



SOCIETÀ AMICI DEL PENSIERO



THE FREUD TRIBUNAL (IV)

## THE TREE AND THE FRUITS ECONOMIC RECTITUDE

by Giacomo B. Contri<sup>1</sup>

We start from a verifiable definition: the average man who we normally meet is an economic reality who works at a loss in more ways than one: we mean the statistic-pathologic “normality” which is a *sub judice* of the norm of our judgment.

We also start from the equation: hostility toward thinking = pathology = diseconomy: the *homo pathologicus* - more real and ordinary than the *homo sapiens* - works at such a loss that ends up to be defined by it.

That the pathology is diseconomy – loss of profits, damages, missed opportunities – is a truism verifiable in the short-run in the life of each individual (balance sheet in hand). It is verifiable because the individual keeps missing his appointments, and all his appointments are business appointments.

I introduce for the first time the expression ‘Economic Rectitude’. Economic Rectitude is the *Thinking of Nature* itself, developed as a Law that posits the man before the Law as usually defined: a man finally imbued with good sense (even if barely existent). A man as economic reality, a producer of wealth for himself and for everyone else (let’s say producer of a GDP much broader than the one normally understood).

Rect-itude or also *Right-itude*, *Recht-itude*, *Jus-itude*, *Droit-itude* of thinking: it is a rectitude preceding the distinction between morality and law, and also preceding the distinction between knowledge and practice.

It is the univocal - not moral - rectitude of having as Principle the saying ‘The tree is judged by its fruits’, a principle which is at the same time practical (without moral or juridical distinction) and cognitive: knowledge *per fructus* preceding and subordinating the knowledge *per causas*.

This rectitude has nothing to do with “natural law”, always and forever devoid of economic coverage (this is also the shortcoming of the “human rights”).

Such a Principle is the prologue of a Constitution, just as the Italian Constitution has as its first fundamental Principle the Art.I: “Italy is a democratic Republic founded on work”.

---

<sup>1</sup>Milan, August 2009. Courtesy translation by Luca Flabbi and Vivienne Prescott.



This Principle is universal, as shown, first of all, by having its seat in the act of thinking of each individual: when such thinking exists it can be called *san(t)a sede* (a seat at the same time sane, healthy, holy and revered).

We can also call this Principle thinking-as-Friend, a friend floundering between hostility and indifference.

I have just written the statute of a Society of such thinking: “The Friends of Thinking Society”.

The precedent of its Principle is the Freudian Principle: called “pleasure principle” to then find confirmation as “reality principle”. The reality principle is a renewed version of the pleasure principle which adds a valid faculty of defense in the conflict (for the most part unsustainable) against hostility and indifference.

The phrase ‘law-economy’ develops the precedent Freudian topical-economic.

The observations of G. Leopardi (Zibaldone) are still relevant regarding the unfavorable conditions in which man lives “We cannot know, nor infer of what human nature would be capable of if put in favorable circumstances”.

We start again from thinking the favorable conditions (of which psychoanalysis is an application) or thinking sustained by law: it is possible to redact (actually, it is already redacted from the beginning) a Charter of the constitutional thinking of the tree and its fruit as the *ordinamento* (juridical order) derived from that same principle. We have also called that Principle, followed by its *ordinamento*, with the expression “the orthodoxy of the subject”. This is autonomous and distinct from the traditional orthodoxies: we point out as a pre-traditional error, the Theory of the orthodoxy as given or imposed only by external forces such as churches, political parties or groups.

The dominant economic Theory known as Economics - but “Economy” is a word not to be thrown away - works today with the man of the “unfavorable conditions”. The man in dissent with his own principle, who doesn’t question himself about it and therefore the man living in the ignorance about his own principle. But the Theory in Economics cannot be concealed because it reveals itself as a Psychology. This fact becomes immediately visible if only we connect it to another fact closely related to it: the man of the “micro”(!)-economic behavior is the man of the so called “comfort zone”. I am alluding here to a critique of the couple micro/macro in Economics (J. Lacan used to write: “*Il n’y a pas de petites économies*”).

This zone is defined as a “*comfortable rut that limits their possibilities, their thinking and their achievements*”: these are the men of the Leopardian “unfavorable conditions”. It is worth noting the sarcasm implied in the use of the word ‘comfortable’. However, nothing changes, not even the sarcasm, in the invitation to assume the “risk” or the “challenge” to come out from one’s own “comfort zone” to enter into another zone, a little more advanced but actually identical. In fact, it ends up being even more rigid and stringent since it must be defended tooth and nail. We are talking small change here, where nothing changes and anxiety and dissatisfaction remain.



SOCIETÀ AMICI DEL PENSIERO



There is no *achievement* - fulfillment, success or the word we prefer *satisfaction* - in such an *achievement*.

Then, there are the many that don't have the *comfort zone*, but there is a lot of publicity to seduce them into aspiring to it – I don't say "*desire*", which is a serious and realistic pull. Desires are what we are really lacking, we should not abhor to consider them ambitions.

*Honni soit qui mal y pense* of desire, first of all slandering it as illusory and impotent: the real illusion and impotence is believing to have the desire within oneself because of the "Self". A quite "normal" - statistically speaking - belief.

But this dominant economic Theory puts reason in our court with respect to our point of departure - the act of thinking - even if in an opposing perspective since it is, indeed, Pure Psychology (with the contribution of Cognitivism).

The vocabulary of the men of the *comfort zone* is: anxiety-emotions-comfort-group-panic-herd-fear-stress-to be stuck-routine-self image-mental state-feeling-heart-flow (the flow in which one feels immersed)-mental limitations (recognized as not real)-(mental) danger-security (recognized as groundless).

It is with good reason that we add that also 'Psychology' is a word not to be thrown away. Just as non-economies do not exist - in philosophy, literature, songs and also in religion, theology and mystical theology - likewise non-psychologies do not exist. But all of them are Orders of behavior. Even thinking is behavior. At least a psychoanalyst should know this well. We ought to distrust anyone who affirms the usual sentence "I'm not doing any psychology!": whatever he says he is doing, he is doing psychology, just as he is doing an economy. The issue is being able to make a distinction between economies and between psychologies. The greatest fraud of last century, and still valid, it is the totalitarian and absolute noun "The Psychology" - 'scientific', of course!

"The Psychology" is an enemy of the economy, it becomes the science of the poor.

It is almost unbelievable to see how this new religion is growing and developing, using all and the same means of the previous religions.

It is the same religion or ghost or Theory or Object of the 'invisible hand' (or of the Walrasian auctioneer, assuring the market clearing and giving rise to the "general equilibrium"). A religion of invisibility just like them all, but a calculated pragmatic invisibility which is capable of any compromise, no matter how contradictory, with religions and mystical religions (of which there has been a noted revival in recent years).

Economics itself shows we are right since the economics-man is actually the anxiety-man. It is real ontological anxiety, the anxiety of the "being of the tree", the all-alone tree. At the opposite, there is no anxiety in the principle 'The tree is judged by its fruits'. In this principle the 'being' is really because it is placed as being by its own fruits.

STUDIUM CARTELLO – IL LAVORO PSICOANALITICO

Via Francesco Viganò n.4, 20124 Milano, Italia. Tel +39.02.29009980 - CF e Partita IVA 11289890151

[www.societaamicidelpensiero.com](http://www.societaamicidelpensiero.com) [www.studiumcartello.it](http://www.studiumcartello.it) [www.sicedizioni.it](http://www.sicedizioni.it) [mail@studiumcartello.it](mailto:mail@studiumcartello.it)