

THE NEUROSCIENCES? or A NEUROTIC SCIENCE?

With the emergence of then light men, mechanistic materialism emerged, called to banish religious ideas in order to place nature and man at the center of the scene. These ideas are supported in the 18th century book of the French physician and philosopher Julien Offray de La Mettrie, "The machine man" (1747). At the end of the 19th century, European cultural circles were moved by the strong impact caused by the discovery of the neuron by Ramón y Cajal. More contemporarily, Pierre Changeux's book "The neuronal man" (1983) sought to relate the human sciences with a biological vision of man, centered on neurosciences. In his book he seeks, unilaterally, to find neurons scientific explanations for human issues.

Everything is explained by neural activity. In this line it is easy to assume psychosis as hereditary. Like other mental disorders: the root cause is located exclusively at a genetic level. From the genome to the astronomical complexity of the brain, everything would ultimately be controlled by the neurological organization. Starting in the 1970s, the development of the so-called "neurosciences" gave rise to the advancement of neurology on the study of the functions of a wide range of neuro receptors placing the accent, among others, on dopamine, serotonin and acetylcholine. We do not deny these discoveries but the body that we refer to as psychoanalysts is the erogenous body outlined by an act of speech that bathes the subject with signifiers that they make that body a space of pleasure, joy or suffering. The question that summons us today is: where does psychoanalysis stand upon the hegemonic advance of neurosciences. In another way: How is the speaker thought to be the effect of an act of speech? What is the position of the analyst before the clearly biologist approach of the so-called neurosciences presented as the only way to be able to give an affirmative answer to the existential enigmas? Our bet is ethical and our desire is not to back down in the face of denialism. In different universities of psychology, cognitivists, supported by neurosciences, have narrowed ranks, harshly attacking the presence of psychoanalysis in their cloisters. Not only do they reject its invention as "unscientific" but they also question its theoretical corpus for considering it a form of obsolete thought. In other cases they seek to

encompass it by appealing to Freud's former neurologist character, "forgetting" that it was what he moved away from very quickly. The irreverent figure for "Science" continues to be hysteria. This has questioned medical knowledge by showing that the localities of the disease in her body do not respond to the paths of anatomy. Wherever he spoke through the body, he enigmatically questioned the anatomists. In this capricious, actually unconscious way, hysteria opens questions that science cannot discern. These "whims" were heard by Freud, giving rise to the emergence of the word. Also in pursuit of the important knowledge achieved, neurology begins to expand in a field of study initially covered under psychiatry, giving its opinion on the descriptions of classical nosology, pointing out that they can only be explained by chemical modifications of various kinds that occur in neuro receptors. Not only do they focus on the study of biochemical alterations at the brain level, but all behaviour could be explained by molecular biology as a consequence of failures in metabolism and neuronal regulation. Obviously the concept of the unconscious was foreclosed in his descriptions. This overwhelming position of the neurosciences is supported by the deployment of cognitive-behavioural psychologies as ways of achieving, with a normative operating scheme, action guide lines that modify incorrect behaviours. These behavioral plans, in the best neo-behavioral way, seek to achieve the "formatting" of that information incorrectly stored in the brain that disturbs the subject's interaction with the environment to incorporate other modes of behavior that restore cerebral homeostasis. Despite the management of techniques based on suggestion, which seek to seduce and "order" to achieve positive results, failure appears when the subject reveals himself to that behavioural approach that ends up being an enslaving way of controlling his actions. "Discomfort in culture" continues to be present in different ways despite "scientific" advances where it seems that the achievements of technology allow us to enjoy greater comfort. Neurosciences are offered as modern responses that can put a stop to the existential anguish of the subject since this is explained as a product of hormonal and chemical alterations, possible to be fixed by means of prescribing adequate drugs. If the "failure" in the information is given by the genotype, it is possible to act on the phenotype. When this is

not possible on its own, they complement it with the collaboration of cognitive-behavioral psychologists willing to adapt the subject to the demands of the environment through an important array of behavioural tips. Patients are subjected to the supposed knowledge of a science that aspires, in its neurotic illusion, to have quick behavior protocols for everything that deviates from the norm. What difference is there with the recruiters of suffering souls who in various ways offer the comfort of a religious path in which to trust to find peace and resolution to their conflicts? The religious seek to convince the subject that there is already a path traced "By the Lord" and they must accept the so-called "Plan of God" with the promise of "another life full of consolations". Freud points out "The roots of this power are, at least in part, in an inclination of human beings towards credulity and miraculousness, to flee from the monotony of the laws of thought and the examination of reality and to take refuge in pleasure and the seductions of the meaningless" (1933: P.31). They remain subdued, slaves to what, at the same time, reassures them. Some religious "preachers" go so far as to promise the solution to serious illnesses that they say they can cure if they approach the temple they promote "with faith". They are shown to be superior to medical discourse, the effects of said neurotic aspiration fall rapidly because castration operates as a limit for every subject. However, in this paragraph, as Lacan said, religions might have better future successes than psychoanalysis as they offer the idea of an "eternal" salvation. So: What is up to us regarding the future of psychoanalysis? Being clear that both Freud and Lacan deny that it is a worldview "Psychoanalysis is neither a Weltanschauung nor a philosophy that claims to give the key to the universe. It is governed by a particular objective, historically defined by the elaboration of the notion of subject. It raises this notion in a new way, leading the subject to its signifying dependency." (Lacan 1964. P. 85). If the subject is constituted from the operation of the lack by an act of discourse, the neurosciences, with all their apology for neurotransmitters, they seek to complete the lack by appealing to explanations that try to bring "scientific" tranquillity to the limit of reality. It is a neurotic illusion to want to find the efficient cause and find all the answers in the biochemical relationships of the brain when variants can be produced according to the discourse that goes through the subject. A

sort of poetic ghost waiting for men to find the eighth day that will allow them to answer all the enigmas. Not backing down from reality does not imply placing oneself in a mystical position. It is about sustaining our practice regulated by the ethical act in the direction of the cure. We don't have to answer to foolish ears. Or in Lacan's words "...psychoanalysis must be taken seriously, even if it is not a science...the annoying thing is that it is not a science because it is irrefutable. It is a practice." (S. XXV 11/15/1977). As Don Quixote said: "If the dogs bark..."

Bibliographic references

Changeux, P. (1983) *El hombre máquina* Boletín de la Sociedad Mexicana de Historia y Filosofía de la Medicina . 2009.

Freud, S. (1895) *Proyecto de una psicología para neurólogos*. (1950 [1895]) Amorrortu Editores. Volumen 1. Buenos Aires. 1982.

Freud, S. (1930) *El malestar en la cultura* (1930 [1895]) Amorrortu Editores. Volumen 21. Buenos Aires. 1979.

Freud, S. (1933) *30ª Conferencia. Sueño y ocultismo*. Amorrortu Editores. Volumen 22. Buenos Aires. 1979.

Lacan, J. (1953) *Función y campo de la palabra y el lenguaje*. Lectura estructuralista de Freud. Siglo XXI Editores. México DF. 1971.

Lacan, J. (1964) Seminario 11 *Los cuatro conceptos fundamentales en psicoanálisis*. Editorial Paidós. Bs. As. Argentina. 1987.

Lacan, J. (1977) Seminario 24 *L Insu...* Versión inédita. Clase del 15/03/77

Lacan, J. (1977) Seminario 25 *El momento de concluir*. Versión inédita. Clase del 15/11/77

La Mettrie, J.O. (1747) *El hombre máquina*. Cambridge University Press de La Mettrie, *Machine man and other writings* (Thomson, trad.). (Hardback version transferred to digital print. edition). 2003.

