



## About gadgets and other entertainments.

Alexander Cruz Aponasenko

Received: December 2012 – Accepted: April 2013

Member of the Psychoanalytical research team of C.S.M. No. 1 "Dr. Hugo Rosarios".

✉: [alickruz@gmail.com](mailto:alickruz@gmail.com)

unconscious?

Lacan said that Joyce was unsubscribed from the unconscious. In this case locating as a noun all those that were so forcefully pointed out as an adjective. What does imply unsubscribe from the unconscious?

Moreover, what is even unsubscribe from something? Is it the same as separated? Is it the same as des-understood? Lacan said that idea while reading Joyce as if twenty-third seminar. Do they not realize the Unconscious? If the latter would have to say that most people at the time are unsubscribed. It's the time of de-fertilizer. Apart from the psychoanalysts, who cares anyway the

The Unconscious is established without the appearance of no object. You can follow Freud and Lacan on this path and arrive at the idea that there is a necessary unconscious object function. Taken or not, locate the status of the object, at fault, cause, desire, lost, etc., It is impossible to think or not being paid to something. Well in general that what one is paid is directly related to the object. If at the end we paid a kind of psychic apparatus, the psychic apparatus which houses the only fantasy comes to be constituted from certain operations founding, mention castration, which are mostly on property transactions. An object to achieve its quality must always be rediscovered, ie previously lost and you will be staying in the place of a supposed original loss, the place that once occupies *das Ding*.

If we thought that the terms used both Freud and Lacan have any reason to be, that is, they are not naive, we might ask whether there is any relationship between des-paid and object. In a slightly more careful reading of the pair Subscribe / Unsubscribe find that the two terms come from Latin bonus, good. And its definition in the dictionary of the RAE him as "credit", "described as good," "give something certain and sure", "enroll someone to enjoy something." This last meaning is particularly interesting. For it is what we believe happens by castration. The point at which the lost enjoyment is a brand, the subject can go there to retrieve it by other means, through psychic apparatus. In other words, one is paid a certain way to enjoy. In any case the effect of hole, call it, gap, is logically necessary to hold the object.

One could blame Descartes have opened the field to technoscience from his cogito. In proposing the radical separation of self and the soma led today to set scientific thought as we know it. An object can be seen, studied completely from the outside, objectively. Descartes however, stood aloof from the cogito point, the place reserved for God in their reflection. However, not satisfied with Descartes, technoscience has made other use of the Cartesian cogito. Stripping of unknowable Cartesian point value has positioned there a "surplus-imitation enjoy" giving impetus to the booming market forces. In various contexts is called gadget.

1588

These great inventions of modernity go to the place that would serve just as empty loop point with another necessitating passage by the Other, plugging loop circuitry. Issue that has been reported earlier by several authors of a sphere not entirely alien to psychoanalysis, particularly by one Phillip K. Dick. In his book "*Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep?*" (1967), made into a film by Ridley Scott titled "*Blade Runner*" Dick has a very interesting gadget called "*Penfield Mood Organ*". It is a device that everyone carries around his waist, has a knob to be programmed and works as an administrator of emotions can graduate the intensity level you want at particular moments. For example, today I want to feel cheerful all day, so programming the *Penfield*, or want to 4pm assails me a nostalgic but I will not get to the point of tears, then a couple of turns *Penfield* further. This device must be started from, as usual in the literature of science fiction, a big war that wiped out a significant number of the world's population, generating, and this is something we think is fascinating vision Dick: loneliness.

Today we know that there is a need for mass annihilation of human bodies to produce loneliness. That is rather the effect of the manner in which the subjects that make societies are linked to each other and especially how they are linked to the object.

The truth is that the reason why the *Penfield* begins to be used is described in the book in a very poetic way the effect of those huge buildings, countless empty now, where never is heard absolutely nothing, not even the noise of the world, since animals also disappeared almost completely loneliness appears as a force, as a matter aggressive and harassing, unbearable. In that place be inserted the *Penfield*. The gadget is "company". Dick named "organ of mind" by having the subject completely vanish in the signals that the device sends electrically to a body whose owner has been almost severed in its relationship with the other. While the work of Dick proposes an argument for another line evolves, this point is particularly interests us.

Described by Dick Humanity has come almost to a state of fusion with this gadget, to the point of ignoring his own emotions leaving them to *Penfield*, that curious organ. Is not this a des-paid? If the suffering is scheduled, what place is left for the responsibility? What place for the symptom?

Al symptom can understand in several ways, as a sign-post, as something that does not need anyone and enjoys alone as surrogate sexual satisfaction, as that which surprises, as the highest singularity, incurable, and even as something to be silenced, a nuisance vain.

It may not be amiss to say that while psychoanalysis has separate medical conception of the symptom, say the traditional conception of the symptom, surely modern medicine House takes it a little more seriously. The symptom as a message will have been the first hypothesis on which Freud worked in the beginning of psychoanalysis. But very early on and could be read in such withering insights of Freud, the presence of something beyond the sign. Or in any case only serves the sign. The definition of "sexual satisfaction replacement" is perhaps the most fruitful that we find at the time. So much so that a sick way sexuality is a "surrogate" to meet ... what? There will necessarily be the drive.

Freud was very clear to point it out and of course Lacan Freud never contradicted in this regard: the drive is always satisfied, before any obstacle a rodeo is always possible and the drive is something that just enjoys rodeos. Lacan said more cryptic but equally blunt: "it has" and elsewhere "the symptom is sufficient unto itself."

Thus, there is autism, not just that of *Temple Grandin*, an autism itself but if the drive satisfaction. It is that which can not fail to be. As Borges responded well on occasion when he was asked: Why do you write? To which I replied, "because I can not write." The inability to drive satisfaction is not.

And that's not to No, the other spare. But the object is needed. The other is a matter of desire, the other works when a cause is in operation, if not, is simply a persecutor. The object however is contingent. Real Lacan proposes it as a time of work can not be otherwise. Then face of the Thing. In any case, around the drive spinning object.

Now, if anything makes the Thing's face then a candidate for the drive. The drive is attached to a functional object as long as the object appear as inaccessible, which gives reason to hope that dike appears as the drive. So, being a speaker wishes to defend the drive attached to an object to be missing, is face. Drive satisfaction is obtained by this route. The desire dignifies the subject and pass the object, it does become more than a simple device drives, more than pure enjoyment. Desire makes the subject is more than just "crawl in the mud" to quote Marcelo Barros. That is the enjoyment. The enjoyment, the drive passed in the body, the desire goes elsewhere. In another scene. Another scene that is precisely the result of that is happening in the body, which serves as its opposite.

So things raised, how modernity impacts of this dynamic?

If we fairly Object designated place can say a couple of things. In a time when proliferating objects as faces, the result can only be an offer for subjects maddening. This madness is evident at both the desire and the drive level. At the level of desire in any case something is always missing. Inserting objects in the field of the subject, rather than quell the desire only shows that more and more missing objects thus pushing the desire to unlimited power. Ultradésirable. A level of drive the issue is more complex and perhaps more serious. As the object faces say too much enjoyment can be anywhere. That the alleged satisfaction can come from virtually anywhere or be anywhere, which is no different to wallow in that "everything" that is the mud. The drive has gone mad. The object no longer serves as a brake on the drive because at every moment is revealed as face. Each time the object is displayed as disposable, changeable face reveals his status, which maddens the drive no longer serves as anchor. The object set stabilizes the drive, is a circuit loss and recovery of enjoyment that makes this libidinal economy is maintained, say, stable. In this circuit we call stable symptoms, and is perhaps the greatest achievement of neurosis. Stabilize the drive, locate and enable satisfaction into certain channels. This is the beginning of what Freud called alternative sexual satisfaction.

When the object does not support, when it is revealed as face and the veil of fantasy can not cover it, the logical consequence is the relocation of the drive circuit. We see it every day. The push to consumerism, the pursuit of objects is simply lure the effect of policies that we call consumer society. The market has been detected that can set up and manage to some extent "that pushes the subject." Via an alleged arousal of desire through advertising, what has been achieved is the last dam to release the drive, the desire itself. Acquire, consume, appear as the largest categorical imperative, enjoy! Shouts the market that takes the shape of a new superego. The new tyrant, the new master. Consume!

That gadget you mentioned earlier appears as the device that makes it possible to do that sort of sleight of hand over the object. If one voice can be everywhere, the thick Wall-E had them look at their screens and *Penfield*, well, all I can say body. Techno-science tells subjects through the gadgets they feel more accompanied. The subjective level effect is precisely the opposite. Some anxiety begins to creep, to appear not to know where, do not know what signal. Maybe those things to which you connect, these "foreign bodies". Because in reality it is the subject which is connected to the gadget and not vice versa. Goodbye to the symptom.

Entertainment is the result of that connection. Curling is to highlight autism itself. Escape the Other. Connect to a semblance labile weak. Put at risk. Suspend the act. Nothing better for the market economy subject entertaining, always planted in consumer position. Small enjoyers.

Following a logic that is extracted from the above, psychoanalysis since its inception has been raised as a practice on the side of the logic of consumption. Outside this range. A psychoanalyst knows that does not offer a service that does not sell, rent or lease. Performs a praxis, an experience. Asks a subject connected to something else, something with no guarantees, the unconscious.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (1) Dick, P. (2008) *Blade Runner*. ¿Sueñan los androides con ovejas eléctricas? Edhasa. Barcelona
- (2) Freud, S. (2003) *Lo inconsciente*. Obras Completas. Biblioteca Nueva. España.
- (3) Lacan, J. (1998) *Seminario 4. La relación de objeto*. Paidós. Buenos Aires.
- (4) Lacan, J. (2006) *Seminario 10. La angustia*. Paidós. Buenos Aires.
- (5) Lacan, J. (1992) *Seminario 14. La lógica del fantasma*. Versión no oficial. Escuela Freudiana de Buenos Aires.
- (6) Lacan, J. (2003) *Seminario 17. El reverso del psicoanálisis*. Paidós. Buenos Aires.
- (7) Lacan, J. (2002) *Seminario 23. El sinthome*. Paidós. Buenos Aires.