Masochism as a Post-Phallic Mandate

1 The cruel woman

The masochistic construct of the femme fatale and the vamp between nature and machine

Duino elegy 1

And if I cried, who'd listen to me in those angelic ears? Even if one of them suddenly held me to his heart, I'd vanish in his overwhelming presence. Because beauty's nothing but the start of terror we can barely bear, and what we adore is because of the terror we could kill us with. Every angel's terrifying. So I enticed myself and clothe back the hue of my dark cry.

Rainer Maria Rilke, 1912/12

Reacting to the industrial revolution driven by machines, a male-dominated culture conjured up a new image of woman. In an overreaction, women were either naturalised resp. renaturalised. This led to the myth of the femme fatale, which developed particularly in the period 1860-1910, or (post 1910) it led to the construct of woman as a machine. The "machine-ised" technoid woman, for example "Maria" in Fritz Lang's Metropolis (1927), derived from the same source of fear as the naturalisation of woman. Both were seen as threatening the male, at beauty without pity and menace the "Belle Dame Sans Merci" (cf. the painting by John William Waterhouse). Keats' poem Le Belle Dame Sans Merci is about an innocent knight who is bewitched by a beguiling woman with very long hair:

She took me to her elfin grot,
And there she gazed and sighed deep,
And there she slant her wild sad eyes
So fixed to sleep.

The subject "long hair" became a trademark of femmes fatales, as Percy Shelley wrote: Beware of her; for she excels All women in the magic of her locks
And when she twines them around a young man's neck
She will not ever set him free again.
The selfish hair takes the man captive and deprives him of his freedom. The woman as the absys where the man perishes is only a reflection of the male fear of the knowledge of his own drives. Clytemnestra murdering Agamemnon, Cleopatra giving poison to the condemned or Salome demanding the head of John the Baptist — all these stories and images depict women with a craving for murder, cruel women who bring disaster. The visions of the Symbolists, which depict women as enigmatic hybrids of creatures and humans, lianas and humans, fishes and humans, phoenixes, cicces, nymphs and striae, reveal in their mythological naturalisation of woman the male fear of falling victim to a war of the sexes, or are projections of the man's fear of his own sex life on to the apparent cause of his libidinal urge, namely woman.

The man looks into the absys of his drives, but blames the absys on the woman. Artists from Fernand Khnopff and Odilon Redon to Édouard Munch or Joseph von Sternberg with his film, Blue Angel show themselves as black magicians and vampires. Thus a myth that has evolved that has lasted a century. It focuses on femmes fatales, vamps, dangerous beauty, beauty without pity and the terror of beauty (cf. Rilke). The man is frightened of the libidinal chaos that beauty triggers off in him. True fear is a projection on to beauty itself, on the woman, the aim being to ward off desire. Discovering that he could persist on his own drives, suffer from his own desires and become a victim of his sex life, the man directs his self-projective mechanisms against the woman. The man sets up in culture the myth of the blood-dripping murderess whose victim he is. He projects his own sadistic or masochistic urges on the woman, who arouses and excites the drives latent in him. He thereby either makes himself executioner and the woman the victim (as for example in the mythology of witches, who rob men of reason through their beguiling beauty, i.e. bewitch them) or the man makes the woman the executioner and himself the victim (like Circe, who turns the companions of Odysseus into pigs, or the sirens, whose mellifluous voices lure sailors to destruction in the Straits of Messina). Odysseus is the paradigmatic tale of a rejection of pleasure, the fear of the absys of one's own sex life that can rob a man of his reason, and is thus also a rejection of woman, who is the source of this risk of excessive, fatal, deadly, instinctive arousal.

"But trusts me with ropes till it burns, so that I cannot move and am bound upright to the mast block, tied by the ropes on the mast. And if I beseech you all and command you to release me, you must then bind still more ropes about me."

This is perhaps the quintessence of a masochistic scene. It describes a craving, a craving for pleasure that is refused, absolutely refused. The bondage is painful, but serves to ward off pleasure, thereby replacing pleasure auto-erotically. Bondage — pain — thus itself becomes the source of pleasure and craves still more pleasure, demonstrating that the fetters and constraints become doubled. The protective mechanism (the force, the fetters) against the pleasure that women provide becomes a part-object or fetish, which is preferred to the woman.

At the same time, the Odyssey myth provides information about itself. Painfully bound and tied to the mast, Odysseus is finally captivated by the bondage itself. He recognises that he is himself the dark force, the dangerous drive. He is not in danger but is himself the danger. In Freud's categories of moral and emergent masochism, we can describe the masochistic spora thus: as a moral masochist, Odysseus allows himself to be tied up in order to avert seduction by the woman and his sexual pleasure; as an emergent masochist, it is the woman herself who enjoys the bondage and the making of the woman who is to give him pleasure. That is the paradox of masochism — self-bondage is supposed to prevent pleasure morally but at the same time engenders it physically.

Thus pain develops into pleasure. He gains pleasure from averting it. Pleasure is torment, but torment gives rise to pleasure. The fettered body or the fettered part-parts, from the breast to the phallicus, are symbols and hints of the Odyssey myth. The body is fettered in order to stop it deriving enjoyment. But this fettering, and the experience and sight of it, themselves constitute pleasure. Thus Odysseus remains fettered to enjoyment (pleasure) by being fettered (pain). The fettered body — the expression and instrument of averted pleasure — itself becomes the source of pleasure. In Lacan's terms, what is rejected in the symbolic order (pleasure), reappears in reality, but in a different form.

Flagellation is a similar mechanism of masochism. It was originally a punishment for violating the law, for crimes of commission and omission, i.e. a deterrent and painful warning not to repeat the deed — a moral defensive mechanism, in fact. But exactly as with bondage, flagellation can act as emergent masochism, a source of pleasure. Bondage and flagellation, perhaps the most prevalent forms in the masochistic, follow an economy of maximizing pleasure. The subject enjoys the

The birth of the cruel woman in Sacher-Masoch's Vénus in Furs (1869) must be seen in this context of fateful, deadly women between 1860 and 1910 as a new variant of Odysseus.

The demonisation of women as plants and animals, creatures of the air or sea, sorceresses or murderers, which accorded with the Romantic ideal of women as a residuum of nature in an increasingly industrialised world, corresponds with the demonisation of women as a part of this industrial, machine-based world. The woman as machine or murderer is devoid of pity, devoid of soul. Both machines and murderers are distinguished by coldness, cruelty and soullessness. The beauty of the machine reinforces the beauty of woman and her terrible nature. The fear of machines and fear of women are linked. Whether woman or machine, both are beauties without pity and distribute poison to the condemned, the labour slaves, just like Cleopatra. The "machinisation" of women, which goes hand in hand with a mechanisation of the sex life, the construction of a combinatorial calculus and economy of the sex life, constitutes an even more radical commercialisation of the woman than reification, as the nature of the activity to rob her of sexual reproductive capacity, the quintessential natural quality of woman, as countless models of "bachelor machines" (machines célibataires) by the Dadaist and Surrealists bear out. The Dadaists and Surrealists had no scruples in depicting women as machines. In Surrealism, male desire goes beyond the wish to reduce women to the status of part-objects. On the one hand, the Surrealist heaven is crowded with part-objects and fetishes, from the eyes to the ovaries, the other hand. Surrealism defines women as machines so volubly that the wish-notion that women are like tools, instruments serving male pleasure has an almost compellative effect.

The mechanisation and "machinising" of women corresponds to a machinising of the libido, a rationalisation and technicisation of sexuality in women, which likewise constitutes a defence mechanism and derives from the masochistic phantasy. Especially in Duchamp, this masochistically desexualisation is recognizable in the machine that "serves for sexuality without human genitalia, without biology, flesh or reproduction — in fact, machines célibataires of auto-eroticism."

The notion of women as machines anticipates the molecular ideology of sexuality in an age of cloning technology. Though women are not hereby disembodied, the machines here is a concept which vulgarly reduces
women to nature and an apparently natural function – women as machines are models of a freed subject to the age of industrialisation that must be disarmed by having this birth-giving function removed or devalued. Mechanised women and the depiction of the sex life as mechanical are anticipations of molecular biological reproduction, which can likewise get by without the sensual act and the sexual one. One could therefore say that the naturalisation of women and "machinisation" of women alike derives from a machoarchity. Both are formulations of sexuality in reaction to the industrial age. There is thus a correspondence between this way of thinking and machismo on which Deleuze's concept of machismo in continuation of Surrealism is based. A basic feature and role of the aesthetic of the machoarchitary is the replacement of nature by machines. Thence comes the "coldness", the anorganic aspect, the lifelessness, moonlight and anomie of the machoarchitary universe.

2 Wish-machines and part-objects

Anti-Oedipus, published in 1972 by Félix Guattari and Gilles Deleuze, came up with a theory of machines that turned everything in a machine, from desire to capitalism. In this concept of the machine, the concept of the machine can be understood as an ongoing arrangement of heterogeneous parts that can be anything that develops in the various onomological registers and vehicles and that can also include real objects. The concept of wish-machines combines two different worlds – the mechanism and the organism, the technical and the psychic. The authors have a long tradition behind them. Human behaviour has been described and explained by means of technical metaphors since the 17th century. Freud himself made manifold use of technical metaphors and models to elaborate his theories, and talks of the psychic mechanism, the mental apparatus and psychic automatons, etc. In Deleuze and Guattari, the subject itself is "machinised" with even the unconscious being compared with a machine. For our purposes the reference to a machine is less interesting than the idea of "machinisation" as a critique of the Oedipus complex.

It is shown that the Oedipus complex must be seen as the result of accommodation, socialisation, internalization, and suppression. The metaphysics of the unconscious are crucially analysed for their social and material implications. Formations of the unconscious include paranoia, miracle-machines and machines, wish-machines, wish-machines and bodies without organs. Bodies without organs are generated in the interconnections of wish-machines. The remarkable machine terminology of Anti-Oedipus relates to a conflict between the movements that form the organism and those movements and tendencies that reject any organisation. Melanie Klein's theory of "part-objects", i.e. parts such as mouth and breast, and "organ machine and source machine" in Deleuze, aims to explain what wish-machines that take their places were, i.e. to harmonise the id and ego as effective polarities. It is the role of the phallic to take over the integration of the aggressive part-objects and attune them to each other. The phallic's role is in this not that of an organ but the expression of this integration.

The concept of bodies without organs and organs without bodies goes back to Antonin Artaud, who describes scenes of the "subjective" with them (a neologism made up of "subject" and "projective"). Likewise anti-Oedipal subject models. Artaud himself often used machine metaphors, e.g. "la machine de l'être". Wish-machines and bodies without organs are basic forms of the unconscious. Wish-machines resemble part-objects, which casts the conflict between wish-machines and bodies without organs. Paranoia projects aggression on a part-object that seems dangerous and (for example as a breast) wishes to poison and swallow the subject. In Klein's psychoanalysis, the breast is locked on as the child's most important part-object. But she also mentions the smell, voice, etc. We may recognise from this that the myth of the crue woman is the projection of an aggression in which the woman herself is reduced from her totality to a part-object, because the projecting subject obviously lacks the capacity to synthesise the part-objects. It is evident that the cannibalistic, sadistic aspect occupies the foreground in this projection. Sadistic impulses are projected on to the breast because the latter has previously been transformed into an aggression. The attenuating of aggressive zones by the phallic has failed. The paranoia reflects the resistance of the body without organs to this hierarchical and harmonising order. Instead of the body, it operates within in the integrating function of the phallic, i.e. the general organisation of the organism, and therewith against the primacy of the phallic. Anti-Oedipus, therefore anti-phantastic work, is a "fumée pour Oedipe", as it is called by Ina Ziemele (1979) by Félix Guattari. The theory of bodies without machines endeavours to relativise not only the Oedipus complex but the whole primacy of the phallic organisation of part-objects as well. The theory of the wish-machine is therefore anti-Oedipal and anti-phantastic, and thus amounts to a general theory of part-objects. Klein's analysis of the mouth-breast relationship carries over to other organ relationships, thus eroding the importance of the phallic. Part-objects are understood irrespective of their functional totality of the whole object. Instead of totalisation, the whole object is conceived as diversification. The independent reality of the diverse part-objects replaces the integrating control of the phallic. The part-objects are allowed to develop independent resistances with reality. The phallic becomes one part-object among many other part-objects of equal status. The emancipation of part-objects is particularly clearly discernible in the art of the Surrealists. An organ, from hand to foot, from ear to mouth, from body to leg, are isolated and multiplied. The isolation of part-objects, which amounts to the subjugation and rejection of the phallic, is logically followed by the multiplication of the organs. Instead of one body and one primordial organ, the phallic, the wish-machine disintegates into a multiplicity of organs. The multiplication of the organs is thus the result of the body without organs. The body without organs as a full organism without parts is contrasted with a pure and fragmented disembodied body. This dis-integration into part-objects and bodies without organs demolishes the frontier between the id and the ego, depriving the superego of power. The Freudian drive model with its primacy of genital masculinity and the hegemony of the phallic is criticised. Organ machines (wish-machines, part-objects) become conceivable that can be realised outside of an "organic" body or genital sexuality. The machoarchitary body is a body of this kind.

Every three months a man of about forty-five years old would visit a certain organ institute and pay her ten francs for the following act. The girl had to undress, tie his hands and feet, bandage his eyes, and draw the curtain of the window. Then she would make her guest sit down on a sofa, and leave him there alone in a helpless position. After half an hour the lady had to come back and unbend him. Then the man would pay and leave perfectly satisfied, to repeat his visit in about three months? (Richard von Krafft-Ebing, Psychopathia Sexualis, 1917).

In this machoarchitary pleasure, there is no physical sexual contact, let alone the sexual act. On the contrary – this is an extreme case of sensory deprivation. Lacking physical sexuality, a body without organs realises a primeval sexuality, which in its temporary state of helpfulness may be a reduction to instinctual condition, where the infant does not know if its mother will return. The masochist thereby gets his pleasure from the absence, from a vacuum, from a desideration, from the torment of absence, but not from physical torment and humiliation and not from sexual arousal and the fullness of phallic presence.

These ideas are the basis with which Deleuze shaped his theory of masochism. The prior role of the satisfaction of desire, given by giving preference to the object-relationship. The separation of drive-energy (libido) and apparatus (object) led in Freud to satisfaction – the objective of the drive – being overvaluated. In masochism, satisfaction cannot be looked upon as a loss. The foreground: the libido is no longer primarily in search of pleasure but looking for an object-relationship. The object-relationship itself is as such pleasurable, even in its negativity. A body logic is discernible in masochism that no longer has anything to do with phallicoarchitary logic and its familiar procedures. The phallicarchitary organ organisation falls apart, to be replaced by a flat, democratic, transparent diversity of organs and objects. The drives derived from the part-objects or linked with them are likewise emancipated. Auto-eroticism, the projection of satisfaction-objects onto the self and in which the ego delights, is part of a strategy for dissolving the power of the id and ego and thus an expression of the libidinal drive. Deleuze already described this process in his expression: "Within the realm of masochism: "masochism has a very strange way of desexualising love and sexualizing the whole history of humanity". Part-drives have found their parlours in Surrealism. Though they developed their machine terminology by turning women into machines, this "machinisation" of the unconscious and sex life, particularly in Dali, did away with the despotism of the phallic and signifiers and opened the door to a polymorphous, perverse realm of freedom beyond phallocacy that extends from sexualized objects, symbolic objects and fetish objects to sexualised rooms. The realm of the masochist's predicates ranges from the first-filled rooms of Adolf Lopo to Marek Opperheim's fur-lined cape and the fur-lined cable of Victor Beneur.

3 Fetishism

The part-object is part of a whole, as the term clearly indicates. The breast or the face, the eye or the gaze, the mouth or the voice can feature as parts of a whole body or person. This listing of a number of part-objects shows that we may thus designate not only the body organs themselves but also the activities associated with them and that we can derive part-drives from part-objects.

...
Part-objects are thus more than just enigmatic zones of the body—they can also be functions of the body.

Part-objects in particular, as part-drives are classically taken to be only part-functions, i.e. substitutes and surrogates. The desire that is then directed apparently only at these substitutes generates the fetish object and is degraded because it seemingly lacks the whole of the body and person. Fetish objects constitute those famous obscene objects of desire whose lovers enjoy some notoriety, because extreme fetichism counts as a perversion. Love of a woman is valued as positive, love of her breast less so, but love of her bra or the water she washed her breasts in that morning is completely despised.

The question then is whether the gaze only substitutes the presence of the body or whether the gaze is not itself the whole object that merited love and desire. Can the eye only act as an agent, as a representative of and substitute for the body? Whose body, whose subject? Is it not the case that art shows us—as for example in François Villon's famous line: "I am so well for your strawberry mouth"—that the mouth is loved for itself, independently of the subject who says these words?

Is it not the case that the history of 20th-century art and its ethos is at least in part based on the historical moment in 1927 when Freud published his basic work on fetishism—suggests that part-objects, from the eyes to the toes, from the bottom to the legs, from the hands to the chin, are objects capable of being admired and desired for themselves? This isolation and absolutism of part-objects as whole objects in the terms of the masochistic phantasy might form a central contribution to a study of sexuality that could form a basis for understanding consumer fetishism as exploited commercially in the industrialized world. Body-image and contemporary fashion and the ideal physics achieved by specific body calls (e.g. body-building), it is evident that pleasure in torment is a universal pre-requisite for attaining the socially conditioned ideal ego, thereby providing the ego with the power to subject the id to the sexual superego. The fantasies presented in the mass media reveal a contemporary society that is structured in a profoundly masochistic way. In Lacan’s theory, the unconscious is structured like a language. Deleuze and Guattari developed this idea, claiming that the unconscious is structured as a machine (L’Evénement machinique, 1979, by F. Guattari).

This machine-like character reveals itself as a masochistic engine in all contemporary society. Most fantasies in contemporary fashion and the mass media, from the fascination with telemarketry to the food of Benetton advertising posters, are masochistic in origin and masochistic in pleasure do not need a partner, an opposite, togetherness, an accomplice, as Baudelaire so strikingly observes: "What makes love so tiresome is the circumstance that it is a crime that cannot be committed without accomplices." Because of this specific nature of part-objects, masochism is close to the phenomena of narcissism and sadism.

In the sexualized universe of the fetishist and lover of part-objects, almost any object can become a sexual object, from the spoon that takes the soup to the mouth to the shoe horn. Desire glides over part-objects as it does over the chain of ordinary objects, which is a chain of substitution (body, foot, shoe). The independence gained by part-objects really requires a re-designation. In this new scheme in which part-objects are no longer part pro toto for the body as a whole, we should not speak of part-objects any more but whole objects, i.e. drive-objects or wish-objects. Part-objects and fetish objects are therefore the delicious "wish-machines" of Deleuze and Guattari. The most famous inhabitant of this paranoid planet of delicious wish-machines was Salvador Dali, whose artistic universe remains to this day the most comprehensive expression of the masochistic phantasy, the universe that Freud called "poly-morphous-perversion." Andy Warhol’s silver aesthetic is more or less the same, and thus the inanimate object has to be found to alleviate the distress of this separation. That would be the function of fetish objects and substitutions.

We see the fetish nature of the product world (Coca Cola and body world) (high heels) from Andy Warhol to Allen Jones without acknowledging its fetish character. We could designate part-objects, like unreferenced, free-floating signifiers of the sign world (Baudrillard), as free-floating signifiers of the object and body world that do not refer to the whole body. Fetish objects are free-floating objects that are not subject to the symbolic ordering and hierarchical arrangement of the phallus. On the contrary, they represent a disruption of the symbolic order. Part-drives are guerillas in the phallocentric system—they blow it up and destroy it, sabotage it and overcome it. Voyeurs and boot fetishists move on a satellite that no longer revolves around the sun of the phallus. Fetish objects travel alone in a universe on the basis of other zones, notably the object world and not the phallus. Annual triggered off by fetish objects can but does not have to end in genital enjoyment. Looking at photos of the objects of desire or liking shoes as three-dimensional images of the objects of desire are pleasures in themselves, leading to an existence in an absolute state of non-recognizing and does not have to end in genital pleasure. Thus basically masochism and skin, pierced skin—are these all involve a frontier, the frontier between system and environment, inside and outside, the self and the other. The skin is the frontier, the location where masochism endeavour to establish a balance between the ego and the world, but also between the id, ego and superego. They shift the battle between the conflicting parties from within as far to the outside as possible, to this outermost frontier, namely the skin, because they know no other way of putting up with or overcoming this battle.

"Always for the first of every new series my head would be pulled round, to see how a hard white ridge, like a railway, darkening slowly into crimson, leaped over my skin at the instant of each stroke, with a head of blood where two ridges crossed... I remembered the corporeal kicking with his nailed boot to get me up; and this was true, for the next day my right side was dark and lacerated, and a damned ribbon did each breath radiate over me. I remembered smiling idly at him, for a delicious warmth, probably sexual, was swelling through me then and that he flung up his arm and hacked with the full length of his whip into my groin." (E. L. Lawrence, Seven Pillars of Wisdom, 1926).

This quotation speaks from a masterpiece of masochism that describes the body as a "breathing phantom," and tells of desires to be beaten down, deliverance from torment and the cruel pride in humiliation and injury. He did not like the idea of the "stiffened blood" in the condemned man's skin with a bullet or whip... These words clearly describe the skin as the scene of writing and the law, of symbolic order, the name-of-the-father and the Oedipus myth. This frontier becomes unstable in its masochism, because they do not accept the symbolic order, the father's name remains empty and they replace the Oedipus myth with the machine myth. The frontier has therefore to be reinforced by a second skin.

The most shocking pictures of masochists are those when they wear whip and nobody rubber boots and give each other artificial respiration through tubes. They thereby acknowledge their total interdependences. They exist only for each other, admitting the weakness of their ego. Their masochism is connected to their sexual, and has on the contrary a profoundly extracultural dimension. They exist as breathing phantasms—that is the real import of the "Phantom of Desire" title of the present project.

It is said that the ego-lessness of masochists are poorly defined, the relevant consequences have to be accepted. The very fact that the frontiers are so weak relocates the conflict of driving forces between Eros and Thanatos—the forces that generate life and those that tend to destroy it—towards this frontier. The very fact that this frontier is so weak enables energies to penetrate
unhindered from outside inwards or from within to the outside. Masochism therefore experience an unusual diffusion outwards or armour themselves inwardly in unusual fashion. In every case they need a second skin.

That is what they wish for with the greater longing - an artificial second skin constructed and controlled by themselves that is as impermeable as possible, as closed as possible and as firm and invariable as possible in order to protect their all too vulnerable, unprotected natures. This takes them always in with a second skin, armour themselves with leather or metal, either partially or wholly, depending on their instability. They are focused on leather from head to foot, or armour themselves with real metal as Coseriu suffered with whalebone are a similar sort of armour, a second artificial skin to protect the first skin. From the laced-in-bodice of the Empress Elizabeth of Austria, which when imitated by the lower classes led to the legendary whip-waist of fin-de-siécle Vienna, to the loose metallic dresses of Paco Rabanne; from the silver leather cloths of Courrèges to the plastic cloths of Mary Quant, from the faced-up clothes of Versace (remember the legendary occasion Elizabeth Hurley turned up at the Cowars wearing a dress only held together at the side by a huge safety pin) to the safety pins, piercings and tattoos of punk culture that have encroached on the sophisticated world of haute couture and fashion models; from the ankle-length dresses of Helmut Lang, who communicates the vulnerability of the second skin by suggestions of sticking plaster and small slits and invites an invasion, to the clothes that only consist of slits and glimpses anyway, like for example Christina Aguilera in her music video Dirrty. Fashion is nothing but a single gigantic second-skin industry that in the second half of the 20th century subscribed completely to the aesthetics of masochism, not to mention the frenzy of plastic surgery, which like masochism has trod the path from horror cases to normal thing.

At the frontier of the second skin and its masks and at the frontier of the first skin and its dramas - because tattoos, piercings, etc. are small theatrical events on the surface of the skin, the skin itself being the stage - then the laws takes place: submission and rebellion.

Masochism and power
(Kant with Sade, Hegel with Masoch)

A critique of the bourgeois subject as constructed by Kant and the Enlightenment via the work of Sade has taken two approaches. Sade can be analysed with Kant, as Adorno and Horkheimer did in The Dialectics of the Enlightenment (1944/69); or Kant analysed with Sade, as Lacan did in 1963 in his essay Kant with Sade. In both cases, the aim was to show the consequences of structuring the subject as master, as "reason without obligation by others", i.e. the issue was unchecked subjectivisation, which as a form of power has paradoxical features and extreme consequences. If we continue our previous arguments, we can recognise a post-phallic practice in masochism in which not so much taking part in a power situation is as doing away with it, or at least the conditions in which power operates. Sexuality as a mirror of social aspects means discovering new, anti-Oedipal subject models in masochism. A post-phallic masochism is for example discernible in the theories of Judith Butler (The Psychic Life of Power Theory in Subjectivity, 1997), where she accounts for the subject not in domination but in subjection, as a development of Hegelian theories about the relationship between master and servant.

In the first half of the 20th century, the theoricians from Ivan Bloch to Sigmund Freud looked more at the clinical aspects of masochism as an individual drive complex. With Theodor Reik's definitive work of 1940, Aus Leiden Freuds. Masochismus und Gesellschaft (Masochism in Modern Man, New York, 1941) more emphasis was put on the cultural forms and social structures of masochism. This was possible on the basis of Freud's views, which themselves had undergone manifold changes. Freud called masochism one of the most common and important of all perversion. According to him, masochism takes three forms: 1. as an attitude to life, as moral masochism, which in the form of neuroses as the determining factors is not restricted to individuals but can undermine the life of social groups, nations and religious communities; 2. as an expression of female nature, as feminine masochism, which is typified by quasi-female characteristics, and 3. as a displacement, masochism as sexual perversion, sexual excitement connected with areas of the body that we call erogenous zones, and particular strata of the body which also permit sexual pleasure as a by-product even during pains and avarice. To these three, he added "social masochism", and endeavoured to build a bridge between masochism as a sexual perversion, or compulsion and an attitude to life imposing submissive and suffering behaviour on the ego. The name of this bridge in his theory is the feeling of guilt, because culture forces all of us to suppress aggressive drives, and as they are suppressed, so the unconscious guilt feeling grows. The exaggerated feeling of guilt about our own aggressive thoughts and power-hungry pleasures gives rise to a need for punishment, and thereby a readiness for suffering and avarice. Prirations and sacrifices, asceticism and martyrdom accompany the development of every cultured person as a masochistic fantasy in the conflict between the demands of our drives and social expectations. In 1967, Gilles Deleuze - by gomd-staking work Pénétration de Sacher-Masoch. Le feind et le crat (Cranden and Cruelty) appeared, presenting a different Sacher-Masoch, in which the complementarity of sadism and masochism was rigorously contested.

If therefore the most successful fashion of the 20th century is masochistic, it can only be successful because it encourages and serves the masochistic needs of the population. The unleashed masochistic aesthetics of fashion stem from the unleashed masochism of society. Masochism replaces sadism as the dominating social structure that dominates the formation and constitution of subjects. There is cause therefore to ponder upon new models of the subject that draw their legitimacy not from mastery but from submission.

When Deleuze asserts "there are not so much masochistic phantasms as a masochistic technique of phantasms", this applies exactly to Hegel's famous passage about the relationship between master and servant in the Phenomenology of Spirit. Clearly Butler also bases her model of the subject on Hegel's sentences: "Self-consciousness amines in satisfaction only in another self-consciousness, it is a self-consciousness for a self-consciousness. They acknowledge each other as mutually acknowledging each other."

With this concept of acknowledgement, the doubling of self-consciousness in its unity. Butler puts the construct of acknowledgement in place of Foucault's power construct, transforming a theory of power, into a theory of acknowledgment. She knows that Hegel himself developed his theory of self-consciousness from the power construct, i.e. the relationship between master and servant.

"They are thus two opposed forms of consciousness: one of them the independent one for which the essence is self-subistence, the other the non-independent one, in which life or being are for another, the former being the negation of the latter."

Hegel accusses the master of being a "purely negative power" because the master has the consciousness of being only for himself, the self-subistence. Hegel demands that acknowledgement should mean mutual acknowledgement, and that self-consciousness only attains satisfaction in another self-consciousness, i.e. the master lacks the reflection in the consciousness of the servant.

"But an element is missing for real acknowledgement, namely that the master does to others what he also does to himself, and what the servant does to himself he also does to others. It is a one-sided and unequal acknowledgement that has arisen thereby."

In the case of the master, no bipolar acknowledgement is possible with no power with a bipolar structure, but an asymmetrical, unipolar exercise of power, an one-sided and unequal power politics. In so far, it is the servant who gives up this feeling of self-subistence and is ready to grant others what he allows himself. He is in possession of real independent consciousness, as his self-consciousness is doubled in unity, to be his own doing as well as the doing of others, to be therefore the self-consciousness of another self-consciousness. Hegel therefore comes to the astonishing insight that constitutes the axial basis of any revolution and a central axiom of the masochistic universe:

"The truth of independent consciousness is accordingly the servant's conscious father's play.

When therefore at the beginning of Venus in Furis the hero meets his goddess in a dream, and, rudely awakened, a book by Hegel drops from his hand, it could not be clearer whom the author considers the source of his universe and his universe, namely, if Hegel turns up in such a central position right at the beginning, i.e. as a key to decode the dream with, it is advisable to follow up the author's clue and to see in the apparently erotic riddle of Venus in Furis an utopian plan for overcoming the historical master-servant relationships and an outline for new models of the subject beyond classical subjectivity as Judith Butler does convincingly in her book."

The political interpretation of Sacher-Masoch's novel is still made easier and backed up by the insistence on the dream character of the first meeting with Venus. Dreams are transformation techniques, linguistically woven on the model of condensation and displacement, genuine masochistic masochism, as transformation objects, dreams are windows on their origins. The metonymical reading of dreams can be illuminated from a well-known dream. If the son dreams he is sitting on a horse and wearing his father's suit, it is clear that he would want to be the master. The second skin, the suit that hugs the body of the son depeles a metonymic process, indicating that the son would like to be the body of the father having the reins firmly in his hand and directing the horse. The dream is thus a typical Oedipal dream tending towards paradise.

In the dream of the Venus in Furis hero, the second skin is a far, as the title suggests. But where does this far come from, and who is it that demands it? The masochist does not love Venus naked, and does not love the far by itself.
either, quasi as a metonymic, contiguous representative, as a part-object of Venus, as he might love her stockings, hair, underpants, boots, shoes and bodice as well, but loves both at once, Venus and her fur. The furry skin of a creature living in Nordic coldness neither justifies the layin of the chain of signifiers, "coldness" and "crueity". It is a false tale that the author himself sets us on again and again, but it does have the benefit of confirming our original, initial thesis that the woman as an economic and social environment. His childhood was marked, perhaps even branded and dominated, by large, fine, heavy furs, i.e. those worn by the Slav gentry, members of the ruling class. He thus transferred the fur coats of the masters, the gentry (as bedsof a dream as a transference mechanism) to the slaves who at that time occupied the status of slaves in the social hierarchy, i.e. women. In the age of industrial revolution, only the male body counted. Women's bodies were only needed for biological reproduction. To keep to the dream vision, Sachse-Masoch transferred the male suit on to the woman, the master's suit on to the servant, and thereby trained, declared and empowered the slave into a mistress. This is how the image of the pre- and post-Oedipal power of the mother arises, the phallic mother with a man's power, to whom the son subjects himself as a slave in order not to lose her. The constuction of the cruel woman could also mean however that Sachse-Masoch's aim was a servant's revolution in the sense outlined by Hegel, whose book the dreamer was holding, in his hand as he dreamed. While the masochist transfers power to the servant during the process of mutual acknowledgement and by means of his power empowers the other to exercise power as well, there arises in masochism for the first time a vision of bipolar power, a model hitherto inconceivable. Power here does not mean domination, the subjection of someone else, control of another, but in giving the other the power to which I temporarily subject myself, I also receive power, albeit with the risk that the other party may fall to honour the contract. This structure of bipolar power in masochistic destrous, disrupts and liquidates the former power model of sadism. Masochism is therefore more than the consciousness of subjection but the vision of a post-phallic power model, the smashing of the rule of the phallos. The 20th century was de Sade's century. The 21st century will be Sachse-Masoch's century.

---

HANS-JÜRGEN DÖPP

The Mortar

For centuries, in the iconography of the Christian Occident "the woman" was considered a tool of the devil. In the book of Genesis, which appeared in 1900 (see Phantoms der Luft, vol. II, p. 49), it is the monstrous male sex organ that is presented as an instrument of devilsh destruction, operated by two malicious, laughing giants — giant when compared to the two Liliput-like women. The one in the back could have arisen from the criminal records of Lombracco; whereas the one in front, with a bat's pointy ears and claw-like fingertips, shows the traits of a siren, an antique precursor to the Christian devil. These faces are ugly, yet this coarse ugliness is the expression of a psychotic disposition: the sadistic hatred of "the wench".""The wench?" In contrast to the mono- linic phallos, she appears as a threatening multitude. Many against one: the multitude is a constant expression of threat as it is, an undefined mass. The female is fantasized as something unmanned, unstructured, formless, which is opposed by the phallos, a clear exclamation mark of unity. The destructive desire of the two fiats must be fed by this threat. In particular, the exact phallos was considered the symbolic Vomсоедин Column of proud masculinity. But here, suppression of the woman turns into extermination. A victory that rests on the destruction of the other—in order to avoid being destroyed oneself! This violence lacks the sovereignty of the ancient patriarchies. Even earlier, in ancient religions that honored the fertility cult, the phallos was constantly a symbol of progressive power. Here, in contrast, it is an instrument for the destruction of all that is living. What is it in man that so greatly intensifies the feeling of being threatened? Here, in the print gives us an almost word-for-word hint: it is two hands that reach into the print from the left and lead the little female bodies into the mortar. "Emancipation": "Out of the hands of the master": is the beginning of woman's subjugation in the nineteenth century that gives the men such fear? The phallos's over- dimensionality can also be explained by this fear — as a complement to the threat of castration, which was felt through the size of the women. We know images of the idealization of the woman under patriarchy images that elevate her to chaste icons, spiritual and beautiful. Here, however, we experience the reverse of this idealization: the woman is devalued through de-individualization and mass proportions. Are these two sides of the same coin? The phallic lies in genital function. The fact that the women are pounded into dust in a mortar makes them equivalent to monstrous excrement. Within the triunity of fear, hatred, and destruction, the organ is given an anal function. As a man, the knowledge of feeling sexually at the same time dependent on the woman can result in hatred of one's own instincts, which is expressed as male self-hatred. This is the deeper reason for the ugliness of the Guillain figures represented here! In this graphic, the real dimensions are reversed into their opposition: that which is fantasized as a great threat is made smaller, and that which for fear threatens to shrink to the smallest size is made larger. This are the mechanisms of dream work as Freud describes them in his concurrently published book, The Interpretation of Dreams. The graphic depiction of the sheet follows a logic comparable with a dream. Freud saw the dream's essential formal characteristics in his graphic qualities. Flowing into the dream are mainly all elements that have a connection to non-integrated scenes in the unconscious. Here, the dream logic, which determined many works arising at the turn of the century, can offer insight into the "underworld", below the "official" culture. The emerging field of psychoanalysis can light a way into the darkness of the soul — and discovered an abyss: An abyss that showed itself independent of the soul, and at the same time in other cultural manifestations. Therefore, these works are not to be interpreted only in terms of individual psychologys but either in terms of personal experiences of the times. The fact that such inscrutable works, that so openly reveal the non-integrated, are at the same time banned and persecuted, corresponds with the logic of the real world. Erotic art is the bridge that suggested fear, power, and destruction at the beginning of a new century which on the surface dream optimistically of a world full of technical progress and feasibility.Yet only a few were capable of interpreting art's heavy dreams as a warning sign. After "the picture: a remark. It shows a little cancer dancing figure, completely full of life and playful, who, turned away from the viewer, has long, long wavy hair and receiver to the phallos, as though awaiting good things from it. She is unaware of the devilish, exterminating game of the "battle of the sexes" in which she finds herself. Otto Gersten's grotesque sheet leads the ideology of masculinity ad absurdum.