

Volume 8, n 2, 2020

Psychotherapy

Lacanian Perverse Structure and Disavowal Mechanism: A Clinical Examination

Özlem Kabraman-Erkuş¹

Abstract

Perversion is one of the three fundamental diagnostic categories that Lacan has proposed. In perversion, the first paternal function is achieved so that the alienation takes place, however, the secondary father function, “The name of the father” is not recognized, thus the person cannot be separated from their mother. This subject is included in the symbolic system with alienation, but the subject’s position is the mother’s object of enjoyment due to not being separated. Disavowal is seen as the mechanism in the formation of perversion, while defence mechanisms are defined as one’s reactions to castrate. In the disavowal mechanism, the person both knows and rejects castration. Hence, one can accept two opposing ideas at the same time. The main purpose of this study is to exemplify the disavowal mechanism in the therapy process by compiling information about Lacanian perverse structure and disavowal mechanism, while sharing information for therapy process by summarizing a case using the disavowal mechanism. Therefore, in this article, Lacanian perverse structure and the mechanism of disavowal will be explained. Then, a case that was formulated in this framework will be introduced and the mechanism of disavowal will be exemplified. In the last part of the article, recommendations for the therapy process will be given.

¹ Department of Psychology, Başkent University, Ankara, Turkey

E-mail corresponding author: ozlemke@baskent.edu.tr



Keywords:

Perversion; Disavowal; Defence mechanism; Lacanian perverse structure.

Received: 12 December 2019

Accepted: 2 August 2020

Published: 13 August 2020

Citation: Kabraman-Erkuş, Ö. (2020). Lacanian Perverse Structure and Disavowal Mechanism: A Clinical Examination. *Mediterranean Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 8(2). <https://doi.org/10.6092/2282-1619/mjcp-2283>

1. Introduction

Jacques Lacan suggests three fundamental categories of diagnosis, these are namely, neurosis, perversion and psychosis (Lacan, 1998). These three basic structures show different patterns in terms of their position in the symbolic system, their relation with the Other, and their defence mechanisms (Verhaegle, 2008). Since the focal point of this article is the disavowal defence mechanism in perversion and perverse structure, other structures will be summarized and the perverse structure will be explained in detail. Later, the described concepts will be elaborated through a case example.

By looking at the normal developmental stages, the child is initially in a passive position and requires the attention of the mother (or another primary caregiver). In other words, during this period, the child is a passive object of the mother and starts establishing his/her identity by entering into the symbolic system through the process of alienation (Verhaegle, 2008). According to Lacan, alienation is one of the determining factors in the process of subject formation. Moreover, Lacan defines alienation as the division of subject, i.e., one's alienation from one's self (Lacan, 1998). The existence of alienation occurs through the establishment of the first paternal function. In this state, the father says 'no', to the pleasure that comes from contact between mother and child. This is also called the 'The No of the Father'. Through alienation, the subject begins to exist in language which causes a division between consciousness and unconsciousness, while 'the Other' exists. Psychosis is not an achieved process of alienation, although it is established in perversion and neurosis (Fink, 1997).

Once the basic identity is established, the child is directed towards a more active position. This activity is caused by the separation from the mother. The paternal function plays an important role in ensuring that the child takes the required action for the next stage (Verhaegle, 2008). This phase occurs through recognition of the secondary paternal function, in other words "Name of the Father" (Lacan, 1997). Through the symbolization of 'the lack' of the mother, the child begins to dissociate from being a source of jouissance of the mother (Swales, 2012). The symbolization of the lack of the mother is established by giving it a name, thus the lack is constructed. This lack may be named by the father, or the father himself can be seen as the name of the mother's desire (Fink, 1997). What is important here is that the mother's desire moves away from the child onto something or someone else (e.g. career, husband) (Heyer, 2015). While the perverse structure recognizes the primary paternal function, the secondary paternal function is not being provided. Moreover, separation does not occur as alienation occurs in perverse structure (Fink, 1997; Lacan, 1962).

The most important factor in the occurrence of secondary paternal function is the mother's desire towards the father (Verhaegle, 2008). The first possible cause for the failure to provide a secondary paternal function, could be that the mother acts in a manner that apparently recognizes the father's symbolic authority while at the same time, she undermines that authority. The mother creates a place between the child and herself where the father will be isolated and his authority will not reach this place. Thus, the child is hesitant concerning the role of the father, since the mother refers to the authority of the father, and at the same time the authority is underestimated by her as well. Because of this dilemma, the father's law will be known only as a symbolic value in the perverse structure. In other words, the father's law is recognized, but there is no consequence and value of this law and it can be changed by the

mother's request (Andre, 2006). Another possible cause of the failure to provide a secondary paternal function can be when the mother is dissatisfied with her husband, and so she tries to obtain satisfaction from the children. The mother tends to prefer her son over her daughter to obtain this satisfaction. In the case where the mother overestimates the child, the child may be adhered to it and may be resistant to interventions aiming to separate himself/herself from the mother. Another reason for the failure of the secondary paternal function is that the father can be reluctant and uninterested in terms of interfering with the relationship between the mother and the child. This situation may lead to a similar effect, either when the father does not believe in the establishment of the authority over the child, or he leaves all this establishment to the mother (Fink, 1997).

What is critical in the father's role is to name, embody, and represent the mother's desire, lack and sexual difference. Instead of the physical being, the important thing here is the establishment of the symbolic function of the father figure (Fink, 1997). This symbolic function must be provided in order for the separation to be created.

In failure of the separation, the mother puts the child in the position of a passive object to make herself complete. Then, the child stays under the control of the mother, subsequently being part of the mother (Verhaegle, 2008). An illusion of 'no lack' of the mother appears in the presence of the child and vice versa (Andre, 2006). For this reason, people in the perverse structure often feel themselves as a part of their mother, not as separate entities (Welldon, 1988). In other words, the subject position of the child is as the object of the mother's enjoyment. The subject is in complete identification with the object of the Other's enjoyment, which is the object that will clog its lack (the mother's lack). For a person with a neurotic structure, becoming a source of enjoyment for the Other is an undesirable position, and moreover, this is what the pervert subject desires (Verhaeghe, 2008).

The term of perversion brings to mind sexual deviations (Freud, 1953), committing certain judicial offenses and violation of laws and regulations. But not every person in the perverse structure may fall into trouble so that they would become a forensic case. This distinction is important in terms of defining the differences between pervert behaviour and perverse structure. An important point here is that since the structures are defined on a spectrum, every perverse structure may not be identical (Grossman, 2015; Pires et al., 2005; Verhaeghe, 2008). Also, every person could have or exhibit some degree of pervert traits (Gunn, 2018). Although pervert fantasies can be seen in many people, they are not considered to be perversions unless they turn into behaviours (Khan, 1979). Sexual deviation and forensic conditions may be common in the perverse structure, but these are neither sufficient nor necessary criteria for

diagnosis (Verhaeghe, 2008; Willemsen et al., 2015). Perversion is a structure that emerges due to an opposition to the law and lack (Swales, 2012; Van Haute, 2016), hence, sexual deviations or judicial offense can only be seen as a consequence of this structure, and not a condition (Lacan, 1966; Verhaeghe, 2008).

2. Disavowal

The categories of diagnosis proposed by Lacan are structural categories based on three basic, and radically different defence mechanisms. According to Lacan (2010), neurosis is based on repression; perversion is based on disavowal; and psychosis is based on foreclosure. Repression is related to the negation of the subject's demonstration by itself, and similarly, disavowal is the negation of the phallus and foreclosure is the negation of the father (Miller, 1996). According to Freud, repression is a mechanism leading to the formation of neurosis, rather than accompanying it (Freud, 1957). Also, the mechanism of disavowal of the pervert does not merely accompany perversion, but the system leads to the formation of it (Fink, 1997; Freud, 1927). As stated in Lacanian theory, the distinctive criterion of perverse structure is the recognition of the disavowal mechanism and its reflection on one's life (Willemsen et al., 2015).

Defence mechanisms are used to deal with anxieties (Freud, 1936). The subject feels anxiety for dissatisfying the phallic desire of the Other in the existence of castration. On the other hand, during the lack of castration, the subject feels anxiety for satiating it excessively. The subject in a perverse structure feels anxiety to satisfy the desire of the Other excessively. As Freud's definition of the lack of castration states, the person is positioned as a complete solution to the mother's phallic desire because of his/her subject formation (Verhaeghe, 2008).

According to Freud, in the mechanism of disavowal, when the boy first realizes that girls do not have penises, the boy denies this fact and continues to believe that they do. Hence, the absence of a penis implies castration to him. The castration he sees in the Other reminds him of his own body's castration, which is disavowed (Freud, 1923). In perverse structure, the child believes to be positioned as the substitute for the mother's phallus, thus accepting that castration causes a contradiction in terms of his own position. Moreover, the child does not want to give up his position (Freud, 1927). Whilst Freud defines the concept of disavowal as peculiar to fetishism, a form of perversion, Lacan extends this to the whole perverse structure (Willemsen et al., 2015). As stated in Lacanian theory, disavowal is one of the reactions to castration, along with repression and foreclosure. In disavowal, the subject is aware of the existence of what he has disavowed. In other words, the person in the perverse structure does

not completely reject the castration, but instead recognizes and disavows it at the same time (Evans, 1996).

While Freud defines the disavowal mechanism as denial of the absence of the penis in women, Lacan expands this definition to deny the absence of the Other's imaginer and the symbolic phallus (Willemsen et al., 2015). According to Lacan, a traumatic encounter is to recognize that the cause of desire is a lack (Christensen & Muhr, 2018; Lacan, 1962, 2007). Therefore, disavowal is to reject the fact that the lack causes the desire, and also to believe that desire is based on the existence of something (Dickson, 2011; Evans, 1996).

The imaginary phallus is an erect penis image that symbolizes desire and sexual satisfaction. However, in the neurotic structure, this imaginary phallus is castrated by the wish of the family, where in return it becomes the pleasure that the child gives up. Here, the pleasure the child attains from his own body and the pleasure he has in relation to his mother are both castrated. The neurotic structure receives a symbolic phallus, while it also gives up the imaginary phallus. The symbolic phallus contains signifiers with symbolic meanings to earn the desire of the Other. Therefore, in the neurotic structure, the child abandons pleasure and maintains his relationship with the Other, in order to achieve symbolic success. On the contrary, a person in the perverse structure makes a different allocation at this point, where he determines something, which represents an imaginary phallus, and thus he sets the imaginary phallus with this representation. Moreover, he is aware of the demand to abandon this desire without serious consideration, and thus he disavows this request (Willemsen et al., 2015).

All the defence mechanisms that Lacan refers to are related to paternal function. For instance, disavowal is related to the castration or separation function of the father, meaning that the disavowal mechanism can be described as the reaction of the child to the father's demand to abandon pleasure. For perversion, it is not only refusing the demand, but also making the Other bring the law or make himself the law. By doing this, the subject tries to establish the unachieved separation, hence the aim is to alleviate the anxiety of not being separated (Fink, 1997). However, according to Freud, giving up the first object of desire allows the person to enter the symbolic system (Freud, 1938). For a perverse person, the existence of the phallic lack is denied by the disavowal mechanism. This causes an inevitable division in a perverse subject's life. The subject adopts a dual situation: As he thinks that there is no phallic lack (for himself and his mother), he also thinks that there is lack (for everyone else, including the father). Because of this dual situation, the pervert lives in a strictly divided world in which the rules are both recognized and rejected at the same time (Penney, 2012; Verhaeghe, 2008). There are two divided scenes in the world of a pervert subject, namely, the public and the

private scenes. The public scene can be defined as the appearance of the subject in his social life together with rules and authority. As a contrast, the rules are changed and ordered in the private scene (Andre, 2006). However, there is no connection between these two scenes (Verhaeghe 2008).

Because of the structure of disavowal, each perverse symptom involves a duality: Yes, and no at the same time. This situation is also reflected in the speech of the pervert subject, so that in a conversation 'yes' and 'no' may be replaced by one other (Verhaeghe, 2008). The structures which have been described by Lacan, reflect the subject's position with symbolic order and also his relationship with language (Fink, 1996; Lacan, 2013). In a conversation, this contradictory attitude of the subject in the perverse structure is an example of the subject's relation with symbolic order and language (Verhaeghe, 2008). In perversion, there may be contradictory considerations at the same time, due to a splitting in the ego. For instance, a woman having or not having a penis can be considered valid by the same person at the same time (Fink, 1997).

Disavowal is manifested in all the relations of the pervert subject with the Other and the authority. There is nothing lacking in the pervert's own world and he imposes his own rules onto the Other. Consequently, according to the pervert, the existing rules are valid for anyone but himself and his mother (Verhaegle, 2008). According to a pervert person's view, the rules of the Other are to challenge him or to leave him in a weak position, which are the rules that only other people must obey. The rules are stretched or put aside in almost every relationship these subjects have. When he brings his own rules instead of following others, he wants to make sure that the Other is aware of this situation. Hence, he puts the Other in a weaker position (Verhaeghe, 2008). For this reason, the existence of the Other is important for the pervert, but observation is the only function the Other carries (Miller, 1996). During his actions, the pervert also uses the disavowal mechanism against his own roles. He denies the passive position, which is the object of the Other's pleasure he is in and imagines himself as a controller who is in the active position (Swales, 2012). Also, pervert subjects could push others to bring the law, which the pervert will not obey (Fink, 1997; Lacan, 2016). The pervert subject could take jouissance (enjoyment) from this process (Heron, 2020).

The main purpose of this article is to review information about Lacanian perverse structure with disavowal mechanism and to explain these concepts by giving an example from the therapy process. So far in this paper, a brief literature was presented. In the following sections, the perverse structure, and especially the disavowal mechanism will be exemplified through a case. To my current knowledge, there is no study in the literature, which explains a case from

the aspect of Lacanian perverse structure with a focus on the disavowal mechanism. Therefore, this paper aims to become a guiding resource for new psychotherapists, as it contains therapeutic recommendations together with a case study.

3. Case Example: Mr. A.

The therapy sessions that were conducted with the case were done so under supervision within a clinical psychology Ph.D. program in a University. Prior to the interviews, the participant was informed and accepted that his information could be used in scientific publications with his real identity hidden and informed consent was obtained.

Mr. A. was 32 years old, single and working as an engineer. He stated that his reasons for applying to the clinic were due to his complaints of anxiety and anger. The case formulation of Mr. A. was made according to the Lacanian perverse structure. However, this is not a psychiatric diagnosis, but one of Lacan's definitions of personality structure (Parker, 2010). Additionally, this diagnostic system does not ignore the importance of one's subjectivity. These diagnostic systems offer a structure, but within this structure, the subjectivity of the people determines the therapy process. During the therapy sessions, the therapist's feelings are also used to understand the person (Rustin, 2003). The diagnosis was made according to subject position, relation with the law, and main defence mechanism of the case. In the following paragraphs, the case will be explained in the context of the personality structure. Lastly, examples of the disavowal and their effects on the therapy process will be explained.

In early sessions, Mr. A's expectations from the therapy process were asked and Mr. A. had answered by saying "I depend on you" and had also stated that he wanted to be a social man. After gaining insight about the concept of the personality structure, Mr. A.'s previous statements were found to be compatible with the pervert structure. When asked about his expectations from therapy, (as a desire), Mr. A. had difficulty answering this question. This was related to the pervert subject's subject position, as the object of the Other's desire (Lacan, 1998, 2011a), he/she does not investigate his/her own desire (Bernardes, 2005), and hence he/she may not have his/her own desire to express.

Mr. A. has described himself as: 'A person who is religious, trying to be religious' and has said that he also had a religious family. He stated that his father was a soldier, a repressive, hard-tempered and unfriendly person and his mother was a housewife. He expressed his closeness with his mother by saying, "My mother is over-sensitive and I feel I should be protecting her" and "Her children live away from her, I have to give up my private life". Mr. A. has stated that he had an older sister and a little brother, and added that Mr. A. was the only one who did not

disobey or defy his mother. Then, he had uttered that his sister and brother were living away from their house, and claimed that Mr. A. was the only one who could not overcome his family's restrictions because he is living with his mother. Mr. A.'s relationship with his mother demonstrates a clear example of a perverse's relationship with their mother. He has 'given up' his life because of his mother.

He has explained that the oppressiveness of his father affected all the family activities they did; even at picnics, there would be a chain of command. Although Mr. A. stated that he was obeying his father's rules, he would sometimes intentionally make his father get angry, break the rules and try to escape his punishment by pretending to sleep. These examples seem to be contradicting with his statement. The symbolic value of the father's rules is recognized in the perverse structure, but as can be seen from this example, in practice these rules have no validity (Swales, 2012). Moreover, this is an example of the perverse force, where the Other brings the rules but he cannot obey them in any way (Fink, 1997; Lacan, 2016). The apparent acceptance of the rules in the perverse structure causes problems in Mr. A.'s daily life. Mr. A. has stated that he was following the rules, but when the example he has told was analyzed, one can infer that he does not obey the rules. Moreover, he stated that a rule must fit with his own logic in order for him to comply with that rule. For example, in a library section at a cafe, he has said that he spoke very loud on the phone even though he saw someone else was working and noticed a sign stating 'please be quiet'. Here, he stated that the statement of 'please be quiet' is ambiguous to him. He said that he would like the sign to say 'do not talk' instead, in order for him to comply with this rule. However, even if the sign said 'do not talk', he did not believe that he should be obeying this rule, since the place was not a library, and therefore this rule seemed absurd to him. This is an example of the belief where the pervert believes that rules do not apply to him.

Mr. A. has stated that his father passed away when Mr. A. was a teenager and after his father's death, their relatives told him 'You are the father of your family now', but he added that he did not take on this role. He also stated that he felt obliged to take care of his mother, even though his mother earned her own money, owned a house and showed no sign of needing anything. One can interpret that Mr. A. was unable to achieve separation from his mother, when considering his relationship with her. Mr. A. has explained that he has never been in a romantic relationship and also felt sad for being unmarried. Moreover, he expressed that he did not want to be married because he believes that he should be living with his mother and in order to get married, he would have to leave her. Here, he "renounces marriage from his life". Apart from physically separating from his mother, he was also afraid of emotional separation

which is interpreted with his words: “There is something that binds us to each other, and this bond would be corrupted.”

Although some examples of this case could be considered as an obsessive structure (such as the library example), the disavowal mechanism creates a distinction between neurosis (obsession or hysteria) and perversion. Also, disavowal is the main feature that makes it possible to diagnose perversion (Willemsen et al., 2015).

3.1 Disavowal mechanism in the therapy session

During the sessions with Mr. A, the most challenging part for the therapist has been the part that is associated with the disavowal mechanism. In disavowal, two opposite conditions can be considered as valid at the same time. For example, Mr. A. stated that he felt himself under pressure and restricted as a result of his religious beliefs. Due to the religious rules, he believes that he should not have a girlfriend, nor get close to a woman, nor drink alcohol. He also stated that religious rules have prohibited him from doing what he wants, however he said that he has gone to a strip club and drunk alcohol while he was abroad. He stated that the contradiction between what he complained about and his behavior was not contradictory to him, since he did them to see whether he could overcome his religious rules or not. When he was asked about the meaning of overcoming these religious rules, he explained that he could not overcome them. He stated that the religious pressure and his behaviors were “totally different things.” So, his reason for going to a strip club was “to overcome the cowardliness that he feels”, which is in line with Fink’s claims: The pervert subject finds justifiable reasons for his behavior and does not see the mistakes in his behavior (Fink, 1997). Although Mr. A.’s behavior can be described as a mistake to him, he finds a justification for himself and thinks that this behavior is not wrong.

Another example is about Mr. A's relationship with women. Mr. A. has explained that he has had no girlfriends. When there is a woman that he would want to get close to, he would offer to directly go out with person, instead of meeting her and first becoming their friend. He said “women should think he was a naïve and nice guy and therefore they should be impressed.” Despite the fact that he knew that women were not impressed by his behavior, and even though his friends had warned him, he would persist in his behavior. Here, he stated that his thought was “yes, women were not impressed but they should have been impressed.” Because of the disavowal, the subject both knows and does not know the truth at the same time (Heyer, 2015). It seems like although Mr. A. accepts the failure of his behavior, he still believes in his actions.

Disavowal is a mechanism based on the 'both' mentalities. Although the subject knows that two opposite things cannot exist at the same time, the subject still wants both or believes these opposite things at the same time (Swales, 2012). While Mr. A. is ambivalent about his religious beliefs and having a girlfriend, his sentence “My religious beliefs demand an arranged marriage, but my heart wants to do something else. A person should choose one of them, but I want to choose both”, shows an example of this.

The duality and the subsequent contradictory thoughts, which have risen due to the disavowal mechanism, confuses the therapist. Showing that any two thoughts can be controversial and questioning the duality would create progresses in the therapy process for a neurotic patient (Anastasopoulos & Papanicolaou, 2018; Baldwin, 2018; Ellis & Wholey, 1966; Nobus, 2018), but the function may not be the same for the perverse patient. Even when confronted with a contradiction, the pervert subject does not accept the confrontation because there is no contradiction in his system of thought. For this reason, according to Swales, the focus of interventions is not a strange rationale of disavowal, but a process that leads to it (Swales, 2012).

At the beginning of the therapy process with Mr. A., the therapist was confused by the inconsistent and contradictory thoughts he possessed. There were periods at the beginning of the therapy when the questions of the therapist were insistent at times about choosing one of two ideas, and she was in confusion as to how opposite ideas could be present at the same time. However, after it was understood that these were due to the personality structure of the person, the examples of disavowal were detailed as much as possible and the therapist abandoned the previous persistent attitude. It was observed that this persistent attitude caused ‘stubbornness’ between the patient and the therapist, and it was thought that it could be harmful for the relationship in the therapy process.

4. Recommendations for the Therapy Process and Conclusions

The treatment process of a pervert subject is difficult due to the existence of a disavowal mechanism and difficulties related to transference (Clavreul, 1980; Eshel, 2005; Etchegoyen, 1978; Jimenez & Moguillansky, 2011; Willemsen, et al., 2015). A pervert is considered to be someone who is reluctant to deal with a deeper therapy process (Lacan, 1993; Willemsen et al., 2015). Moreover, the people in the perverse structure apply to therapy/analysis as a legal necessity or just for small problems (Clavreul, 1980; Willemsen et al., 2015).

Neurotic patients put the therapist into the ‘subject supposed to know’ position so they always expect something from the therapist. On the contrary, a pervert does not put the therapist in the same position and he/she thinks he/she has something to offer instead of receiving

assistance from the therapist (Verhaeghe, 2008). Thus, a pervert does not have a real request for help. At the beginning of his sessions, Mr. A. would often say “I feel good; I am better now” which can be considered an example of a perverse structure. At this point, it seems important for the therapist to take on the role of an object, which can stimulate the subject’s desire for a therapeutic process. Thus, the patient can see himself/herself as an individual who has a lack. The therapist should encourage the patient to question himself/herself and should place emphasis on what the patient lacks. Dreams, fantasies, slips of the tongue, free associations, and conversations about the past may form the basis of the therapy process for the perverse structure as similarly seen in the neurotic structure (Swales, 2012).

Since disavowal is the constitutive mechanism of the perverse structure, a therapist should pay attention to the existence of the disavowal in the pervert subject’s discourse and punctuate it when necessary. Just like in the speech of a neurotic subject, denial may conceal something clinically valuable, a disavowal may have the same function in the discourse of the pervert subject and further exploration of the disavowal is needed (Swales, 2012). Therefore, when Mr. A. would talk about his contradictory thoughts, his ambitious words would be punctuated. Also, he was encouraged to give details concerning vague parts of his discourse.

Because of the disavowal structure, a pervert subject usually creates socially acceptable stories to reject the guilt. The pervert can be seen as an expert on using social rules to his favor (Verhaeghe, 2008). Mr. A. would make explanations concerning his contradictory behavior that fit his own logic. Therefore, it should be noted that even though the examples of disavowal are detailed, the pervert may not realize that his thoughts are contradictory. Thus, he/she may consider both of them as correct by making different explanations. This can be challenging for the therapist. However, the pervert’s source of pleasure is the anxiety created in the other person (Lacan, 2011b), and so the therapist must manage his/her own anxiety and confusion.

In the therapy process, an effective therapeutic alliance is necessary to rework the original pathological mother-child relationship. The contradictory sentence of the perverse structure is due to the disavowal, which is formed by the nature of the relationship with the Other. A change in the disavowal can only be done by establishing a different-type relationship with the Other (Hoens, 2006). It is known that the subject formation is related to the positions of the alienation and separation stages in the developmental process (Lacan, 1998). In the perverse structure, the child cannot be separated from his/her mother due to the fact that the mother's desire is not named and the child is the only focus of his mother’s desire. Therefore, the therapist’s desire to take this function is important during the therapy process. Thus, there will

be a chance to work on his identity in a relationship where perverse people are not considered to be in positions of a passive objects and sources of enjoyment. In this way, a gap like this, where perverse people could be positioned as subjects in the symbolic area, would occur (Verhaeghe, 2008) and this could lead to change (Willemsen et al., 2015). Although it is not possible to change the personality structure of a subject, there might be significant changes in symptoms and relationships (Swales, 2012).

As a result, according to Lacanian theory, defence mechanisms do not only accompany the structure but also influence the formation of the structure. Disavowal is related to a reaction to castration (recognize and ignore at the same time) and it is also related to the formation of the perverse structure. Mr. A. was considered to have a perverse structure as a result his position as a subject (an object which serves to mother's enjoyment), relation to the law (knowing the rule but not abiding; having behaviors that leads Other to make the rules), and having a disavowal mechanism. In therapy sessions, the most challenging parts for the therapist were Mr. A.'s discourses that contained contradicting expressions as a result of the disavowal mechanism. For disavowal, it can be said that it is important to elaborate the contradictory sentences and focus on the process that leads to the disavowal. Therefore, the ultimate goal of therapy for the perverse structure is the generation of the therapist's desire and thus, creation of a gap, in which the perverse subject could be positioned as a subject in the symbolic area (Swales, 2012).

Acknowledgements

The author thanks to The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TÜBİTAK) for financial support.

References

1. Anastasopoulos, D., & Papanicolaou, E. (Eds.). (2018). *The therapist at work: Personal factors affecting the analytic process*. Routledge.
2. Andre, S. (2006). The structure of perversion: A Lacanian perspective. In D. Nobus, & L. Downing (Eds.), *Perversion: Psychoanalytic Perspectives/Perspectives on Psychoanalysis (109-125)*. London, Karnac Books.
3. Baldwin, Y. G. (2018). *Let's Keep Talking: Lacanian Tales of Love, Sex, and Other Catastrophes*. Routledge.
4. Bernardes, W. S. (2005). Condemnation, disavowal, division. *International Forum of Psychoanalysis*, 14(3-4), 144-147. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08037060510044787>
5. Christensen, J. F., & Muhr, S. L. (2018). Desired diversity and symptomatic anxiety: Theorising failed diversity as Lacanian lack. *Culture and Organization*, 24(2), 114-133. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14759551.2017.1407764>
6. Clavreul, J. (1980). The perverse couple. In: Schneiderman S, editor. *How Lacan's ideas are used in clinical practice*, 251–33. Northvale, NJ: Aronson.
7. Dickson, A. 2011. The Jouissance of the Lard(er): Gender, Desire and Anxiety in the Weight-Loss Industry. *Culture and Organization*, 17(4), 313–328. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14759551.2011.590307>
8. Ellis, A., & Wholey, D. (1966). *Rational-emotive psychotherapy*. J. Norton.
9. Eshel O. (2005). Pentheus rather than Oedipus: on perversion, survival and analytic 'presencing'. *The International journal of psycho-analysis*, 86(Pt 4), 1071–1097. <https://doi.org/10.1516/9598-lcgw-hqly-hlwn>
10. Etchegoyen, R. H. (1978). Some thoughts on transference perversion. *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 59, 45-53.
11. Evans, D. (1996). *An Introductory Dictionary of Lacanian Psychoanalysis*. New York, Routledge.
12. Fink, B. (1996). *The Lacanian subject: Between language and jouissance*. Princeton, New Jersey.
13. Fink, B. (1997). *A Clinical Introduction to Lacanian Psychoanalysis: Theory and Technique*. London, Harvard University Press.
14. Freud, S. (1923). The infantile genital organization. *Standard Edition* 19:139-145.
15. Freud, S. (1927). Fetishism. *Standard Edition* 21:147-157.
16. Freud, S., (1936). Inhibitions, symptoms and anxiety. *Toronto: Longmans, Green*.
17. Freud, S. (1938). Totem and taboo: Resemblances between the psychic lives of savages and neurotics. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books.
18. Freud, S. (1953). Three essays on the theory of sexuality (1905). In *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud, volume VII (1901-1905): A case of hysteria, three essays on sexuality and other works* (pp. 123-246).
19. Freud, S. (1957). Repression. In *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, Volume XIV (1914-1916): On the History of the Psycho-Analytic Movement, Papers on Metapsychology and Other Works* (pp. 141-158).
20. Grossman, L. (2015). The object-preserving function of sadomasochism. *The Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 84(3), 643-664. <https://doi.org/10.1002/psaq.12023>

21. Gunn, J. (2018). On political perversion. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 48(2), 161-186.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02773945.2018.1428766>
22. Heron, K. (2020). Toying with the law: Deleuze, Lacan and the promise of perversion. *European Journal of Political Theory*, 0(0), 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1474885120906935>
23. Heyer, G. (2015). The making of a tragedy: perversion in the perception of truth. *The Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 60 (5), 642-656. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5922.12177>
24. Hoens, D. (2006). 'Toward a new perversion: psychoanalysis', in J. Clemens and R. Grigg (eds) *Jacques Lacan and the Other Side of Psychoanalysis*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
25. Jimenez, J.P. & Moguillansky, R. (2011). *Clinical and theoretical aspects of perversion: The illusory bond*. London: Karnac.
26. Khan, M. M. R. (1979). *Alienation in Perversions*. New York: Int.
27. Lacan J. (1997). *The Ethics of Psychoanalysis: The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book VII*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
28. Lacan, J. (1962). The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book X: Anxiety (translated by Cormac Gallagher from unedited French manuscripts).
29. Lacan, J. (1966). Kant avec Sade. *Écrits*, 765-790.
30. Lacan, J. (1993). The Psychoses: The Seminar of Jacques Lacan: Book III. *Trans. Russel Grigg*. New York: Routledge.
31. Lacan, J. (1998). *The four fundamental concepts of psychoanalysis: The seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book XI*. J. A. Miller (Ed.), & A. Sheridan (Trans.). New York: Norton.
32. Lacan, J. (2007). *Écrits: The First Complete Edition in English*. W. W. Norton & Company. Bruce Fink (Trans.)
33. Lacan, J. (2010). *Identification: The seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book IX 1961-1962*. C. Gallagher (Trans.). Retrieved from <http://www.lacaninireland.com/web/translations/seminars/>
34. Lacan, J. (2011a). The seminar of Jacques Lacan: Book VI: Desire and its interpretation: 1958-1959.
35. Lacan, J. (2011b). The seminar of Jacques Lacan: Book X: Anxiety: 1962-1963.
36. Lacan, J. (2013). *On the names-of-the-father* (1953-1963). B. Fink (Trans.). Malden, USA: Polity Press.
37. Lacan, J. (2016). The Sinthome: The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book XXIII, ed. *Jacques Alain Miller, trans. AR Price*, Cambridge: Polity.
38. Miller, J.A. (1996). An introduction to Lacan's clinical perspectives. R. Feldstein, B. Fink & M. Jaanus (Eds.), *Reading Seminars I and II: Lacan's Return to Freud* (ss. 241-247). Albany, State University of New York Press.
39. Nobus, D. (2018). *Key concepts of Lacanian psychoanalysis*. Routledge.
40. Parker, I. (2010). *Lacanian psychoanalysis: Revolutions in subjectivity*. Routledge.
41. Penney, J. (2012). *World of Perversion, The: Psychoanalysis and the Impossible Absolute of Desire*. SUNY Press.
42. Pires, A. L. D. S., Pires, A. L. D. S., Sette Bicalho, C. F., Vergara, E. M. D. M., Fonseca, M. C. B., & Laender, N. R. (2005). Perversion—structure or organization?. *International Forum of Psychoanalysis*, 14(3-4), 138-143. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08037060510044741>

43. Rustin, M. (2003). Learning about emotions: the Tavistock approach. *European Journal of Psychotherapy, Counselling and Health*, 6(3), 187-208. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0967026042000269665>
44. Swales, S. (2012). *Perversion: A Lacanian Psychoanalytic Approach to the Subject*. New York, Routledge.
45. Van Haute, P. (2016). Lacan meets freud? Patho-analytic reflections on the status of the perversions in lacanian metapsychology. *Studies in Gender and Sexuality*, 17(4), 274-284. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15240657.2016.1236547>
46. Verhaeghe, P. (2008). *On Being Normal and Other Disorders: A Manual for Clinical Psychodiagnostic*. London, Karnac Books.
47. Weldon, E. (1998). Group therapy for victims and perpetrators of incest. *Advances in Psychiatric Treatment*, 4, 82-88. <https://doi.org/10.1192/apt.4.2.82>
48. Willemsen, J., Inslegers, R., Meganck, R., Geerardyn, F., Desmet, M. & Vanheule, S. (2015). A metasynthesis of published case studies through Lacan's L-schema: Transference in perversion. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 96(3), 773-95. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-8315.12179>



©2020 by the Author(s); licensee Mediterranean Journal of Clinical Psychology, Messina, Italy. This article is an open access article, licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 Unported License. Mediterranean Journal of Clinical Psychology, Vol. 8, No. 2 (2020).

International License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

DOI: 10.6092/2282-1619/mjcp-2283