




# Diálogos


ISSN 2177-2940



## From the erotics of liberation to the Transference syndrome

 <https://doi.org/10.4025/dialogos.v28i3.74071>

Gabriel Herrera Salazar

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9598-6412>

Instituto Politécnico Nacional (IPN). Ciudad de México-CDMX, MX

E-mail: gabofritz08@hotmail.com

### From the erotics of liberation to the Transference syndrome

**Abstract:** The anti-Oedipal theory of liberation erotica proposes a new and alternative family model. It is about overcoming the macho Totality to the realm of Otherness; Narcissism is the denial of Otherness and the totalization of the “I”, mental illness: the abnormal. From this criticism we can base the Transference syndrome that becomes a consequence or product of fetishization, sacralization of the ego (as an ontological foundation) that virtually transfers its pathology to Otherness, denying it. Transference syndrome is a psychotic illness that occurs or is a consequence of the modern neurotic ego.

**Key words:** erotic, anti-oedipus, otherness, syndrome, transference, pathology.

### De la erótica de la liberación al síndrome de Transferencia

**Resumen:** La teoría del antiedipo de la erótica de la liberación plantea un nuevo y alternativo modelo de familia. Se trata de la superación de la Totalidad machista al ámbito de la Alteridad; el narcisismo es la negación de la Alteridad y la totalización del “yo”, enfermedad mental: lo anormal. De esta crítica podemos fundamentar el síndrome de Transferencia que deviene consecuencia o producto de la fetichización, sacralización del ego (como fundamento ontológico) que transfiere virtualmente su patología a la Alteridad, negándola. El síndrome de Transferencia es una enfermedad psicótica que se produce o es consecuencia del neurótico ego moderno.

**Palabras clave:** erótica, antiedipo, alteridad, síndrome, transferencia, patología.

### Da erótica da libertação à síndrome de transferência

**Resumo:** A teoria antiedipiana da libertação erótica propõe um modelo de família novo e alternativo. Trata-se de superar a Totalidade machista para o reino da Alteridade; O narcisismo é a negação da alteridade e a totalização do “eu”, a doença mental: o anormal. A partir desta crítica podemos basear a síndrome transferencial que se torna consequência ou produto da fetichização, sacralização do ego (como fundamento ontológico) que transfere virtualmente sua patologia para a Alteridade, negando-a. A síndrome de transferência é uma doença psicótica que ocorre ou é consequência do ego neurótico moderno.

**Palavras-chave:** erótico, anti-édipo, alteridade, síndrome, transferência, patologia.

Recebido em: 04/10/2024

Aprovado em: 04/12/2024

This short essay is divided into four sections, the first is based on the erotics of the Philosophy of Liberation, with which the anit-oedipal critique that places the problematic of the family beyond psychoanalysis and antipsychiatry is postulated. In the second section, cultural elements of the civilizations Abya Yala are shown that make up subjectivity in a non-Western way and therefore disengage from the model of the Western Oedipal myth.

In the third part, narcissism as a mental illness is used at a social level, where cultural relativism evidences the secularization of hegemonic narratives, which are placed in crisis by cultural distinctions. Delimited within the framework of globalization, cultural relativism causes difficulties in understanding citizen rights in the dialogue of the intersubjective relationship, between local groups and the modern nation-state and the global interstate relationship. To advance in an intersubjective and intercultural dialogue, it is necessary to have an interpretation that allows us to comprehend the minimum of Alterity, the other culture, for this reason the basic conditions necessary to engage in a dialogue with a claim to honesty are analyzed. This section tries to take a step towards the interiority of subjectivity to radicalize relativism and reveal its pathological side that prevents dialogue and thereby creates intersubjective isolation, non-consensus.

In our analysis, the necessary conditions for an intercultural dialogue are: human life as a transcultural material criterion, the sensitivity of the senses to interpret the presence of Alterity and the wise silence to understand the reason of the other and to be able to establish an intersubjective dialogue or democratic discursive consensus. Intercultural dialogue is impossible if the pathological "I" of the egocentric culture that kills and destroys the cultural distinction of Alterity is not overcome; the last part goes on to argue in favor of citizenship from a cultural or ethnocultural perspective, which coexists analogously to the civic citizenship of the nation-state. Dialogue, and intersubjective and intercultural negotiation are necessary for subordinate groups, since they suffer to a greater extent from the homogeneity of civil rights that have the paradox of unifying and ending cultural distinction via a dominant culture that is imposed through of violence and exclusion.

In the fourth section, by way of conclusion, what we have called the Transference syndrome—a narcissistic pathology that consists of an unconscious reflecting of the negative of the self upon the Other, Alterity—is delimited and defined,

### **1.- The anti-Oedipus of the erotics of liberation**

The erotics developed in the Philosophy of Liberation thinks about the meta-physical face-to-face relationship between a man and a woman, privileging the heterosexual relationship due to its procreative capacity: the fecundity of the child. The woman is going to be placed in the position of the dominated of the erotic totality of machismo, theoretically systematized by Sigmund Freud. The

erotics of liberation is a going beyond the totalized family founded on the capitalist European experience; in the formula of the anti-psychiatrist David Cooper, what this is about is “the death of the family”. In other words, it is necessary to go beyond the sexist interpretation of psychoanalysis, and even of anti-psychiatry, since the intent is to analyze erotics with new categories and transontologically go towards another way of being in the family.

To take Alterity as an object of sexual need is to deny the Other in an erotic relationship, it is to deny their human dignity. It is a matter of moving past the sexist Totality to a space of Alterity; narcissism is the denial of Alterity and the totalization of the "I" is mental illness: the abnormal. In the logic of Alterity, the meta-physical drive of the Other than oneself, is the radical desire for love-of-justice and its realization, coitus. The above leads us to trace anti-oedipal theory in an original way and with a different form than the French theorists Deleuze and Guattari. The anti-oedipal theory of the erotics of liberation proposes a new and alternative family model; this schema will serve as the basis for other face-to-face metaphysical relationships at other concrete levels such as the pedagogical, political, economic or archaeological.

If for the “erotics of the Totality” human perfection is asexual and every phallic act is necessarily death of the father or son and incest, on the contrary, the “erotics of Alterity” proposes human fulfillment and perfection in sexuality. Sexuality is a constitutive moment of ethical perfection and its exercise in justice is liberatory obliging righteousness. The Other, the woman for the man, the man for the woman, the son for the couple, does not come to intervene, nor sadistically negate the father or commit incest with the mother, nor does he masochistically experience himself as castrated. The Other, on the contrary, is the realm of Exteriority that allows the full expansion and unfolding of sexuality as a meta-physical or “alterating drive”. [...] perfection is total penetration in dis-tinction, the negation of the alienating totalization [...] the personalization of the relationship in the always new and other *countenance* of the woman, the man and the child as their creation. Oedipal or Freudian ontology affirm the contradiction without overcoming it: they move tragically within the totality without the possibility of going beyond it. The meta-physics of Alterity affirms instead the exteriority of the Other sexed distinctly. (DUSSEL, 1977, p. 107)

In the erotics of liberation when fulfilling the dis-tinct desire of Alterity in the full sexual fulfillment or love of justice of the couple, the dialectical passage is opened to new practical fields such as economics—the human-nature relationship. The arrival of the child in procreation relaunches the “alterating drive” denying the possibility of a narcissistic autoeroticism or the totalization of the couple fulfilled in gratuitous erotic service. The son/daughter emerges from the erotic home to become an adult of the political society, formed by the pedagogical for future erotic and productive life.

The schema of the anti-oedipal family of the erotics of liberation is taken as the original

founding structure of all practical field; in the political field, the place of the father will be analectically occupied by the State, that of the mother by culture, and that of the son/daughter by the people. If the State violently dominates culture and culture in turn extends this to the people, then the pedagogy is one of domination; thus, the phallocracy of the father, analogous to the imperial State, produces the uxoricide of the culture (mother) and the filicide of the people (son or daughter).

In Freud's psychoanalytic hermeneutics of the Oedipal family, the father hates the son for coming between him and the mother. Cultural domination explained by the tragedy of the Western Oedipal complex is intended to be universal, however, it is hardly so in other cultures outside the West. The erotics of liberation implicitly and explicitly deny the Freudian Oedipal family model, questioning its universal validity.

If, on the other hand, the father satisfies the mother as man-woman, for which the woman must have liberated herself (having reached in the face-to-face the fullness of the historical orgasm), the woman does not totalize the son. In this case, the father appears to the mammary-buccal bipolarity (mother-son/daughter) as Exteriority, as the Other, as the *poor person* who questions from beyond the principle of totalization: he implores as teacher, as prophet that shows the future path and that calls to the "vocation" of alterity. [...] In the same way, if the new, social, post-industrial and democratic State, the liberator, fulfills the project of the oppressed people, satisfies it in real social justice, popular culture will not totalize the people as an opposite principle to the coercive, repressive or conductive institutions of the State. On the contrary, it would be the institution that would serve so the people to grow in what they have received, in what they are: their own dis-tinct culture. (DUSSEL, 1977, p. 150)

## 2.- The mythical-ontological nucleus of the family structure of native peoples of Abya Yala. Beyond the Western Oedipal Myth

The cultures of Abya Yala (Our America), from Alaska to Tierra del Fuego, systematized reflection on speculative thought by creating symbols, images, concepts, categories and words, with which to explain the creation of humanity, the world and the cosmos. All the cultures of the Abya Yala continent are based on the principle of complementarity, understood not as a dual negation but as a complementarity of life, not in struggle but in perfect harmony; Paradoxically, complementarity is the first and irrevocable unit.

Everything starts from a virtual community of beings, who decide to participate in a communal assembly (which we will call: *nosotric community*), they agree on the best reasons through dialogues, reach agreements after listening to all the arguments and deliberate on irrefutable motives: the *creation* of life on the in-between Earth is necessary.

The *complementary unit* of the couple is the perfect balance, justice; they are the twins of all

the cultures of Abya Yala, they will live and die deservedly as they go through very serious and dramatic adventures until they become the *essence* of all beings in the cosmos, the spirit-of-everywhere. The divine twins represent *totality* and *exteriority*, the One and the Other, the ego and the alter ego, the "you" and the "I", the "heavy corporality" and the "light" of *being*, the *ch'ulel* and the *nawalito*. López Austin indicates: "There was no absolute polarity between good and evil because everything had a reason for being in relation to its complement: life would lead to previous death. The complements alternated indefinitely: thus night and day; thus, the rainy and dry seasons, each phase governed by a god who was its essence" (LOPEZ, 2001, p. 250).

In a discontinuous place or non-place prior to the original structure, that is, at a zero point where the ineffable permanent is silently located, it is not a level because it is prior to any structure, it is there where the ancestors live and live in marriage ("great-grandparents"), these have no form because no one can see them, from their loving embrace arises *creative complementarity*: Ometeotl, Alom-Qaholom or Tocado-Imaymana Viracocha (great-grandparents). In the high cultures of Abya Yala, the source from which *being* emanates is *creative complementarity*, a couple of sacred beings, grandparents. Before the *being* of the entities is the *nosometric community* that *creates being*.

So, at the highest level of the pyramidal structure of the Sacred is the creative couple (great-grandparents), who are represented as elders: the first grandmother and the first grandfather are symbolically the moon and the sun; in the *Popol Vuh* these first grandparents, in turn, become the first parents Hun-Hunahpú and Ixquic who beget the twins Hunahpú and Xbalanqué—in the final death before the birth of the human species, these brothers materialize in the ear of corn and later in the sun and moon, respectively.

On a second level we find the children of these great-grandparents, it is a second generation where fire, wind, rain and earth are placed. The grandparents and the four transcendental forces, together with their wives, met in a communal assembly, all of them forming the Heart of Heaven and the Heart of the Earth. After presenting and listening to reasons, they reached a reasoned consensus: they decided to become human life, in the production process they materialize their *being* in the corn plant. After turning the grains of corn to dough, the *being* of the *nosotric community* of creators was introduced as *essence* in the dough, used to endow the first human couple (third generation), the parents, with flesh: the true man and woman—from these the fourth generation is produced, the common origin of all the human families of Abya Yala. For this reason, humans (fourth level) carry in our flesh genetic information from the *nosotric community* of mythical parents and grandparents.

On the third level are placed the "children of the *nosotric community* of creators" which are the *worldly entities* (among them the first human couple). The first beings above the in-between

world were *created* before the *anthropological entity*, these beings inhabit the Earth—in other words: animals, plants and stones. The youngest brother is the human species. Corn was the raw material with which the flesh of the human body was created, the dough of the grains of the cob contain the *essence* or genetic information of the heritage of the *nosotric community* of creators.

The earth (mother) and the corn (child) are material manifestations of the feminine part of *being* because in the ontological construction of the cultural world of Abya Yala, the feminine part or mother goddess of the *creative complementarity* shares the same essence with the earth and corn. However, "the feminine" among the creators is not separated as differentiated individual entities because the different are complementary, they are an indivisible complementary unit. In this way, the feminine part of *creative complementarity*, materialized as earth and corn, are two quantifiable determinations of the *feminine mystery* of the *infinite complementarity* of the *absolutely Other* or *complementarity-of-all-parts*.

In each calendrical cycle the *being* of the entities is manifested in different ways, it is presented with a different face because in each agricultural cycle there is a qualitative and quantitative transformation of *being*. For the Mayans, as for other cultures of the continent, corn is a sacred being whose content has a double quality inherited from the *infinite complementarity* of the creators: on the one hand, it is a *meta-physical entity* from where the flesh of humanity is *created*; and on the other hand, it is concrete matter, sacred nourishment for the human species. Said food has the hidden face of the mother or goddess who gives life: Tonantzin, Ixchel, Pachamama.

Just as the spermatozoa travel a long way with adventurousness, effort and struggle until they reach the ovule, and the ovule, due to its quality of reception, wisely chooses the spermatozoon that is most compatible with its nature and subsumes it inside where it exchanges genetic information, so also when the *nosotric community* of creators organizes itself, it creates the right conditions for the cultivation of the corn plant to grow inside the Earth or mother, which feeds and protects the embryo until it is born.

In this way, it is in the corn plant where the *will* of the Sacred dwells, or in other words, the *desire* of life. In the plant, the "genetic information" of the *essence* of the *nosotric community* of creators is materialized in the same way, which is why the communal organization represents what is always *a priori* of subjectivity.

In the case of the cultures of Abya Yala, the principle of rational explanation is not reduced to the tautological One, but to a virtual community of intersubjective communication where the feminine and masculine genders, the Two, participate symmetrically. For us, the idea of a *being* that creates itself is rationally inconceivable, since otherness, the other, *infinite complementarity* is always necessary. In the cultures of Abya Yala, the principle of everything is not the passive,

tautological and immutable One of Western cultures. For us, *infinite complementarity* has as its irreducible principle the minimal or irreducible participation of what is revealed as Two and, paradoxically, as an indivisible unity, multipliable and therefore always in infinite creative movement.

In Abya Yala, corn is the sacred material and ontological manifestation of the infinite love of the *nosotric community* of creators, which they give to humans; corn is “meat” with which we human beings feed ourselves in a real way. Corn is given to humans in exchange for the sacrifice and the deserved effort of the mythical sacred twins to fight and be reborn in the last death before human life. So, the *creation* of human life is a deserved gift for humans, their worship towards their creators is the work of planting the milpa and harvesting corn, a product or fruit with which they postpone the death of the physical body, avoiding and combating material hunger. Hunger is represented as a *meta-physical entity* generated by its parents, injustice and suffering, which snatch away dignified life and consume it until they have killed it.

Hunger is one of the bodily manifestations of bad governments, these have offended the creators by perverting their sacred mandate through corruption, violence and decadence. The abandonment of the *nosotric community* of creators in the public administration of the State is a consequence of fetishized governments which are corrupted. These lose their respectable character by enriching themselves from the exploitation and death of the people.

### 3.- Towards an intersubjective and intercultural dialogue beyond relativism

For the anthropologist Clifford Geertz, the new world order of international capital has produced a world in pieces. The heterogeneity of the dismembered world is impossible to be covered by grand theories. In this multicultural relativism, the available genres of description and evaluation do not fit; the irregular, changing and discontinuous world requires a reframing, not only in the way we perceive reality, but also in the way of conceptualizing, writing and living, that is, in the way of being.

This dialogue is more complex at the level of feasibility than at the formal level of law. In dialogical praxis there is a silence of that subjectivity that listens and tries to understand, otherwise, it is not a dialogue but rather unconnected monologues. The listener uses his senses to internalize and interpret the epiphany of alterity that challenges with its presence; however, the message that is interpreted is never identical to the real one as such.

All subjectivity, to interpret, departs from its cultural construction and uses that structure to try to understand the alterity that is revealed. Interpretation is limited thanks to the *a priori* of our mother culture and the limits set by our sensibility. It is impossible to know the naked truth of

alterity in its entirety. Presence and interpretation are already concealments.

Without sensibility there can be no dialogue, since sensory sensitivity is a necessary material condition that precedes speech and its linguistics<sup>1</sup>. The scream precedes the word, and human life as a real corporality is prior to all guttural sounds<sup>2</sup>. That is, the cry "ah!" is always before every "help!" as a word structured by a culture; but the "ah!" cannot exist if there is no human life. Without life there is no dialogue, no interpretation, no words, no linguistics; then, the fundamental material condition to establish the possibility of dialogue is human life<sup>3</sup>. The life of the living being is the *transcultural* material "criterion".

The "ah!" as a human expression that interpellates, is a cry that moves the listener, the one who complains of pain is there, it is the alterity that is revealed in a harsh lament so torn that it is unable to utter a word. The "ah!" is the interpellation, not of a written text, but of the one who suffers, and endures existence in their body. Thus, in order to start a dialogue, the minimum necessary is: human life as a transcultural criterion and the material manifestation of alterity that is beyond me.

The mother culture is the *a priori* that constructs subjectivity. Our praxis is intersubjectively conditioned by the culture that welcomed us, cared for us, and nursed us in the process of learning to survive in the face of the dangers of the world<sup>4</sup>; however, no culture can be proclaimed as the "only" and "true", disqualifying all others distinct from it as "barbaric" or "uncivilized".

Possessing cultural particularities allows us to distinguish features, but in turn leads us, not to privilege one culture over another, but to try to understand the distinctions. Showing the limitations of our interpretation and the existing cultural distinctions in alterity leads us to accept the other in its distinction.

In the same way, no human can be the perfect model to imitate, since there is no norm or perfect established system, since no human is, so how can we distinguish pathology from what is healthy? Who puts forward a convincing criterion to be able to classify someone as "uncivilized"? What would be the criterion of truth to support a dialogue with a claim to honesty that avoids

1 Sensory sensitivity is prior to orality and the construction of words. The verbalization of words and the construction of concepts and categories create a logic within each culture with which they reach a limited extent to express the feeling captured by perceptions, without sensitive organs we could not suffer the presence of otherness. The sensations of human subjectivity, with which the message of the presence of alterity is captured, are drive strategies of bodily survival, of the concrete materiality of human life.

2 The oral word is structured long before the written word, and before the oral word is the scream, which is a guttural sound that interpellates as a proto-word.

3 See: Dussel, Enrique, 1998, *Ética de la liberación*, Trotta, Spain. Especially chapters 1 and 4, there human life is the material content of ethics and the life of the victim is the critical material content, philosophical contribution of the Ethics of Liberation. We analogously understand human life as a *transcultural* "criterion" and the life of the victim as a *critical transcultural* "criterion".

4 The subjectivity of each human life is built in memory, since the historical learning of traumas, suffered existentially in the past, are what determine the impulses that alert us to the dangers that can cause us an always possible death.

perversion in intercultural dialogue?

We can begin by clarifying that the scientist interprets from his subjectivity and his existential life experience; their interpretation—like that of any other subjectivity—is loaded with misunderstandings, it cannot be otherwise, since the human limits of subjectivity do not allow us to understand the other in their entirety, we can never be the other, we can approach and try to understand with the existential experience of cultural subjectivity, but one cannot be the other as such, since if hypothetically we could do so it would be absurd.

The doctor, like any other human being, is trapped in his own historical existential experience. Thus, the interpretation that the psychiatrist makes of his “patient” can be very different from what really happens to the other, to the “abnormal”. The human interpretation implies moving in the field of speculation, where the specialist affirms himself as “healthy”, but perhaps the life of a human who claims to be a scientist is “pure” like a blank page? Does the therapist not have internal conflicts that determine his subjectivity and this in turn determines the interpretation that he makes of the other subjects of his life, of his cultural world and of other cultures?

Culturally constructed subjectivity is presented in the person as a determination for interpretation<sup>5</sup>. In this way, dialogue with a claim to honesty would have to be established in a “silent” language, through the sensibilities of the interlocutors, beyond linguistics<sup>6</sup>; it would be full of errors or lacking a singular truth, since neither of the interlocutors is totally certain that the interpretation made of the other is the correct one.

The culture of the other also has its truth based on the rationalization of their myths with which they unconsciously try to express metaphysical<sup>7</sup> subjective experiences; however, as we have already said, no culture can proclaim itself as the only, total, authentic, exemplary, absolute truth; the healthy par excellence, the unequivocal, the end of history, since after it there is nothing more “civilized”. It cannot be like that, because neither the Egyptian, Inca or Greek culture, nor the Western culture, nor the capitalist culture, can be perfect. The authentic claim to honesty must be one without certainties, without words, without absolute truths.

5 For example, the culture of Western modernity imposed the “I” through violence, for this culture the “I” was the criterion of truth, however, the “I” of Western culture is based on myths that interpret their cultural reality. Subsequently, the truth of the “I” was imposed on other cultures as a dogmatic, unquestionable truth. The nascent western modernity of the 15th century had to mature until in the 16th century it begins to pass into modern anthropocentrism which reaches its maximum manifestation in the 19th century with the absolute egoism of Hegel. Later, with the “death of god” proclaimed by Nietzsche, the decadence of humanism begins to manifest itself and the Eurocentric anthropocentric “I” submerged in its egoism is consumed in loneliness, the madness of war and self-destruction.

6 We understand these aesthetic experiences as those unspeakable metaphysical manifestations, where words are no longer able to say what they mean, where linguistics and writing are useless.

7 The foundations are implicit in the myths. At first, they were manifested to people in metaphysical language, direct language, the one with which human sensibility captures the message in such a way that there is no doubt about the truth. Mythical reason plunges us into the mystical silence of symbols.

For us, philosophers from a post-colonial country, the problem lies in questioning the principles of cultures that claim to be superior and are therefore oppressive. In our situation, the problem is to question the dogmatism of the cultural foundations of the ruling groups.

Western culture has fallen for centuries into a dominating, fetishized, anthropocentric egocentrism; since it has not historically accepted the rationality of other cultures and has described them as "barbaric" and "uncivilized", useful, enslavable, non-human. In their silence they do not listen to the other, since it is a monologue in two voices disguised as a dialogue, self-absorbed they reason for themselves, they speak to command the other, they do not listen to learn. For this pathological dominator "I", the other is non-existent or in the best of cases is an object of study, a means or instrument with use and exchange value, a commodity, it is exploitable.

For us, the rationality of the other is not the irrational, as the foreign invaders who were received in the cultural collision of Europe and Abya Yala thought. Otherness for us has a distinct reason, built from its own cultural world. The cultural rationality of the other is one reason among many others and, because it is distinct, it is necessary to recognize the *dignity* and *symmetry* of its cultural distinction, never one that oppresses the other since: who has the perfect measure to judge others as inferior or non-human? Without this other condition of symmetry, the dialogue is a simulation, it is a dialogue of self-deception. The pathological ego invents concepts such as "good" or "bad" from the cynicism of violence and dominating power with which it oppresses and annihilates what is distinct, the dissident, those who try to free themselves by subverting the imposed order. In the field of mental illness and the therapeutic relationship, the Scottish anti-psychiatrist Ronal D. Laing, in an interview published as *The Mad and the Sane*, says:

[...] the Other is a being just like me. He is another me, not different from me; he is himself in the same way that I am myself. He is, for example, the relationship between you and me. This means that I can put myself in your place and you in mine. If each of us treats the other with the same consideration that he would like to be treated, we probably won't make as many mistakes (LAING, 1990, p. 60).

Enrique Dussel, one of the Latin American philosophers of Liberation, in volume I of his book *Para una ética de la liberación*, written between 1970-1971 in the midst of the military dictatorship in Argentina, tells us:

[...] The Other is not the one with whom I am in my world (Heidegger's *Mitsein*) and with respect to which I have a mode of com-prehension: the Other as other is, as such and ultimately, in-com-prehensible and outside my world; if they present themselves through their countenance as an entity to my understanding, they overabound, however, in their freedom and personal autonomy as exteriority, negativity. [...] "The Other" will

always remain an incomprehensible mystery in their eschatological remainder of freedom as long as I open myself to them as another person. Face-to-face indicates the limit of one area before the limit of another area: the confrontation of two convergent exteriorities that meet. Their very relationship is one between me and the Other that originally leaves no "space" or fissure for a world of meaning; it is proximity. [...] Said world, however, was organized from Otherness: intrauterinely, the fetal-I began the dialogue with the first Other: its mother (first, original position). (DUSSEL, 1977, p. 122-123)

In the dialogue with alterity, the distinctions and limitations for an interpretation are evident, which is why, in the unequal exchange of intersubjective and intercultural sensibility, injustice, oppression, exclusion are also revealed. Faced with alterity, in antipsychiatric therapy, the existential reflection of Laing seems important to us, he tells us:

[...] if I do not have, in one way or another, any feeling for the other person's feelings, it will be difficult for me to construct a correct interpretation, or at least a pertinent one, of the feelings that I attribute to him [...] If I were missing this field from personal experience (everyone has their own characteristics), I don't think I would be able to talk to anyone in distress in a way that made any sense to them. However, many people have described to me numerous states that I have never experienced, and that in any case it is painful for me to imagine. Surely, many of these states I do not want to imagine, nor do I try to (although it might be better for the other person if I were capable of it). (LAING, 1990, p. 62-63)

For an intercultural dialogue with a *political claim to justice*, it seems important to us to define *justice*, which in each cultural environment can be different and in Dussel's Philosophy of Liberation is understood as: *love of justice*. In volume II of his *Política de la liberación*, published in 2009, he writes:

[...] In Hebrew, the concept of <<justice>> [...] has a critical sense that does not exist in the Greek, and it will be the semantic content that we will adopt [...] In this case <<justice>> includes responsibility for the Other, solidarity with the <<widow, the orphan and the poor>> or the foreigner. It then has a transcendental and critical content with respect to the current political order [...] <<justice>> is no longer a mere compliance with the law, with rights, with what is required by the established order. [...] it is to meet the demands of the Other as worthy of inalienable solidarity for the fact of being <<someone>>, the sensible subjectivity of the suffering corporality of the person in need (negative effect of the actions of the current political order). (DUSSEL, 2009, p. 517)

At the beginning of the 21st century, the progressive globalization of the world-system and its transnational economy has as an obstacle the autonomous ethnocultural differential identity that

threatens the order of capital<sup>8</sup>. Currently the terrestrial globe suffers the economic consequences of the transnational cultural system, the transborder “ah!” is the empirical and at the same time symbolic cry of material suffering from injustice that is the result of a dominating, decadent system, creator of death, hunger, exclusion; that is, a perverse, fetishized and pathological system. Added to all this is the ecological crisis resulting from the overexploitation of natural resources.

This world situation provokes in the victim a practice and a language consistent with her concrete historical becoming. The victim as otherness inverts from *non-being* the egocentric logic of *being* of the philosophy of oppression. From the dialogue of social movements—such as that of the EZLN—“a world where many worlds fit” is built, a real world, with dignity and justice for all.

So, the recognition of the distinction of alterity is important for dialogue, but even more important is the recognition of the existence of material injustice such as hunger, this is a critical material determination and therefore: the life of the victim it is the *critical transcultural* material criterion.

It does not matter to which culture one belongs, since for us human life is the transcultural material criterion that must be placed at the base to establish a new human subjectivity, one that respects the *dignity* of life and its ethnocultural distinction. The hunger and thirst for material and historical justice of the guerrillas is a transforming vital drive, not pathological, because it is conditioned by survival, that is, by life itself as a material criterion of truth.

#### 4.- By way of conclusion. About the *Transference syndrome*

In the little literature that we have consulted in psychiatry and psychology, regarding the field of mental health, we have not found any definition of what we have begun to call Transference syndrome, which we could emergently define as that: set of pathological symptoms that appear and characterize a narcissistic ego that transfers all the negative burden and responsibility of its actions to Alterity, denying it and analogically denying the disease itself, given the fetishized ego that presents itself as self-referential devoid of material cultural community *a priori*.

The Transference syndrome becomes a consequence or product of the fetishization or sacralization of the ego (as an ontological foundation) that virtually transfers its pathology to Alterity, denying it. Having sacralized the *I*, it believes it has the right to make everything an instrument for its benefit. This loss of reality could well be classified within the category of *schizophrenia*.

A first symptom is the ego that has lost all pretense of goodness, since it imposes its will

<sup>8</sup> The Nation-State has not been able to homogenize the original peoples that trace their history before the arrival of the delimitation of imaginary borders with which it was intended to form a nation and with it a citizenship.

through the negative figure of the *will to power*, with which it annihilates the will of the alterities that surround it, that is, it loses all empathy of human solidarity and therefore all moral or ethical conscience.

The *superiority complex* is a second pathological symptom of the *I* that shows the Transference syndrome, it consists of the ego presenting itself convinced of being endowed with an inexplicable natural superiority, luck has led it to be above all people who besiege it, whom it despises for their submissive attitude, inferiorizes them and uses them for its selfish ends. It becomes an excessive, cruel egomaniac, who acts without fear of being wrong, devoid of any ethical conscience, always pretends to be right and neurotically seeks to defeat all opposition, in a psychotic attitude of permanent war against any life affirming drive of Alterity that seeks to free itself from the oppression generated; the drive for liberation of Alterity justifies the violence and hostility used, free from any responsibility for the life of Alterity, it can kill it in the name of just defense.

In this perverse logic, the transference syndrome acts by transferring to Alterity the guilt or responsibility for the violence exerted against it and simultaneously, in an analogical way, the sick ego presents itself as the victim, reversing the events, since the life drive of the victim places it as the starting point of the violence or initial violence, and the reaction to this violence is defense, for this reason their actions do not have an irrational charge and they can simply annihilate their supposed “aggressor”, vindicating their right to live.

A third symptom of the ego that suffers from the Transference syndrome is the deaf and blind attitude towards criticism, since it places itself at the center of knowledge, in a constant monologue that always returns to the same thing, that is, it convinces itself that that its action is correct, it does not accept teachers, they hinder it, because it is a superior self, therefore it always assumes its right to express its opinion or comment before others, it is the first and the last to speak, it does not listen to inferiors, whoever assumes a rebellious attitude towards its opinion becomes the enemy to destroy and transfers all its own errors in the figure of the dissident; by pointing out mistakes it pretends to be a good teacher and its act of kindness is to correct those who have a wrong path that has not been marked by it. It feels empowered to make itself noticed before others and to respond when it feels alluded to, since it always assumes itself as the center.

Transference syndrome is a psychotic illness that occurs or is a consequence of the neurotic *modern ego*, which bases its way of living-being-acting on a subjectivity devoid of a *material* creative community *a priori*, because schizophrenically its mythical and ontological origin is the creation of itself, an omnipotent ego, that is, its origin is self-referential. This fetishized ego is the very ontological foundation of the capitalist economic system, the neoliberal political system and

the legal system that makes it effective and elevates it to the rank of natural law. That is to say, it is a competitive, self-destructive, criminal ego, murderer of the life that surrounds it, it is the toxic subjectivity of all human relationships and with non-human beings.

In summary: the *Transference syndrome* is a psychotic schizophrenia that consists in transferring all negative burden to Alterity, denying it. The symptoms are: 1) loss of the human ethical claim or ethical empathy with Alterity; 2) Complex of superiority that inferiorizes and uses all Alterity for its selfish purposes; 3) Blind and deaf attitude to the criticism of negative acts carried out by its person and abandonment of all responsibility for the life of Alterity; 4) megalomaniac obsessive neurosis of the modern ego.

These symptoms that make up the *Transference syndrome* make it very difficult to help the narcissistic or mentally ill ego, since it does not accept help, diagnosis, or illness in itself. The reflex consciousness of Alterity is the point that triggers the identification of the disease, so it is the victim where the diagnosis and its possible overcoming have to be focused, since it is in Alterity where the disease is deposited or transferred virtually, in it, the sick ego sees its own "ghosts" and evils, it never sees them in itself, since there is no ethical conscience for criticism and even less so for self-criticism. The work of the reflex conscience of the victim who detects injustice is the key to the identification of this mental illness.

## References

- DUSSEL, Enrique. *Filosofía Ética Latinoamérica. Presupuestos de una Filosofía de la Liberación*. México: Edicol, 1977.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Ética de la Liberación, en la edad de la globalización y la exclusión*. Trotta: España, 1998
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Política de la Liberación. Volumen II Arquitectónica*. Trotta: España, 2009.
- GEERTZ, Clifford. *Reflexiones antropológicas sobre temas filosóficos*. Paidós: España, 2002.
- HABERMAS, Jürgen. *La inclusión del otro. Estudios de teoría política*. Paidós: España, 1999.
- LAING, D. Ronald. *Los locos y los cuerdos*. Trad. de Silvia Furió. Grijalbo: México, 1990.
- ROSALDO, Renato. "La pertenencia no es un lujo: Procesos de ciudadanía cultural dentro de una sociedad multicultural". En *Desacatos*, núm. 3, primavera, CIESAS, México. 2000.