Lacanian 'Symbolic').