

## Where Can Psychoanalysis and Education Articulate?

Vera Marta Reolon<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Doctor in Philosophy from the Pontifical Catholic University of Rio Grande do Sul - PUC/RS - Brazil and Doctor in Education from the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul - UFRGS – Brazil

<sup>2</sup>Professor at the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul UFRGS – Brazil

### \*Corresponding author

Vera Marta Reolon, Doctor in Philosophy from the Pontifical Catholic University of Rio Grande do Sul - PUC/RS, Doctor in Education from the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul - UFRGS and Professor at the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul UFRGS – Brazil.

**Submitted:** 22 Mar 2022; **Accepted:** 29 Mar 2022; **Published:** 15 Apr 2022.

**Citation:** Vera Marta Reolon. (2022). *Where Can Psychoanalysis and Education Articulate?*. *J Edu Psyc Res*, 4(1), 323-327.

### Abstract

*The structuring of the subject. Psychic structures: neurosis, psychosis and perversion. The other. The signifier Name-of-the-Father. The father metaphor. The repetition. The alienation. The status of the unconscious. The desire. The desire. The truth: the symptom. The ghost. The language. Mark, cut, primary scene. Relations of Lacanian thought with linguistics, philosophy, mathematics and logic. Descartes, Lacan and the cogito. Spinoza. Jakobson, DNA, significance. Foreclosure, denial, repression. displacement. The Law as a basis for moral conscience. Psychoanalysis and education: practical applications.*

**Keywords:** Lacan, Structuring, Subject, Desire, Ghost, Repetition, Alienation

“Mere things are not entitled to titles” (Danto)

“Discourses are erased, but they are present in every action.  
One hundred lines and no lines [...]”

**The Secret:** “to make it exist, not to judge” (Deleuze)

In seminar 14, on the logic of the phantom, Lacan starts from the Cartesian “cogito”; “cogito, ergo sum” – I think; therefore, I am – to develop his thinking, specifically his seminar. He starts from *repetition* and tells us that in repetition what is repeated is never the same. What do you mean by that?

From the premise “the unconscious is structured as language”, it is known that the subject is constituted from the desire of the Other, Conatus – Spinoziano?, which institutes Desire, thus passing to the Desiring Subject, S. This Desire that the subject door, from the desire of the Other, could be in Spinoza the desire, “appetite with awareness of itself”. This Other, from the direction of his gaze towards someone other than the son, the Mother's Place of Desire, bars the subject, instituting the lack, “[...] the subject is, on the one hand, barred from what the constitutes properly, as a function of the unconscious”, \$ [1].

Not only is the subject always-already ecstatic-dispossessed and so on, but this stasis is the subject, that is, the subject is the void \$ that arises when a substance is “dispossessed” through stasis. As much as it seems to look for fur in an egg, this distinction is

crucial: is the subject's condition always limited, dispossessed, exposed, or *is the subject itself the name for this/that dispossession?* From the limitation of the subject, we must pass to the limit itself as the name of the subject. That is why it is not enough to say that, in Hegel, there is a movement of “self-castration”, that the subject castrates himself – who is this I? The problem is that this Self only arises as a consequence, as a result of castration [2].

Thus, while lacking, this \$ will seek in the world to complete this lack that is never capable of completion, but a necessary search for life. Lacan makes use of logic (“there is a subject from the moment we make logic, that is, when we have to handle signifiers”), to insert ourselves in the context of understanding this unconscious of different subjects, “a signifier is what a subject represents for another signifier” [1]. Thus, we do not personalize, but create logical structures to understand what happens in these structuring of different and many subjects.

The human is a relational being. Therefore, it is inscribed in the discourse by alterity. However, in order to constitute himself as a subject, since he will never be an individual, it is necessary for this *alter* to look at him. Before the verb, then, in the beginning, it was the *visage*, the mirror image. To be called a subject, to be formed as such, it is necessary that an Other, the big Other, sees him and, more than that, looks at him with a look of difference, with a look desiring that this one, in front of him, be so without -equal. This constitutive Look is what launches

---

desire, lack in the subject. And this lack is a primordial condition for him to be barred, looking for something, for the object, that completes him; it is essential for the human to develop in the most “healthy” way. It is through its reflection, discovered in the Look of the Other, that there is, with identification, the notion of self. Without this lack, he does not have the necessary key for entry into the symbolic, into language, into discourse; will be amorphous. Without this lack, he will be complete, without something that impels him to search, to life par excellence.

Lacan conceives the human as a structure. This structure is conceived from three registers: Real, Symbolic and Imaginary. The Real is everything that cannot be apprehended, only symbolized, is only known through its manifestations in the Symbolic. It is the unconscious, the place where the signifiers are inscribed, it is the profound, the non-accessible, the nameless, the disordered, the not-forbidden. The Symbolic is the system of representations, language, reality, based on signs and meanings, it is through which the subject can be known, since it is only a subject, as it is the subject of speech. The Imaginary is related to the imagination, to the faculty of representing things in thought, independently of their reality. It is the place of the self-par excellence, with its phenomena of illusion, capture and deception.

Finished, closed, the structure will be when it reaches adulthood; rather, then, it is a structure in formation, in childhood; and in the process of consolidation, finishing, in adolescence. Lacan's psychoanalytic theory, in this sense, describes three possible structures in which the subject will undoubtedly be configured. They are: neurosis, psychosis or perversion. The determining factors, the fundamental roles in the formation of personality, from this perspective, will be the Other, primordial, and the paternal metaphor, instituted by the Other. The field and the Name-of-the-Father signifier, therefore, will be the foundations of the subject, the foundations. The subject, in fact, is subject to signifiers, inscribed or not by the big Other. Therefore, the Other, more than a place, more than a role, normally exercised, occupied by the mother, is a field. And, like any field, it encompasses what is contained in it. Well, this field, the Other, is a field of inscription of signifiers and the subject is what is in it.

In the beginning, then, the Other and the subject are one and the same. This thing is a blend, a whole, a complete, yet nameless. In general, subject and Other, subject and its field, are in symbiosis. But this whole, this nameless one, is not. If not, it remains in life, without ever having entered it, until death. If so, absence of desire, absence of separation, of cutting, psychosis is. Psychosis is the structure of the subject without Desire, of the amorphous that is not even a subject, since it is subject to nothing. It is the structure of what is intrinsic to the Other, as it was not included in the discourse – which is only given by the love launched by the Other – but excluded. Without first subjecting himself, he was not allowed to live, he was forgotten, at the same time imprisoned.

More than a negative mark, the psychotic, the one who forecloses, has a non-mark. This foreclosure is from the Name-of-the-Father, signifier of the limit order, which introjects internal, ethical, principle and fundamental law for the external law, so-

cial morality. It is from this signifier that the subject is outside, it is he that the subject forecloses, along with the Other, who did not show it, on the contrary, deprived it of the metaphor. It is the function of the field, of the big Other, to cast Name-of-the-Father on the subject, so that he can be named, called a subject. This launch, this inscription takes place through desire, the desire of the field towards the subject. This desire, launched by the big Other, will constitute the Mother's Place of Desire, the basis for the inscription of the paternal metaphor, Name-of-the-Father.

The unnamed, the non-subject, the non-subject, the psychotic, the loveless, will intertwine the three registers once they are untied. The link was not allowed, which is only given by the lack. Thus, they will be superimposed, which will cause sometimes hallucination, sometimes delirium. Without the key that allows him to enter the discourse, that allows repression or denial, he remains outside, that is, not included in reality. He creates another “reality”, created, in fact, by the Other.

The perverse, on the other hand, is the one who denies, who knows, but pretends not to know, denies the metaphor. It is introjected, because the subject was desired, but it is denied, because it is weakened, torn apart. The law is present, but it is set aside. The big Other presents it, but does not favor it, does not embrace it, places it on the margins: it provokes a violation. Once the law is violated, previously weakly inscribed, the subject replaces it with a fetish, with jouissance at any price, with voyeurism. There is no conception of alterity, all are instruments of manipulation and jouissance of the subject. The unconscious of the perverse is exposed. There is fantasy of plenitude, since the Real is detached from metaphor, from discourse. Instead of a symbolization, it is imagined. The subject is a subject of transgression to the norm, to nature, to the law, which is manifested through masochism, sadism, narcissism.

The neurotic, in this sense, is the “opposite” of the perverse: in place of the act, of acting, the neurotic fantasizes. Fantasize about the acts that the wicked do. Fantasy, because those are forbidden in your unconscious, they are impossible. If carried out, carelessly, they are guilty, since the law is present at all times, the law is the guiding thread of their existence. The neurotic, manifested in hysteria - who wants attention, the search - and in obsession, whose rules are act by act, is the subject of the internalized law, he is the subject that needs a supplementary symbolic, that is, the symptom., so that desire remains repressed. Repression, then, is the neurotic's defense mechanism. For him, the desire is understood from the demand. He creates the symptom, to donate it to the Other, as a retribution for the love deposited in him. He believes in the Other, while the psychotic is the Other, and the perverse gives himself to the Other, as a form of jouissance, as an object and instrument.

In the structure of this \$ , the Other remains, then, under the logical prism, as a signifier, which represents the Other, A, by *Autre* , for the signifier \$ , a signifier that remains as an unconscious mark, “[...] the mark it is original in the function of repetition”, which eventually appears as breast, gaze, voice, “[...] it is while one of the letters is absent that the others work, but which is undoubtedly , in its very lack that all the fecundity of the operation

resides" [1].

Lacan makes use of mathematical logic and, together with the Cartesian cogito, where Lacan makes fun of the use they made of this cogito, making fun of the expression *specialist*, because the modern understanding (here, modern of Modernity) took the cogito to the status of science, science called "American", dogmatic, closed, compartmentalized and not the one instituted by Descartes himself when he enunciated it, later corrected with "*dubito, ergo sum*", to think, as an operation, doubt, which leads me to the search, search for different answers to my questions, a fundamental difference from everything we see being done with the Cartesian *cogito*, even, and until now, in Post-Modernity. He thus develops, from doubt, a well-translated Cartesian *cogito*, his SEARCH FOR THE TRUTH, this truth of the \$, which is the object of study of psychoanalysis. It then develops the statute of the structuring of this \$, in its search for the truth.

Lacan says that in the presence of the symptom ("I lie"), one must pay attention because it, a symptom, is a lie that calls attention to the truth, a fundamental importance to analytic praxis, to question ourselves about what is the truth of the which "I, the truth, speak" is here: "it is the characteristic of the false to make everything true" [1]. This point of origin is between the signifier and the truth: "[...] the substitute has the effect of subsituating that to what it replaces [...]", which repressed in the unconscious comes to show itself as a metaphor for the functioning of the unconscious in the symptom [1]. In the universe of the subject's discourse there are no closures, the truth is shown, hence we say that the structure occurs as an effect of language, an effect of truth. Lacan arrives in the unfolding of the Cartesian cogito in the "I am not, I do not think", because everything that appears, moves, is of the order of the ghost, as a defense: and for lack of knowing that everything is displaced, marginal, in the perspective that each phantom what the reality of the unconscious can be. This something that we lack and that constitutes the rough edges of what we are confronted with, not by any contingency: namely, this new conjunction of being and knowledge [1].

In displacements, where "I am not, I am not", something displaced, marginal, but that represents my status of truth, my search for knowledge in order to be, to become. It is always masked in the lie that the truth emerges. In the symptom we *refuse to be*, we hide, we ask ourselves. "[...] there is a being of the self-outside the discourse", "I am", does not contain any element, it is an empty place, because the argumentative self of the "I am, I am I think" is only in argument with the Other, it is not mental functioning, but psychic functioning, a mark [1]. The interrogations of being, whose limit is the franking of the *cogito*, what comes in place is the Other, as alienation, an alienation that, in the place of the Other, is the will. "The truth of alienation is only shown in the lost part, which is none other than the *I am not*" [1]. The Other appears like this, as the place of the word.

In his Report to the Congress of Rome, held at the Istituto di Psicologia della Università di Roma, on September 26 and 27, 1953, specifically on the Field Function of Speech and Language in Psychoanalysis, Lacan begins:

In particular, it should not be forgotten that the separation into embryology, anatomy, physiology, psychology, sociology, clinic, does not exist in nature and that there is only one discipline: neurobiology to which observation forces us to add the epithet of human in what concerns us [1].

This introduction by Lacan proves to us exactly what Jakobson theorizes. Nothing distinguishes us more in the human field of our evolution than the DNA we carry, but especially language. Intrinsic language to the human, a singular and distinctive mark, "minimum signifying units, entities endowed with meaning", in Jakobson's words, and a mark that distinguishes us, since "the unconscious is structured as language".

Thus, in the Report, Lacan says:

The discourse found here deserves to be introduced by its circumstances. For he of them the mark [...]. Aulus Gélío, in his Attic Nights, gave the so-called place of *Mons Vaticanus* the etymology of *vagire*, which designates the first babbles of speech [1].

In the text "What do we learn from children who do not learn?", the different texts present multiple cases of children who arrive at the psychoanalytic clinic with learning difficulties. Especially in the text "*Writing and Sexuation*", Michele Dokhan highlights that children who do not learn "bring us a lesson not only about their subjective difficulty, but also about what they can reveal about the effects of social discourse on subjective identity" [3]. Social discourse, I get to thinking, especially which one? The discourse of the Other, the singular Other, a mother who marks the life of this being generated by her, carries her DNA, but also her linguistic mark – good or bad – that will lead him to life.

Lacan explains to us what "makes" Giacomo's learning difficult, carried by the mother's speech "unidentified neurological syndrome", mother, here, Other internalized, important and imported in the alienation of repetition, unconscious of the subject, difficulty generated in learning to be learned in the school context [3].

Lacan begins Lesson XII, telling us that "alienation is the elimination, rejection outside the threshold, ordinary elimination of the Other, the threshold in question is the one that determines the **cut** in which the essence of language consists" [1]. What cut is it? Elimination of the Other?


Language is an emanation from the field of the Other, truth for the subject. Learning problems are symptoms, symptoms that refer to the truth, which one, where is it? It refers to the field of the Other, the Other, here, always, the **mother**.

It is in the credit that the mother gives to the child, according to which the latter makes a demand, addressed to her, to the mother, that this third element is involved. And what this credit says is logically linked to the hypothesis made by the mother: the child is competent to make a demand. When he was a few days old, his mother said to him: "Are you cold? I will cover you".

At the same time that the mother assumes that the child comes out which means “cold”, she also assumes that the child asks to be warmed. It is through this stroke of force, as we proposed to name this operation, that the mother asks the child to identify what she tells him [4].

Lacan says of repetition as a *temporal place*, of what was suspended from alienation, in the unconscious, from castration, “in this privileged and exemplary way of establishing the subject that is the passage to the act” [1]. An act that refers to the act that we use, routinely, in language, sexual act, a mark that makes jouissance, in what differentiates us man/woman, a place of desire, but also an act that refers to us as the first mark of our constitution, the *sexual act* of our parents to genetically constitute us, the **primary scene**.

Lacan then follows and leads us to what makes our *sexual act sublimation, repetition of a signifier that “is there”, unconscious, the cut*, necessary for there to be a speaking subject. Cut as a significant function of castration, a mark of something that represents the fundamental lack.

Successful copulation occurs with “genital maturation”. In order for it to happen, it is necessary 

- φ CASTRATION AS FUNDAMENTAL VALUE  
a + A - φ

Castration of/in the Other, symbolic castration in/in the subject, possibility and basic premise for language.

Articulating the theoretical-clinical confrontations proposed by Bergès, we see multiple sufferings, children who arrive at the institutes with singular symptoms, from writing, from articulated language, sent by schools still unprepared to listen to their singular truths, still imprisoned (the schools) in speeches Cartesians (here dogmatic, closed, specialized) that only mask the truth even more, and distance them from solving the riddles proposed by the different symptoms. These symptoms are often, almost always, brought in this impossibility of perceiving the castration of the Other, necessary to establish any desiring status in these small beings.

S (Á) → the whole dialectic of desire is articulated there → insofar as it deepens with the interval between the utterance and the utterance.

↓  
you are not, therefore I am not → is it not language that is really the most annoying thing about love? → you are nothing but what I am

In order for us to find the truth, it is necessary that “[...] the gaze → must be sought elsewhere → in what the traveler wants to see → where he is unaware that it is what immobilizes him in his traveler’s gaze” [1].

Reading and writing pass as the meaning of learning as castra-

tion, denial of the castration of the Other. I do not learn because it would be to recognize the castration of the Other, if I learn I would recognize myself there where I “buffer” the castration of the Other.

In my theoretical-clinical confrontations, I was confronted with the drug addiction clinic, where involved subjects, lost in their sayings, bring their “truth” in not assuming the paternal name, not accepting the law? These subjects have always led me to think about the double: not assuming the paternal name, not (having?) the paternal registration NP, not respecting the social law (drugs are illegal, socially and for my body!). “The paternal role comes to temper the primitive social repression, the mother’s interdiction, primordial obligation, for its effect of opening the social bond supported by an ideal of promise” [5].

As Françoise Dolto tells us: “Castration, whether it concerns oral, anal or genital drives, consists of giving the child the means to establish the difference between the imaginary and the reality authorized by law, in the different stages mentioned” and “Our attitude concerns only this symbolic being. This is our analyst castration.” [6, 7].

But it needs to sing  
I can't just be a scream  
Hear you cry inside  
Stories from the past.  
The terrible grain they sow  
It matures from poem to poem  
The riots started

Aragon, Le Fou d'Elsa  
Read malheur dit, Paris, Gallimard, “Poésie”, 1963.

## References

1. LACAN, Jacques. *writings*. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 1992.  
\_\_\_\_\_. *The seminar; book 3: the psychoses, 1955-1956*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 1985.  
\_\_\_\_\_. *The seminar; book 4: the object relation, 1956-1957*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 1995.  
\_\_\_\_\_. *The Seminary, Book 8: The Transference, 1960-1961*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 1992.  
\_\_\_\_\_. *The Seminary, Book 14: The Logic of the Phantom, 1966-1967*. Recife: Center for Freudian Studies of Recife, 2008.
2. ŽIŽEK, Slavoj. *The parallax view*. Sao Paulo: Boitempo, 2008.
3. DOKHAN, Michele. Writing and sexuation: Giacomo or what is it to be a man/woman? In: BERGÈS, Jean; BERGÈS-BOUNES, Marika; CALMETTES-JEAN, Sandrine (org.). *What do we learn from children who don't learn?* Porto Alegre: CMC, 2008.
4. BERGES, Jean; BALBO, Gabriel. *Is there an infantile of psychosis?* Seminar 2. Porto Alegre: CMC, 2003.
5. BERGES, Jean; BERGÈS-BOUNES, Marika; CALMETTES-JEAN, Sandrine (org.). *What do we learn*

---

*from children who don't learn?* Porto Alegre: CMC, 2008.

6. DOLTO, Françoise. *Child psychoanalysis seminar*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 1985.  
\_\_\_\_\_ *Child psychoanalysis seminar: volume 2*. Rio de Janeiro: Guanabara, 1990.
7. JURANVILLE, Alain. *Lacan and philosophy*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 1987.  
\_\_\_\_\_ *Other writings*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 2003.

**Copyright:** ©2022 Vera Marta Reolon. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.