

Extract from *Passions de l'Objet*
Études psychanalytiques de psychoses
Marcel CZERMAK

trans. Quinn FOERCH

We have discussed these questions of the incarceration of object *a*, of parentheses, of double loops, starting with the delusion of negations, passing through hypochondria and paranoia. In doing so, we have attempted to partially realize the program that Lacan proposed at the end of his "Remarks on Psychic Causality."

One of the essential points remains that, whereas in the neurotic the fall of object *a* between S_1 and S_2 gives rise to $\$$, the object *a*, through its fall, animates the chain—in the psychotic, object *a* is incarcerated in language, disorganizes it, unmooring the links of the chain and abolishing all difference, a phenomenon that fundamentally presents itself as a disturbance of language. Apparently, the body is hardly mentioned, although, in the case of the patient mentioned above, we noted hallucinations that denigrated her physical appearance, even threatening her decapitation. And on this point, I alluded to both significant decapitation and capital decapitation. However, if we refer to the problems I mentioned from the outset, we will undoubtedly have noticed this essential thread: the homogeneity, or even the strict isomorphism, of the consequences of the disorganization of language—in the cases considered—with that of the body in hypochondria, paranoia, and delusions of negation.

These are fundamentally forms of *lalangue* hypochondria that we have encountered. Every linguistic disturbance has its spatial, bodily, and temporal consequences, which are homogeneous with it. If the unconscious is structured like a language, the same is true of space, the body, and time.

Certain clinical formulations show us—in an accentuated way—the linguistic aspect of the equation, others the bodily, spatial, and temporal aspects. All present, to varying degrees, the entirety of these disturbances, but

353

with a different relief and proportion. All are endless pregnancies of that with which *lalangue* is pregnant in the context of psychosis: the object *a*.

Without language, there is no body. To the point where, from a human perspective, we might wonder whether animals possess a body, given that for man, the body is fundamentally the apparatus of language. For us, *lalangue* is an autonomous body to which everything else is subordinate.

Furthermore, we must bear in mind that even if a discourse—such as one of the four Lacan sought to formalize—is articulated around what it has spat out (or is attempting to spit out), it never fully succeeds in doing so. It is never entirely free or detached from that object; a residue

always remains—if I may use the expression—that sits heavily on its stomach, compelling it to repeat—iteratively—its act of cutting.

Expulsion is a mechanism that is never completed and never leaves us entirely at peace.

It is perhaps here that we can find the reasons for the current proliferation of racism and religious wars. I return to this point because it is vital to me that our discipline harbor ambitions beyond the purely therapeutic or medical; otherwise, the discipline itself risks evaporating. We must be able to grasp clinical problems and social problems within one and the same perspective, approach, and stride.

Yet, our work shows us this: the mechanisms of hatred, of grievance, and of racism—directed at the Other, at the body and what dwells within it, and at territory (be it a book—a territory one ingests and devours, yet inhabits)—these mechanisms will continue to proliferate as long as we imagine we can construct discourses that are thoroughly purified and clear-cut, having successfully ejected the object.

The more we seek to rid ourselves of it—even through a discourse like that of science, which excludes the perspective of the calculating subject and standardizes its object by leaving out any consideration of the object *a*—the more it will return:

354

one hears the long lament of the purified subject—as well as that of the object which fails to divide the subject, yet with which the subject is identified and by which it is consumed. This lament will always center on the Other of incarceration we have discussed at length: a reiteration, on a global and political scale, of that which is excluded from the Symbolic and returns in the Real. In short, a planetary hypochondria, holding up a mirror to the nuclear fission of this immense, unified subject.

The relentless expansion of the discourse of science gives rise to discourses that are equally absolute in their relationship to the object: the more we seek—through discursive procedures—to be done with this cumbersome object (an ideal science strives to achieve), the more we normalize, through their feedback effects, the repercussions of the object's presence and the ways it is rendered positive within the Real.

Consequently, the object will play an increasingly disruptive role in human life—perhaps to the point where no discourse remains capable of spewing it out. In a world devoid of symbolic cuts, actual ruptures and disorganizations will proliferate—as seen in the case of our recent patient—cuts repeated endlessly, yet yielding no results other than disturbances, excisions, and murders.

We have seen enough examples of this, whether in Nazism or in the wars currently ravaging the globe.

These facts confront us with the necessity of a wisdom we ought to possess—including a political wisdom—that would declare: the object *as such* is inaccessible, even as advertising and scientific advances dangle it before us with a promise that inflames insatiable tensions. One can always attempt to spew out the Name-of-the-Father, given that this is precisely what humanity suffers from by virtue of its very humanity. The trouble is that it comes back to haunt you in the form of rigid, entrenched organizations and societies.

As for psychoanalytic discourse—which also standardizes the object—might it not also be implicated in what it denounces?

But we started with that extraordinary question: what is the human body? What goes on within it? Our freedom rests solely

355

on this infinitesimal step, as narrow as the edge of the double loop that constitutes the subject—alienated within the signifier. It is as well to know this.

Supplementary note: after all, I have merely spoken of what might be called the *phanerosis* of the object *a* in language—a topic that would lead me to discuss the rise of phenomena of exclusion and segregation across the globe.

I have upset certain friends who saw an overreach in the way I moved from clinical practice to discussing these broader issues. I, too, am struck—but by the clinical facts; it is these that seem to me to cut the deepest. Once that hurdle is cleared, the rest seems to follow naturally.

Clinical practice is not a matter of sentiment, nor does it concern what suits us or not. It is a matter of formalism: how to find one's way within the structure—that is to say, the Unconscious. It acts as an obligation placed upon us—an obligation coupled with the one requiring us, as analysts, to meet the subjectivity of our era at its horizon (*Écrits*, p. 328). Thus, we ought to ask ourselves against what backdrop our work is woven. Answering this might allow us to break free from the timelessness in which the psychoanalytic movement has settled—a state resulting from its own capture by the object. This is enough to provoke anxiety—the anxiety of Cotard's immortal life, with all the consequences we have examined.

Perhaps we need a modern-day La Boétie to address the modern forms of voluntary servitude—especially given that psychoanalysts act just like everyone else, endlessly chewing the same cud while glancing occasionally at their cows, all under the pretext that everyone is better off sticking to their own field. One forgets, then, that by identifying with one's cows, one risks following them to the slaughterhouse one day.

356