

WHEN AN INSIDE OPENS UP

Author: Gisela Avolio

Part of what is amazing about the *Freudian project* is its ethics which came back enlightened by the reading of Lacan in several of his seminars. Far from traditional moral purposes that institute the *must do* to the extent possible, psychoanalysis in turn reveals desire as an unfathomable measure, an infinite measure that plays out in psychism such where there is no good without evil, or without suffering. It also explains why hedonism fails in order to explain the mechanics of that desire. Since narcissism and ambivalence are conditions of the mechanism, the subject may find the supreme Good in malaise.

Bringing together homeostasis and pleasure, the areas that will give rise to the Ego begin to differentiate at the rhythm of their creation based on the topology of sets of that *outside* zone (Lust) the Ego will gradually “occupy” simultaneously becoming uneasy or stirred because it gradually creates that difference between purified pleasure, and the unassimilated from which the Unlust will emerge. The sculpting of this non-ego is the result of what leaves a dent in the Ego when the homeostatic functioning does not totally reabsorb the object. This is where we find the basis of what will be the hostile object, the “Thing,” Das Ding. (Sem 11)

Such uneasiness does not mean disappearance of the mechanism, all to the contrary, it is a severing or cut off which creates a surface tilted towards the *outside* where we locate the subject carrying defenses in terms of what there is *inside* (representations, affects, drives). {Sem 11}

This reversive spatial conception of psychism shows us that the Umwelt and Innenwelt have very sensitive edges, so much so it could be stated that reality is but psychic. From then on, desire and fantasy are the fabric of that reality, and the world of perception evolves from that fundamental delusion without which there would be no available attention.

In this topology of subjectivity, the first grasp of reality will become the core of the mechanism’s operation, the Nebenmensch. A Freudian formula that powerfully brings together the marginal and the similar, separation and identity.

The Ding will be the isolated element in this experience due to its foreign nature, even hostile, around which the whole journey of the subject will be organized, that is, a place of subjective direction that will constitute the first choice of a man’s relationship with reality {Sem 7} and will essentially imply rejection or non-rejection of the support from the symbolic order.

Such is the structural and structuring nature of this instance of the process which, on the other hand, enables stating that such “extimacy” {Sem 7} is not foreshadowed from the start, rather a void is shaped by walls and words themselves.

That *inside* is not before an *outside*. Not even does the outside gain existence until it contains a world of desired objects that will never be found again.

Hence, we find an identical topology in the mechanism of negation “this is an original split in the experience of reality [...] from within the subject, at the source, is taken to the first outside space” {Freud}, a split that appears in the form of “no”, under which repression essentially presents itself.

Yet again, it is possible to suspect the following logic: There is no inside-outside existence that doesn’t stem from a psychic act, i.e., the judgment of attribution and then of existence. This means that an intellectual function is required, which emerges aided by drives and enables thought to gain a first degree of independence.

“Negation as a logical operation, writes Anabel Salafia, {...} entails the affirmation of the existence of the object of which is said that *it is not what it is*. There, in *it is not what it is*, {and that} contributes to the fact that negation is an operation of admission of the repressed” {...} “That affirmation (Bejahung) correlates to the expulsion of the element identified as...non-ego {and that} is the condition for the creation of a first outside.”

When a breakdown in those constitutive times has deprived words from sculpting *per via de levare* the frontiers of a void, someone may not be able to have a place of one’s own to keep a distance from the Other with its object.

A child initiates treatment having transited the first years of his life with learning and comprehension challenges, but fundamentally harassed by the sound of thought. At first it was a diffuse noise (the child alluded to swords being sharpened) which gradually took human shape through a “call” whose acephalous voice coming from the *outside* pronounced the boy’s name as well as an unfinished phrase he heard in a foreign language.

As the treatment progressed, that “call” alternated with periods of silence, while the murmur of the characters of the games the boy imagined practiced fencing with that mysterious voice. Sometime later (perhaps a time to conclude), that phrase which was always in suspense, caught a signifier and brought a point of closure while simultaneously opening up for signification (of the phallus). The child speaks of relief when “recalling” that word and discovers that such phrase (in a foreign language) was telling him “*someone is angry with you.*”

Being only 10 years old, his journey was earmarked by the question: Why should this be that way? In no time the companions of that signifier chain came along, and he found an argument: His father’s anger at him once when he was very young. Then, the analyst intervened suggesting he think that if this punishment was no longer anonymous and was in his memory, maybe the voice of insistence did not arise from the place he had located it (*outside*).

That's when he astonishingly uttered this formulation full of logic, and which seemed to almost be a watershed of the egoic non-discrimination: "*I didn't know it came from inside my head, I thought it came from outside.*"

The phrase containing the symbol of negation "I did not think it came from inside my head" preceded that phrase which in a second moment admitted the existence of what was *not* the outside. We could equate it to the emergence of an *inside*, which the child symbolized in the signifier "head" .

Precisely there, an *inside* seemed to have opened simultaneously with an *outside*; an "extimacy" that harbored the resonance of a voice (superegoic?) that could become a memory with that same act. An *inner* voice seemingly closer to a symbolic gain (as referred to by Freud in Civilization and Its Discontents (*Das Unbehagen in der Kultur*)) than a return to the real.

We would be mistaken if we believed that analysis has closed the circle, marked the boundaries, found the last word, but we *can* assert that the Thing which makes up the ethics of psychoanalysis is already operational...

