

---

## THE WORK AND THE OTHER SCENE: QUESTIONS ABOUT SUFFERING AT WORK<sup>1</sup>

Luciene Jung Campos<sup>2</sup>  
University of Caxias do Sul, Brazil.

**ABSTRACT.** The aim of this article is putting on dialogue the concepts of “labour power” for Marx, “drive” for Freud and “psychic charge of the work” for Dejours. Work is not only a pragmatic realization. It does not let itself reach by a technical precept, because it is subjected to an erratic movement about what is desire of other thing. More than an identity, working affords aesthetics to workers. Thus, to work is rather an inscription in the world that traces a stylistic being for the subject. Based on psychoanalytic and Marxist approaches, the article discuss about suffering and meaning of work. The Brazilian short-movie “Veja bem”, directed and scripted by Jorge Furtado is the materiality for this study. The interface of these concepts are as in a contest of strength. The labor power, the worker’s vital energy is understood as a deployment of the libido from the life drive. When work does not offer a symbolic space for the worker and his/her desire is inconceivable with this, suffering takes the scene and the psychic charge of the work happens. Then the worker needs to start another kind of task, the kind that is not given to him.

**Keywords:** Labour; unconscious; cinema.

## O TRABALHO E A OUTRA CENA: INDAGAÇÕES SOBRE O SOFRIMENTO NO TRABALHO

**RESUMO.** Este ensaio tem por objetivo o diálogo com os conceitos de “força de trabalho” para Marx, “pulsão” para Freud, e “carga psíquica do trabalho” para Dejours. O trabalho não é apenas uma realização pragmática, ele não se deixa apreender na prescrição definitiva de uma técnica, pois está submetido ao movimento errático daquilo que é desejo de outra coisa. O trabalho dispõe uma estética ao trabalhador, mais do que uma identidade. O trabalho é, antes, forma de se inscrever no mundo, delineando uma estilística de existência para o sujeito. Esta abordagem, de viés psicanalítico e marxista, indaga sobre o sofrimento e o sentido do trabalho. Tem como materialidade o curta-metragem “Veja bem”, com direção e roteiro de Jorge Furtado. No jogo de forças dos conceitos em interface, compreende-se a força de trabalho, energia vital do trabalhador, enquanto um desdobramento da libido, da pulsão de vida. Quando o trabalho não oferece espaço simbólico e o desejo do trabalhador está fora de questão, a dor toma conta da cena, instala-se a carga psíquica do trabalho. Aí cabe ao trabalhador iniciar uma outra tarefa, a qual não é dada a ele.

**Palavras-chave:** Trabalho; inconsciente; cinema.

## EL TRABAJO Y LA OTRA ESCENA: CUESTIONES SOBRE EL SUFRIMIENTO EN EL TRABAJO

**RESUMEN.** Este artículo trata de la importancia del trabajo en la constitución del sujeto al discutir la relación entre inconsciente y trabajo. Partiendo de un abordaje psicoanalítico y marxista, tiene por objetivo el diálogo con los conceptos de “fuerza de trabajo” para Marx, “pulsión” para Freud, y “carga psíquica del trabajo” para Dejours. El trabajo no es solamente una realización pragmática, él no se deja aprehender por una prescripción definitiva de una técnica porque está sometido al movimiento errático del deseo de otra cosa. El trabajo dispone de una estética al trabajador, más que una identidad. El trabajo es antes una manera de inscribirse en el mundo, delineando una estilística de existencia para el sujeto. Este abordaje, tiene como materialidad el corto-metraje brasileño “*Veja bem*”, del director y guionista Jorge

---

<sup>1</sup> *Support and funding:* National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq); Research Support Foundation of the State of Rio Grande do Sul (FAPERGS).

<sup>2</sup> *E-mail:* ljungdecampos@gmail.com

Furtado. En el juego de fuerzas entre los conceptos en interfaz, se comprende la fuerza del trabajo, energía vital del trabajador, como un despliegue de la libido, de la pulsión de vida. Cuando el trabajo no ofrece un espacio simbólico y el deseo del trabajador está fuera de cuestión, el dolor toma cuenta de la escena, se instala la carga psíquica del trabajo. Ahí toca al trabajador iniciar otra tarea, la cual no se le fue dada.

**Palabras-clave:** Trabajo; inconsciente; cinema.

---

The issue subject-work is one of the themes that is included in the order of the impossible approaches. The worker subject does not dominate the work from outside as if it was external to him, because the subject himself is found at work, in an inextricable face-to-face with that what escapes to the knowledge. When studying the work, we are subject and object, all at once. It is the ambivalence of the subject's statute in the labor process that is in question. The subject of knowledge and know-how is at the same time the subject who knows nothing and the object to be known.

Taking this direction is to open up knowledge of facts that refuse to the evidences of the management. It is working in its blind corner, in the careful examination of its scopes. This study deals with the relationship between the unconscious and the work that inscribes the subject in the production of his subexistence. With a psychoanalytical and Marxist perspective, it has as objective to dialogue with the concepts of "workforce" to Marx, "drive" to Freud, and "psychological load of the work" to Dejours. The discussion of the concepts is given through the analysis of the short film *Look Closely* (Veja Bem, Furtado, 1994/2005), with direction and script of Jorge Furtado, who exposes the disconnection between work (the Outside) and employee (the Inside) in two very distinct phases, through two poems punctuated by images and scenes. In this disjunction, of what cannot be separated, the video poetically presents the nuisance that the theory explains, but does not feel.

In this approach, the quantitative measures or statistics are not what count to observe the work. Not even the questionnaires or the structured or semi-structured interviews. However, all that is forgotten on purpose is what counts: the suffering, the place of desire and the place of the subject at work that are not considered in the aforementioned objective analysis of work. This is about producing inquiries about the meaningless of work, in trying to give way to the Other Scene of the work.

### **The Work and the Other Scene**

Against the spectacularization of the everyday life, the research of the Other Scene of the work follows the line created by Freud since his studies on hysteria, which is worth resuscitating here. Freud goes beyond Charcot by removing the hysterical women from the theatrical scene of hypnosis. He empties the scenic dimension open to the public. Charcot exposed his patients on the scene, in the amphitheater of the La Salpêtrière, where they on stage presented on the public scene their paralyses and convulsive contractions with their bodies. On Thursdays, the sessions were restricted to physicians, but on Tuesday, they were open to the public interested. Freud takes the hysterical women outside the scene and proposes to listen to them carefully. He listens and appreciates the smallest details of their history and their feelings. He welcomes the fantasies of the patients, where what is not on the scene plays a central role. He realizes the relationship of the symptoms of these women with the patriarchal and repressive society of the time. He positions the symptoms as a product of their time. He discovers that it is only by the word that the affections can come out to the surface.

Similarly, the painful excitement caused by the suffering at work cannot be unloaded by the pragmatism of the action, but solely by the worker's speech. In the spectacularized work, there where, often, the acts are combined with the technological paraphernalia: in the training, in the performance, in the goals, in the awards. The work ties the body of the subject in the space with tools and machines; it is a controlled and planned space. However, something is not there, something is missing, something does not let be seen. It is in the relationship between the visible and the speakable that the work can be presented. The work is, above all, its story. The meaning of the work could only be found in fantasy. As with the hysterical women, with the imagined scene, however central to the constitution of the subject. The fantasy as a story, as a personal and social drama that organizes the subjectivity.

In this perspective, the subject and the work are organized in a line of fiction, in the direct relationship of the work with the ghost of the subject. Ghost, as the unconscious idea, in Freudian theory, around which is organized an imaginary script in which the subject is present, and that appears, in a more or less deformed way in the defensive processes, the fulfillment of a wish. So to speak, an unconscious desire. Something that takes advantage of a remainder, a surplus that was detached from a previous and lost pleasurable experience, which makes its return. In this line trodden by Freud since the treatment of hysteria, fantasy is also scene, is the Other Scene. The Other Scene of the work is the scene of the unconscious, which jeopardizes the worker's desire in the search for something about his childhood. It is in the worker's words about his work that the metaphoric and metonymic ways that would compose the meaning of the work are remade.

Interpretations about the work experience made by the worker himself is composed of an endless tangle of thoughts, feelings and remainders of other experiences of his labor body. No matter how much the worker's body may comply with the well-designed organization of the work; the meaning of the work is fragmentary and revolves around a dense opacity, enigmatic, impossible to interpret. There is at least one point in every work in which it is unfathomable – a knot, so to speak, which is its point of contact with the unknown.

The work is not only a pragmatic accomplishment, it does not let itself be apprehended in the definitive prescription of a technique, because it is subjected to the erratic movement of what is desire for something else.

The work provides an aesthetic to worker, much more than an identity – a way to enter the world, outlining a stylistics of existence. From this premise, it may be thought that the work outlines in a privileged way the field of the subject and that cinema and poetry give themselves in the construction of the plot and the drama of the subject at work.

*Look Closely*, directed by Jorge Furtado (1994/2005), presents a fragmented montage, made of cutouts of drawings and photographs between filmed scenes. The work is a short film of a little more than six minutes, composed of two parts: the *Outside* and the *Inside*. The *Outside* with the reading of the poem of Carlos Drummond de Andrade in male and female voice; the *Inside* with the reading of the poem of João Cabral de Melo Neto in male voice. The work, at the same time as a visible object and questioning eye, engenders an intertextual scheme to place into the scene a silent hero, adjusted to the demands of the production, in opposition to the chatter of the machines.

### **Look closely: *Outside***

The *Outside* shows off machines in operation, traffic, objects, utensils, work of art. Collage and bricolage that somehow make a return to the aesthetic sensibility of the 1950s, including announces taken from magazines of wide circulation, material that is appropriate and that begins to be recognized in the images. The *Outside* exalts technology, the unlimited supply of products and services, in the exhaustive mobility of the urban life.

Objects that rotate and can be observed on all sides, including a gourd of yerba mate, souvenir engraved with "Memory of Itaquí". The Elvis I and II, of Andy Warhol, where Elvis Presley is made up, in androgynous version, with a gun in hand, conveying with humor and finesse the product "gun for painting" and the service "painters for the gun". It also appears Andy Warhol himself also appears, with his face in full screen, crossed by light beams with multiple colors, in a strong allusion to pop art that seeks inspiration in mass culture, bringing art and merchandise together. Warhol called his painting studio of *factory* in the connotation of a "business" like any other (Mccarthy, 2002, p. 26). Warhol, Furtado and Drummond do not deny their belonging to consumer culture.

The poem of Drummond insists in naming the multiple possibilities of mechanization of activities in the different machines:

Washing machine  
Sanding machine  
Drilling machine  
Bending machine

Folding machine  
 Bottling machine  
 Packaging machine  
 Bagging machine  
 Baking machine  
 Billing machine  
 (Drummond, cited by Furtado, 1994/2005)

Meandering the images, in addition to the machines, numerous services and products in the announcer's voice parade: "security systems", "night surveillance", "industrial monitoring", "circuit breakers", "baits", "plumbers", "noise suppression", "wholesale champagne", "pressure cooker", "steamrollers". However, through the images of the film, the meaning of the poet's words is carried in metaphors.

For instance, to display "drilling machines" is used the figure of guns. Just as, "garbage collectors" receive the image of a cemetery. The work circumvents the difficulty to convey what is death in the contemporary society, exposes the aspect of the murderous machinery and alludes to the dead body as waste product – remnant of a good – that is no longer a worker and is not also a consumer, but a debris in the system flow.

It is the fluidity of images that is coagulated in each commodity. The commodity, seemingly so simple for the use and functionality, and at the same time, so complex. Complex for its opacity and density. The opacity of the commodity does not let to see the worker who precedes it, his work force in operation, the suffering at work, the mobilization of the worker's desire, which provokes the creative acts to give account of the task. The density of the merchandise in its various layers contains the political and historical thickness expressed in the employment contract, in the social division of labor, in the gender issues, in the working conditions, in the job insecurity.

In his text *Estranged Labor and Private Property* (1844/2010a), Marx begins with the phrase: "We start from the assumptions of the national economy. We accept its language and its laws" (p. 79). Thus, this author recognizes the symbolic order in the form of language and law that structures the production system and does not cease to remember that behind all commodity, there is a worker:

From political economy itself, using its own words, we have shown that the worker sinks to the level of a commodity,

and moreover the most wretched commodity of all; that the misery of the worker is in inverse proportion to the power (*Macht*) and volume (*Grösse*) of his production; that the necessary consequence of competition is the accumulation of capital in a few hands. (Marx, 1844/2010a, p. 79)

Thus, it is understood that with the appreciation of knickknacks, the devaluation of the human working in direct relationship, increases. Worker impoverishes as he produces wealth, because work does not produce only goods. Work produces work and worker with the act of commodity production. In addition, Marx seeks to be more explicit:

... the object (*Gegenstand*) that labor produces, its product, stands opposed to it as something (*sachlich*) alien, as a power independent of the producer. The product of labor is labor embodied and made material in an object; it is the objectification (*Vergegenständlichung*) of labor. (Marx, 1844/2010a, p. 80)

To Marx (1844/2010a), making permanent the work reverberates in the worker impermanence. Objectification works at the same time as "loss of the object and servitude to the object, the appropriation as estrangement (*Entfremdung*), as alienation (*Entäusserung*)" (p. 80).

From where it is observed, the work is language. Therefore, the meaning of work is not transparent, it is a historical-political-ideological construction that is woven in the opacity and density of the commodity

that the second part of the short film – the *Inside* – allows to see in “hole-image”, which flickers and exposes radically the issue of the worker.

### Look closely: *Inside*

In the *Inside*, unlike the great and diversified fluidity of the images of the first part, what we see are scenes of imprisonment of the repetitive work. Arid prairie where unfolds the work, the most specific product of the human being, in the search of a contour to his unreason. It is in this activity, always restarted, and always as unsatisfactory as necessary and good, where everyone is struggling: the three scenes are presented. The first scene shows a worker breaking a wall. The camera privileges the movement from the waist up, the naked back – meat wall – that contracts at every sledgehammer blow against the reinforced concrete. The image is not well defined, almost a shadow. Even so, the helmet raised on the forehead assumes the sweating of the anonymous worker.

Amid the hammering, the poetry of João Cabral de Melo Neto (1943/1979) is heard in male voice. Emphatic, he asks the viewer's attention:

Love ate my name, my identity, my picture. Love ate my certificate of age, my genealogy, my address. Love ate my business cards. Love came and ate all the papers where I had written my name....

Love ate my peace and my war. My day and my night. My winter and my summer. It ate my silence, my headache, my fear of death. (Melo Neto, 1943/1979, pp. 365-372)

The “hole-image”, for Tania Rivera (2008), is this agencying of image that involves us and that “can place us in the vertigo, sometimes poetic, of a heterogeneous world of which we are not masters” (p. 8), although we are part. It is in these gaps between image and voice that is established the pulsating chaos of labor.

In the second scene, a construction worker walks out by a door, climbs a staircase and enters through another door with a bucket in each hand. The action takes place in a building under construction (a mix of construction and demolition), behind the outline of a large clock that encompasses the entire scene. The continuous circulation of a same worker by the stairs produces an effect of doubling, tripling – very close to the language of dreams, and also of nightmare – like a row of workers climbing the stairs in an continuous movement, in one upward direction. Swallowed up by the top door, they reappear, by the mechanisms of division and playback at the bottom door to restart the same movement. It is the subject redoubled who is unfolded. The scene can be associated to the “living mechanism of manufacturing”, observed by Marx (1867/2013) in a continuous repetition of the same limited action for hours.

The scene takes place under the insistent narrative:

Love chewed my childhood, of fingers soiled of ink, hair falling in the eyes, boots never shined. Love chewed the elusive boy, who was always in the corners, scribbling the books, biting the pencil, walking on the street kicking rocks. Love chewed the conversations, next to the gas pump of the square, with the cousins who all knew about birds, about a woman, about car brands....

Love ate my clothes, my handkerchiefs, my shirts. Love ate meters and meters of ties. Love ate the measure of my suits, the number of my shoes, and the size of my hats. Love ate my height, my weight, the color of my eyes and my hair (Melo Neto, 1943/1979, pp. 366-370).

Marx (1867/2013) in his text *Division of labor and manufacture*, refers to the “partial worker and his tool”, denouncing the form-subject of the industrial capitalism. He mentions that “a worker performing a same simple operation throughout his life turns his entire body in an automatically unilateral organ of this operation” (Marx, 1867/2013, p. 414). This is the image of the “worker's indignity” referred by Dejours (1992, p. 49), result of the forced contact with an unattractive task, poor in psychic, psychomotor and phantasmatic activities.

In the third scene, certain constellation then is repeated, combining monotonous work and poetry: a female worker kneeling, scrubbing the floor with her arms stretched forward, with large and successive

movements from one side to the other in cleaning a floor, using cloth and bucket. On the left side of the screen, the hands of a clock rotate quickly in a counterclockwise direction – as if they were two other useful and accelerated arms in the execution of a common task in the combination work-effort-time.

Permeating the scene, the verses of the poet, as follows (Melo Neto, 1943/1979, pp 366-371.):

Love ate my medicines, my prescription, and my diets. It ate my aspirins, my short waves, my X-rays.  
It ate my mental tests, my urine tests....

Love even ate the days that have not yet been stated in the wall calendar. It ate the minutes of advance in my watch, the years that the lines of my hand ensured. It ate the great future athlete, the great future poet. It ate the future trips around the Earth, the future shelves around the room.

However, the poetry, in its knowledge, reconstructs the Other Scene that can only be offered in words that surprise and astonish the speaker himself. This scene is not satisfied as a spectacle, it does not give itself properly in sight, the memories and feelings betray it and do not present it as such. Just a space of word builds the Other Scene of the work in the free association about its gestures, its technique, and its knowledge. Images that can reconstitute more than a spectacle, a shady area where the worker does not re-encounter his figure there.

*Look closely* (Melo Neto, 1994/2005) makes us thinking about the disconnection between the *Outside* and the *Inside* and attempts to show this division. It shows the paradox of the work that as a guarantee of survival can become harbinger of destruction. While it is a second chance to deal with the children's psychological weaknesses (Dejours, 1996), work is also source of illness.

This is produced, finally, when the subject is treated as an object, a human resource or when the body is surrendered to exhaustion. Isolated desires and renegade thoughts are thrown in the form of strange forces to the subject, while the insistence of these forces attests to the division, the cleavage of the self. It may be thought the work as a risk experience, in the moment that the subject must make an effort to exclude something of himself, leading him to deny its existence, experiencing feelings of strangeness and depersonalizations. Thus, in the Other Scene, that of the phantasmatic activity, when the repression relaxes, the suffering can be recognized and the desire – this inner stranger – is shown as part of the real of the worker subject. The screen of the unconscious constitutes this *locus* where the truth of the strangeness can be thought.

Freud (1930/1976e) addresses in his text *Civilization and Its Discontents*, that life, as we find it, is too hard as we have to deal with the disappointments and the impossible tasks that appear in its path, so we can not do without science and art – these auxiliary constructions that provide shelter for our helplessness: “science and art are powerful derivatives that make us draw light from our own misfortune” (Freud, 1930/1976e, p. 93).

The knowledge that the cinematographic work brings acts as a trigger to think about the work-subjectivity relationship. It calls the concepts of *workforce*, *drive* and *psychological load of work* addressed by Marx, Freud and Dejours and offers shelter to withstand the unmeasured work.

### **Workforce, drive and psychological load of work: concepts interfaced**

Marx is emphatic and disturbing in saying that the *workforce* is this “particular commodity that only exists in the flesh and in the blood of man” (Marx, 1848/2010b, p. 34). This follows in the next pages:

... the workforce in action, the work, is the vital activity itself of the worker, the very manifestation of his life. Moreover, it is this vital activity that he sells to a third party to ensure the necessary means of life. His vital activity is for him, therefore, only a mean to be able to exist. He works to live. He does not even consider the work as part of his life; it is firstly the sacrifice of his life. It is a commodity that he awarded to a third party (Marx, 1848/2010b, p. 36).

In the citation above, the issue of alienation of the desire of the subject at work is touching, because before the work being part of his life, it is the sacrifice of his life. This is what Marx calls “force” of work,

“vital activity”, adding that the workforce is the very manifestation of life of the worker, it may be related to the “psychic energy” that is worked by Freud, since the *Interpretation of dreams* (1900/1976a), where he calls psychology to be interested not by the contents of the consciousness, but by the unconscious processes such as the decisive factors for the psyche. He proposes himself to treat the psychic energy from the premises of psychoanalysis, while unconscious process and tied to the sexual domain.

In *The drives and their vicissitudes*, Freud (1915/1976b) makes progress on this issue by introducing the concept of drive – as the representative of the psychic energy:

the drive will appear as a concept located on the border between the psychic and the somatic, as a psychic representative of the excitations that are originated inside the body and reach the psyche, as a measure of the demand made to the psyche with a view to working as a result of its connection to the body (Freud, 1915/1976b, p. 142).

In the same article, Freud proposes a retheorization of the concept of energy, when dealing with the destiny of the drive. With this, it is marked the entry of the Object, from the outside world, therefore, from the Other in the proposition of the work of the psychic apparatus, addressing the mobility of the associative routes that the drive energy can take. Thus, the work of the psychic energy will be governed “by three polarities, the antitheses: subject (me) – Object (external world), pleasure – displeasure and active – passive” (Freud, 1915/1976b, p. 155.). The polarities and antitheses propose a range of feelings determinants of the approaching of one pole or the other, introducing the economic/quantitative point of view of the psychic energy.

In *Group Psychology and Analysis of the Ego*, Freud (1921/1976c) returns to the issue of psychic energy in the perspective of libido, linking it to the love and malleability of this signifier. While he affirms the impossibility to measure the affections:

Libido is an expression excerpted from the theory of emotions. We give this name to the energy, regarded as a quantitative magnitude (although in reality is not currently measurable), of those drives that have to do with everything that can be covered under the word “love”. The core of what we mean by love consists naturally (and this is what the poets sing) in the sexual love, with the sexual union as being its objective. However, we do not separate from this – which, in any case, has a share in the name “love” – the self-love on the one hand and, on the other, the love for parents and children, the friendship and the love for humanity in general, as well as the devotion to concrete objects and abstract ideas (Freud, 1921/1976c, p. 116).

The insistence of the poet with the statement *love ate*, which repeatedly acquires the status of enigma placed on the destination of the psychic energy at work, where *love ate* denounces the suffering of the worker who appears as the mistake in the real of work. The worker’s suffering, when transposed by the poetry in language, makes the pain to join the scene, allowing the sliding of the logical certainties, it makes tinkering with the regularities that govern the work, it exposes the real of image, and it becomes an act.

Freud insists on the word “love” as a bridge that connects to both the poetry and science, even paying a high price for daring to work with it:

We have the opinion, therefore, that the language made an entirely justifiable unification in creating the word love with its numerous uses, and we can do nothing better than take it also as a basis of our discussions and scientific expositions (Freud, 1921/1976c, p.116).

Freud discusses in *The Ego and the Id* (1923/1976d) that the experiences of pleasant nature are not coercive. While the impressions of displeasure cause tensions and incite discharge. Therefore, the displeasure is taken as an increase and the pleasure as a decrease in energy investment. He finds in the clinical experience that the impulse repressed, the Id “can exert impulsive force without the *Ego* noticing the compulsion. Only when it is given resistance to this [impulsive force], a detention in the discharge reaction, is that the *Ego* becomes conscious as a displeasure” (Freud, 1923/1976d, p. 36).

It is the displeasure antithesis – pleasure in the work that the approach of Cristophe Dejours privileges to treat the concepts of psychological charge and release. He states: “The worker’s organism is not a “human motor”, inasmuch as it is permanently object of excitations, not only exogenous, but also endogenous” (Dejours, 1994, p. 24).

In this game of economy of the internal and external excitations, Dejours (1992) elects the organization of the work as the main aspect of the work capable of jeopardizing the work-subjectivity relationship. The author justifies that the organization of the work promotes: the division of labor and the fragmentation of the work; the division of the workers in the hierarchical system into bosses and subordinates, the command modes, the power relationships; the goals, the liability issues, the forms of remuneration, methods of performance evaluation of the workers. It is the organization of the work that endangers the psychic and phantasmatic activities of the worker and establishes the suffering:

It [the organization of the work] is firstly, the division of labor and its sharing among the workers, that is, the division of men: the organization of the work cuts out, thus, in one go the content of the task and the human relationships of work. We will not think abusive to observe in this, the exercise of a will: of dominating, controlling, fully exploiting the workforce (Dejours, 1994, p. 27).

To Marx, the labor force is a commodity, the so-called “free labor”, where the worker sells himself and by parts: “By auction he sells 8, 10, 12, 15 hours of his life, day after day to who best pays” (Marx, 1848/2010b, p. 36). Marx introduces the idea of alienation at work to indicate that the product of his work does not belong to him:

What the worker produces for himself is not the silk that he weaves, is not the gold that he extracts from the mines, is not the palace that he builds. What he produces for himself is the salary; and the silk, gold and palace are reduced for him to a certain amount of means of subsistence, perhaps to a cotton clothes, to some coins, to a room in a basement (Marx, 1848/2010b, p. 36).

In this form of work organization, the concern is not in relation to the excessive application of skills, as in the case of the physical load that produces musculoskeletal disorders and other injuries for repetitive efforts. However, the risk is the underutilization of psychical activities, which lead to a retention of drive energy, which will produce suffering, the psychological load (Dejours, 1994).

From this, it can be inferred that the underutilization of the psychic and phantasmatic activities at work, so well characterized by Dejours (1994), directly affects the possibilities of allocation of meaning to the repetitive and fragmented work, what Marx had already reported:

What about the laborer, who for 12 hours weaves, digs, operates a lathe, a bricklaying shovel “will these hours be worthwhile for him as a manifestation of his life, as your life? On the contrary. Life for him begins when this activity ends, at the table in the pub, in bed. The 12 hours of work have no way to him **the meaning of weaving, spinning, drilling** [our emphasis] etc, but represent solely the means of making money that will allow him to sit at the table, to go to the pub, to lay down on the bed” (Marx, 1848/2010b, p. 36).

Therefore, to Marx and Dejours the organization of the work is materialized as the will of another. As pointed out Dejours (1994), it is the will of the employer, which is often mediated by a technical supervision, where the worker, in a way is dispossessed of his physical and nervous body and forced to act according to the will of another. In line with the idea of “docile bodies” of Foucault (1987): bodies at the same time docile and fragile, easily trainable and manipulable, highly susceptible to domination. It is in these circumstances that is given what Dejours (1994) identifies as “the psychological load of work” resulting from the confrontation of the employee’s desire to the determination of the employer, contained in the organization of the work.

The psychological load of the work is the load, that is, the echo at the level of the worker, of the pressure that constitutes the organization of the work. When there is no more possible arrangement of the



organization of the work by the employee, the conflictual relationship of the psychic apparatus to the task is blocked. It is opened then the domain of suffering (Dejours 1994, p.28).

When the impossibility to transform the content of the task and the work process is set out, the organization of the work itself engenders for the worker a fundamental contradiction: the desire to work against the employer's will (Dejours, 1994).

With this gesture, the worker seeks to preserve his psychic integrity, as a subject of the desire. In the Ideological plan, whenever there is domination there will be resistance, in this operation, the worker tries to recreate his symbolic world, because he is a subject of language.

It is worth asking if the *prescribed task* would not be the heart of work organization. The prescribed task, here understood as the one that is in the manual of description of functions and procedures and that, in turn, guides the selection, the personnel hiring, the training and the performance evaluation.

The prescribed task as part of work organization drives to the *discursive spaces logically stabilized*, proposed by Michel Pêcheux (2006, p. 34) who assumes that every subject knows what he says and that he has the control of what he does. "Things to know" about the management produced by the neo-capitalism and the neo-positivism, knowledge to be managed and transmitted socially. However, this universe logically stabilized is, in relation to the formulations irremediably equivocal, against the real of the task, to the points of drift, always susceptible to become another. It is installed the double background of the task with which the worker has to deal with, which claims an unconscious for the worker. However, as states Pêcheux (2006):

The bourgeoisie insists on the old elitist certainty that wants that the dominated classes do not invent anything ever, because they are very absorbed by the everyday logics.... The proletarians do not have (the time to pay a luxury of) an unconscious (pp. 52-53).

It is about the issue of denial of an unconscious to the worker, precisely to reaffirm it, which is intended to undermine the pragmatic positivity of the work, addressing the work and the Other Scene, where the subject seems to be the central issue of the work. Therefore, the vulnerability and precariousness of his position as an employee do not indicate a guarantee of his place as uncontested producer of the work.

The worker in his wanderings makes return to the unconscious, able to engage on the task or in its periphery and collect something about himself, as a subject of heterogeneous discourse in the relationship with history and ideology. In the organization of the work, the Other Scene would not allow itself to be shown if there were no failures in this ritual and if the worker had not an unconscious. This is the contradictory and suffering subject capable of reconstructing the task from its ruins. He teaches us about the capacity to deny the weight of the organic body and gives the testimony of its immateriality, ensuring the urgency of the fantasy in the process.

*Look closely* (Veja Bem, Furtado, 1994/2005) shows the indecipherable language of the work, captured in performing the activity, on the verge of its emergence as a lapse. The *Outside* and the *Inside* indicate a dialectical moment of the functioning of the work; it is like an absurd score that forgot the image that is mediating. The work appears in its rupture, division, non-conformity, and is inscribed in counterpoint to what is evoked by the idea of coherence. It reveals the crisis, the commitment, the hard negotiation between forces or parts, prudent or dominant, which the work governs at its discretion. The work gives manifestations of the internal economy of the subject. The work is the symptom of the subject.

The world of work is experienced on the screen as reactivation in laboratory of a principle of division and alienation that makes itself permeated in full of a dimension that makes clear that everything is a representation that consolidates, by the form, a constant commentary to circumscribe the experience staged and that moves forward a diagnosis on the limits of the subject at work.

The deployment of these two points: machines/commodity and the worker's body, however, supportive on a same rope. Machines and commodity around a body. *Look closely* is an act that proposes a circle of reversion. It supports the tying and the torsion of two sections: "The outside" and "The inside". The desire of the Other, this great Other of the capitalist ideology where is given the trading of goods and services – radical field – in which the desire of the subject is irremediably tied by this torsion where is revealed that the worker's demand, in the organization of the work, is always jettisoned of the desire of

the worker. This topological surface that is at issue does not cease to remember what implies for the worker to be a speaking subject. He constitutes himself in place of the Other, of the imaginary, of the prescribed task and it is necessary to explain for the worker, about his unconditional dependency of the signifying chain: it should be understood what results from it for the subject of the unconscious, in the two poems of João Cabral and Drummond.

## Final considerations

In the psychoanalytical and Marxist theoretical perspective, the Other Scene of the work is shown in the interplay of forces in which the work takes place: between the spectacularization of goods and the deletion of the subject who works. Where it can be affirmed that the concept of workforce, vital energy of the worker, according to Marx is closely linked with the concept of libido, life drive for Freud. Work is love converted. We must love to work. However, work can be the sacrifice of the life and love of the worker, in a poorly reciprocated and unequal relationship. This occurs when the desire of the worker is not in question. When the desire of the worker cannot enter in the scene of work, the work resides without purpose, outside the symbolic. Situation in which the psychological load of the work is set, according to Dejours, causing tension and suffering. This path is the theoretical plot of this article.

The scenes of the repetitive work, in the video of Jorge Furtado, expose the relationship with the arduous work, of which the subject is not the master. This is the underutilization of psychical and phantasmatic activities in the work of the subsistence and reproduction of living conditions.

Work is not an isolated act, is an act of relationship, and is an act of language, therefore addressed. So that the work can be shared as a collective system of expression, it is needed that it reaches the symbolic, that it put itself in the sense, that it loses its individualist and of pure extraction enclosure to give access to a field of solidary exchanges. This is not a task given to the worker, on the contrary, this is the difficulty with which he must deal.

Submerged by the violence of old and new imaginary representations, he has to be engaged in reinstate them in the order of the common and shareable and attribute them a value simultaneously universal and derisory, individual and collective. Perhaps this gesture can produce some shock in the structure of the organization of the work and in the reconfiguration of the relationships of work, where the suffering can be understood as the effort of the worker to not get exhausted in the enjoyment of the Other.

## References

- Dejours, C. (1992). *A loucura do trabalho: estudo de psicopatologia do trabalho*. São Paulo: Cortez Editora.
- Dejours, C. (1994). A carga psíquica do trabalho. In C. Dejours, E. Abdoucheli & C. Jayet (Orgs.), *Psicodinâmica do trabalho: contribuições da escola dejouriana à análise da relação prazer, sofrimento e trabalho* (I. Domingues, Trad.) (pp. 21-32). São Paulo: Atlas.
- Dejours, C. (1996). Para uma nova visão do sofrimento nas organizações. In J. Chanlat (Org.), *O indivíduo na organização* (pp. 149-173). Vol. I. São Paulo: Atlas.
- Foucault, M. (1987). *Vigiar e punir: nascimento da prisão* (R. Ramalhe, Trad.). Petrópolis: Vozes.
- Freud, S. (1976a). A interpretação de sonhos. In J. Strachey (Ed. e J. Salomão, Trad.), *Edição standart brasileira das obras psicológicas completas de Sigmund Freud*. Vol. VI (pp. 361-725). Rio de Janeiro: Imago. (Trabalho original publicado em 1900).
- Freud, S. (1976b). Os instintos (a pulsão) e suas vicissitudes. In J. Strachey (Ed. e J. Salomão, Trad.), *Edição standart brasileira das obras psicológicas completas de Sigmund Freud*. Vol. XIV (pp. 137-168). Rio de Janeiro: Imago. (Trabalho original publicado em 1915).
- Freud, S. (1976c). Psicologia de grupo e análise do ego. In J. Strachey (Ed. e J. Salomão, Trad.), *Edição standart brasileira das obras psicológicas completas de Sigmund Freud*. Vol. XVIII (pp. 91-184). Rio de Janeiro: Imago. (Trabalho original publicado em 1921).
- Freud, S. (1976d). O ego e o id. In J. Strachey (Ed. e J. Salomão, Trad.), *Edição standart brasileira das obras psicológicas completas de Sigmund Freud*. Vol. XIX

- (pp. 23-76). Rio de Janeiro: Imago. (Trabalho original publicado em 1923).
- Freud, S. (1976e). O mal-estar na civilização. In J. Strachey (Ed. e J. Salomão, Trad.), *Edição standart brasileira das obras psicológicas completas de Sigmund Freud*. Vol. XXI (pp. 81-178). Rio de Janeiro: Imago. (Trabalho original publicado em 1930).
- Furtado, J. (Diretor). (2005). *Veja bem. In Curtas da Casa: Curtas Jorge Furtado*. Porto Alegre: Casa de Cinema de Porto Alegre. (Trabalho original produzido em 1994).
- Marx, K. (2010a). *Manuscritos econômico-filosóficos*. São Paulo: Boitempo. (Trabalho original publicado em 1844).
- Marx, K. (2010b). *Trabalho assalariado e capital & salário, preço e lucro*. São Paulo: Expressão Popular. (Trabalho original publicado em 1848).
- Marx, K. (2013). *O capital* (R. Enderle, Trad.). São Paulo: Boitempo. (Trabalho original publicado em 1867).
- Melo Neto, J. C. (1979). *Poesias completas: 1940-1965*. Rio de Janeiro: José Olympio. (Trabalho original publicado em 1943).
- Mccarthy, D. (2002). *Arte pop* (O. Nunes, Trad.). São Paulo: Cosac & Naify.
- Pêcheux, M. (2006). *Discurso: estrutura ou acontecimento*. (E. Orlandi, Trad.). Campinas: Pontes Editores. (Trabalho original publicado em 1983).
- Rivera, T. (2008). *Cinema, imagem e psicanálise*. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar.

Received: Aug. 19, 2015

Approved: Jul. 13, 2016

---

Luciene Jung Campos: Psychologist, psychoanalyst, Doctor in Discourse Analysis PPGLET/UFRGS. Professor in the Center of Human Sciences and in the Postgraduate Program in Tourism of the University of Caxias do Sul. Researcher of CNPq.