



Ontological Narcissism and Ethnocide in the Psychoanalytic Area

Amneris Maroni¹

Abstract: *How have Indigenous peoples been received by the psychoanalytic field (Freudian/Lacanian/Jungian) over the past two and a half decades? The mainstream of Freudian psychoanalysis continues to venerate Freud's Totem and Taboo; Christian Dunker embraces Amerindian perspectivism to serve Lacan; and the Jungians, celebrating Amerindian perspectivism, maintain hope in a somewhat anachronistic idea of nationhood. Counter to this white narcissism, which is not free from being ethnocidal, this article resorts to the lenses of the ontological turn, examining ontological conflicts and frictions, persistent equivocations, and individuations.*

Keywords: *ontological conflict, ontological turn, ethnocide, persisting, individuations, equivocations.*

Narcisismo ontológico e etnocídio na área psi

Resumo: Qual é a recepção dos povos originários pela área psi (freudianos/lacanianos/junguianos) nas duas últimas décadas e meia? O mainstream da psicanálise freudiana segue reverenciando S. Freud de *Totem e Tabu*; C. Dunker abraça o perspectivismo ameríndio para servir J. Lacan; os junguianos, festejando o perspectivismo ameríndio, mantém a esperança em uma ideia de nação um tanto quanto extemporânea. Na contracorrente desse narcisismo branco que não deixa de ser etnocida, o artigo se vale de lentes da virada ontológica, dos conflitos e fricções ontológicas, de equivocações e individuações permanentes.

1 Unicamp – Campinas – Brasil – amneris@plugnet.com.br – Lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/8156932156375838>
- ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-5684-8789>.

Palavras-chave: conflito ontológico, virada ontológica, etnocídio, individuação, equivocação.

Narcisismo ontológico y etnocidio en el ámbito psi

Resumen: ¿Cuál es la recepción de los pueblos originarios por parte del área psi (freudiana/lacaniana/junguiana) en las últimas dos décadas y media? La corriente principal del psicoanálisis freudiano sigue venerando a S. Freud de *Tótem y tabú*; C. Dunker abraza el perspectivismo amerindio al servicio de J. Lacan; Los junguianos, celebrando el perspectivismo amerindio, mantienen la esperanza en una idea un tanto extemporánea de nación. A contracorriente de este narcisismo blanco, no obstante etnocida, el artículo se sirve de la lente del giro ontológico, de los conflictos y fricciones ontológicas, de los malentendidos e individuaciones permanentes.

Palabras clave: conflicto ontológico, giro ontológico, etnocidio, individuación, equívoco.

In a 2019 interview with Ciro Barros and Thiago Domenici, anthropologist Eduardo Viveiros de Castro asserted that we were witnessing a “final offensive against Indigenous peoples”². The interview traversed political and environmental themes of the past two decades in Brazil, exploring the country’s history and highlighting the concept of ethnocide, which is fundamental to our article.

A lot has happened since 2019. In the 2018 presidential elections, Jair Messias Bolsonaro of the Social Liberal Party (PSL) defeated Fernando Haddad of the Workers’ Party (PT) with 55.5% of the valid votes compared to Haddad’s 44.5%. Bolsonaro, positioned on the right of the political spectrum, advocated conservative and authoritarian agendas, stirring discontent among a segment of the population that had been frustrated with the successive PT governments from 2003 to 2016. Unimaginable challenges arose, with the far-right wielding significant decision-making power. The COVID-19 pandemic (2020-2023), for example, exposed the federal government’s neglect of the entire Brazilian population. Indigenous peoples saw their situation deteriorate drastically during the pandemic, suffering without oxygen cylinders while Environment Minister Ricardo Salles

2 Cf.: <<https://apublica.org/2019/10/viveiros-de-castro-estamos-assistindo-a-uma-ofensiva-final-contras-povos-indigenas/>>. Accessed: 6 jun. 2021.

infamously ordered to “let the herd pass”³, encouraging the clearing of forests for pasture and illegal mining.

Indigenous peoples only gained access to their traditionally occupied lands with the 1988⁴ Constitution. This constitution also guaranteed the full exercise of cultural rights, social organization, customs, languages, beliefs, and traditions, supporting and encouraging the appreciation and diffusion of cultural expressions. It tasked the Union with demarcating lands, protecting, and respecting their assets, providing these peoples with political direction after nearly five centuries of predation and colonial ventures on their lands.

However, the political life of Indigenous peoples remains threatened by neo-colonizers, with another dramatic event occurring with the “Temporal Landmark”. This legal thesis argues that Indigenous peoples only have the right to claim certain lands if they were already occupying them when the 1988 Constitution was enacted. This thesis is currently being debated and judged by the Supreme Federal Court (STF). Tensions escalated with the 2023⁵ presidential election. The third government of Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva – and the Brazilian left as a whole – can do little to prevent tremendous setbacks in the face of a predominantly conservative and right-wing Congress.

Patience, however, has its limits! In July 2024⁶, during an extraordinary assembly, the Articulation of Indigenous Peoples of Brazil (Apib), despite maintaining consensus to ally with the Minister of Indigenous Peoples, Sonia Guajajara, experienced significant tension and division. Part of the indigenous movement decided to protest against the Lula (PT) government – which has not prioritized their agenda – by not expediting the demarcation of possible and pending indigenous lands and against the Supreme Federal Court (STF), which is set to begin the reconciliation process on the recognition, demarcation, and use of indigenous lands in August. The indigenous movement deems the Temporal Landmark unconstitutional, arguing that the right to their lands precedes the creation of the Brazilian State – and as fundamental rights, they cannot be subjected to a reconciliation process.

3 Cf.: <<https://g1.globo.com/politica/noticia/2020/05/22/ministro-do-meio-ambiente-defende-passar-a-boiada-e-mudar-regramento-e-simplificar-normas.ghtml>>. Accessed: 13 jun. 2024.

4 Cf.: <<https://portal.stf.jus.br/constituicao-supremo/artigo.asp?abrirBase=CF&abrirArtigo=231>>. Accessed: 15 jun. 2024.

5 Cf.: <<https://www12.senado.leg.br/noticias/materias/2023/09/27/aprovado-no-senado-marco-temporal-para-terras-indigenas-segure-para-sancao>>. Accessed: 12 jun. 2024.

6 Cf.: <<https://extranet.weseek.io/news/viewnews.html?newsId%3d71671183%26channelId%3d7931%26customerId%3dPl9pltYxZgldP%2fGg5zbdkg%3d%3d%26newsletterId%3d2c55f4b-7a65-4fb6-a7a3-d1326b8059e5>>. Accessed: 9 jul. 2024.

In this article, I am primarily interested in naming the different receptions of Amerindian perspectivism by the psychoanalytic area within the context of advancing ethnocide perpetrated by the Brazilian State in alliance with deforestation and illegal mining against indigenous peoples within national territory – namely, ethnocide practiced as the dissolution of the “spirit” and the forms of social and cosmopolitical organization of indigenous peoples.

Since the late 20th century, Indigenous leaders have denounced the destruction of forests, associating national developmentalism with the devastation of nature. During the pandemic, as previously mentioned, the situation worsened for Indigenous populations when efforts were made to “let the herd pass”,⁷ through a military-neoliberal partnership applied to the Amazon, Pantanal, and Atlantic Forest. The role of capitalism in producing environmental collapse⁸ in Brazil was particularly amplified when the military came to power in the Brazilian State – such as in the years 2019-2022, with broad support from Brazilians.

In line with the global climate urgency and decoloniality, the psychoanalytic field, though still timidly, has begun to establish dialogue with Indigenous peoples, weaving new alliances of languages, knowledge, and political practices. Jungians and post-Jungians are enthusiastic about these new dialogues, open to decolonial critique, allowing themselves, to some extent, to be confronted by other Worlds (other ontologies) and their ways of existing and differing. Meanwhile, psychoanalysis – specifically the mainstream Freudian quarters – reaffirms the modern Western subject, revolutionized by it (conscious/unconscious), and until recently, silence prevailed regarding Indigenous peoples and animism.

Recently, however, numerous works – live stream sessions, master’s and doctoral theses, books, and articles – have broken the deafening silence of Freudian psychoanalysis concerning the peoples of the forest. Although I do not see a unified line of reflection among these varied works – except for schizoanalysis – I will cite them at a favorable moment, as I believe they represent the future of a very fertile discussion.

In the writings of Christian Dunker (2015), we find a Lacanian interpretation of animist thought (and Amerindian perspectivism), associating the animist ontology of the Indigenous peoples of this land with the diagnostics of modern psychopathology. I have chosen another path, aligning the decolonial

7 Cf.: <<https://g1.globo.com/politica/noticia/2020/05/22/ministro-do-meio-ambiente-defende-passar-a-boiada-e-mudar-regramento-e-simplificar-normas.ghtml>>. Accessed: 18 jun. 2024.

8 Marques (2015).

critique of the psychoanalytic field with perspectivist anthropology, which we tentatively designate the “anthropology of equivocation in listening”. This approach to ontological conflict outlines irreducible worlds, incorporates the continuous exercise of decolonizing thought in the psychoanalytic field, and opens itself up to the permanent individuation of listening.

I believe this dialogue between anthropology and psychoanalysis operates in a field of tensions where equivocation outlines ontologies in relation, potential pragmatic agreements between them, and frictions from which a wealth of meanings and forthcoming existential possibilities emerge.

Neurosis and Animism

In 1913, Sigmund Freud wrote in *Totem and Taboo* that the concordance between the mental life of savages and neurotics, animism, is the doctrine of souls, in dialogue with the evolutionary anthropology of Edward Burnett Tylor. The so-called “primitive” peoples would then be the living perception that the world is populated by benevolent and malevolent beings, as “they see in these spirits and demons the causes of natural processes and believe that not only animals and plants but also inanimate things are animated by them” (Freud, 2012 [1913]: 80). For Freud, animism represented a system of thought and psychological theory, preceding other “worldviews”: the religious and the scientific.

As is well known, Freud admitted animism as a precursor to the technique of magic and the animist mode of action in the world, being two expressions of the omnipotence of animist thoughts. In summary, according to psychoanalysis, animists – both individually and collectively – believed they could change the external world with their own thoughts. Thus, animism was considered the first stage of the development of thought in *Totem and Taboo* (Freud, 2012 [1913]: 80), followed by religious totemism and science, as it represented a progression from human omnipotence (animism) to religious authority (religious totemism) and, finally, to the submission to the laws of reality (science).

The theory of developmental stages in societies was also linked to a hypothesis about the libidinal development of the individual. Thus, the animist phase would correspond to infantile narcissism; the religious phase, to attachment to parents; and the scientific phase, to the mature state of the individual adapted to reality. In other words, according to Freud’s writings, the modern individual thrives due to their distancing from animism.

While Freud’s early 20th-century writings were informed by evolutionary literature, these interpretations remain very much alive in 21st-century Freudian

psychoanalysis. In 2013, Betty Fucks, Carina Basualdo, and Néstor Braunstein edited *100 Years of Totem and Taboo*, which did not stray from Freud's anti-animism theses.

In the chapter "Totem and Taboo: Freud, Wittgenstein, and the Archaic", Anne Dufoumantelle (2013) recalls the animistic characteristics manifested in children and obsessive neurotics. According to Dufoumantelle, this relationship with the world has disappeared or is "restricted to a few peoples little contaminated by the West" (Dufoumantelle, 2013: 39); thus, animism as a mode of existence and difference is either irrelevant or its remnants are present in modern diagnostics and psychopathology.

For the authors of that book, the writings of anthropologist Claude Lévi-Strauss play a role in validating the universality of psychoanalysis. Néstor Braunstein (2013) understands that the prohibition of incest in Lévi-Strauss's work validates a totemic function to the father, to his imaginary and symbolic representatives, as if the anthropologist's studies merely confirmed the convictions of psychoanalysis⁹.

Curiously, Lévi-Strauss's work – based on numerous ethnographies of peoples from different continental areas – also presents a critique of Freudian psychoanalysis and the universalization of the Oedipus complex¹⁰. The authors of *100 Years of Totem and Taboo* (Fucks; Basualdo and Braunstein, 2013) also overlook the preface of 1966 in *The Elementary Structures of Kinship*, written by Lévi-Strauss (1982). In it, the French anthropologist associates modern theories of the separation of nature and culture with theories of human species exceptionalism, which consider the human species as the sole bearer of culture. Therefore, these theories reserve for the other natural beings desubjectification, political dehumanization, and submission to human interests. In other words, this is a critique by Lévi-Strauss directed at Western civilization and predominant thought, which find in culture a worldview adjusted to the destruction of life forms and social forms.

We are thus led to question the true extent of the opposition between culture and nature. Its apparent simplicity would be illusory if, largely, it had been the work of a species of the genus *Homo*, called *sapiens* by antiphony, which

9 The documentary "What Lévi-Strauss Owes to the Amerindians?" by Edson Tosta Matarezo Filho (2015) presents this transformation of Lévi-Strauss's thought in relation to the thinking of the Indigenous peoples of the Americas and the impact on "modern universalism."

10 Claude Lévi-Strauss later revisited this theme in *Look, Listen, Read* (1990 [1988]), asserting, "It is necessary to prevent psychoanalysts from seizing [Amerindian myths] to find legitimacy there" (Lévi-Strauss, 1990: 139).

ferociously endeavored to eliminate ambiguous forms deemed close to the animal. This drive, inspired hundreds of thousands of years ago by the same obtuse and destructive spirit that impels it today to annihilate other forms of life, has resulted in numerous human societies being falsely relegated to the realm of nature because they did not repudiate it. It is as if it initially intended to be the sole personification of culture in the face of nature, and now remains, except in cases where it can completely subjugate it, the exclusive incarnation of life in the face of inanimate matter.

In this hypothesis, the contention between culture and nature would be neither a primitive given nor an objective aspect of the world order. One would have to see it as an artificial creation of culture, a defensive work that culture would have dug around itself because it did not feel capable of affirming its existence and originality except by severing all passages that might demonstrate its original compromise with other manifestations of life. To understand the essence of culture, therefore, it would be necessary to go back to the source and counter its impetus, reattaching all the broken threads and seeking their free ends in other animal and even plant families (Lévi-Strauss, 1982: 26).

The preface of 1966 marked Lévi-Strauss's distancing from the "sociology of the family", emphasizing that the opposition between nature and culture was a creation of the human species. From then on, it was understood as artificial and particular to each society. The transition from nature to culture is thought of and lived differently by various peoples. For the Amerindians, for instance, this division holds different meanings and complexities, diverging in its political effects.

In the 1960s, Lévi-Strauss also published the works *The Savage Mind* (1962) and *Totemism Today* (1962), with extensive ethnographic material from continental areas. These two works describe various ways in which the relationship of Indigenous peoples with nature responds to an intellectual order of problems, from which they derive other sciences and philosophies, destabilizing the place assigned to animism within theories of stages of human development.

In light of the ethnographic and ethnological developments of the past century, the homage to the work *Totem and Taboo* (Fucks; Basualdo and Braunstein, 2013) persists within a psychoanalysis refractory to animism. Authors like Paula Mieli (2013: 132) insist on the transition between three systems of thought – animistic, religious, and scientific – as a movement from narcissistic omnipotence "to incompleteness, loss, and an enthusiastic renunciation". Let us remember it has been *100 years since Totem and Taboo*, meaning we are in 2013!

Jacques Nassif (2013: 144), in his turn, understands that childhood phobias emerge where the primitive resides in our humanity. He honors Freud as an “profound knower of his library’s arcana, without ever venturing south beyond the ruins of Pompeii or the bay of Agrigento, or donning any colonial hat”, thereby ignoring one of early 20th-century anthropology’s essential achievements: field research. Carina Basualdo (2013: 158), who seemed to comprehend the different paths taken by psychoanalysis and anthropology, stumbles upon speciesism.

Márcio Seligmann-Silva (2013: 212), adhering to Freud’s writings, draws parallels between so-called “primitives”, the psychic life of children, and patients with psychological illnesses. The author appears to unreservedly accept the proposition that the infancy of humanity intersects with the ontogenetic infancy of children. Thus, Seligmann-Silva synthesizes the major missteps of modern psychoanalysis over the past hundred years concerning animistic subjectivities.

It becomes evident that the homage to the centennial of Freud’s cited work disregards the advancements in ethnography and ethnology. In particular, it overlooks that totemism and animism have achieved ontological self-determination, meaning they have ceased to be mere objects of Eurocentric classificatory systems and have attained intellectual, spiritual, and cosmopolitical autonomy. For a better understanding of this complex issue, I recommend the works of Philippe Descola, particularly *Beyond Nature and Culture* (2023), recently translated into Portuguese, and *Other Natures, Other Cultures* (2016) by the same author.

In 2010, the Brazilian anthropologist Eduardo Viveiros de Castro visited the Brazilian Society of Psychoanalysis¹¹ and discussed the legacy of anthropocentrism and modern metaphysics within psychoanalysis. However, his talking did not find receptive ears, as his debaters only offered to him reviewed concepts of modern psychoanalysis! It seems distressing that, under the guise of denouncing racism and speciesism, psychoanalysts prefer to deny the cannibal critique directed at modern metaphysics. Moreover, modern individual-focused psychoanalysis shows no interest in animism, except to equate it with ontogenetic childhood.

The refusal to acknowledge the so-called “ontological turn”¹² likely stems from various interpretations. One reason may be the reluctance to admit that mainstream Freudian psychoanalysis leans towards a modern ontology. Another

11 Viveiros de Castro (2010).

12 I understand the “ontological turn” here as the expression of the equitable existence of Worlds in relation and their multi-realities. Contrary to the ontological domination advocated by modernity and the Modern World, my interpretation engages with “ontological pluralism” (Latour, 2019) and “ontological anarchism” (Almeida, 2021). However, it is committed to the description of “worlds to come” (Danowski and Viveiros de Castro, 2017), or worlds in the making, as I perceive the incessant genesis of existential possibilities.

reason might be the unwillingness to concede that modern psychoanalysis has suffered – and still suffers – from ontological narcissism.

However, as we know, the Earth is not flat. In recent years, there has been an awakening, a form of community-building inscribed on the margins, which is already showing its purpose. Study groups that hybridize psychoanalysis with ancestral healing practices – African and Indigenous – clinical animist seminars, and numerous *live streams* are emerging. This new direction of research and hybridized healing practices is being led by schizoanalysts. I have a particular fondness for two of them, João Pentagna and Flávio Carlos Seixas, with whom I had the pleasure of engaging on a *live stream* on the Youtube channel Compondo com Gaia¹³ João Pentagna (2021, 2022) develops promising writings on animism in Freud's work, offering a refined and contrary reading of the Austrian psychoanalyst; Pentagna's clinic has been influenced by the worldview of Indigenous peoples. Flávio Seixas (2023), a nomadic and international assiduous visitor to non-naturalistic ontologies (from quilombola, Indigenous, riverine, and peripheral communities), allows himself to be shaped by these ontological frictions, and his clinic is equally original and creative. Psychoanalyst Lucila Gonçalves has also been working with Indigenous peoples and based on her ethnographies, invites us to think from a borderland perspective (2011), between the Western and Amerindian worlds, among languages, knowledges, different conceptions of health and illness, and especially dream conceptions (2019). Lacan's dialogues with Krenak¹⁴ and intersectoral dialogues involving anthropology, psychoanalysis, animism, Amerindian perspectivism, literature, and Indigenous knowledges, carried out by Pedro Magalhães¹⁵, also deserve attention. As Ailton Krenak, whose books are prime examples of ontological friction, I highlight research born already hybridized, genuine fruits of ontological frictions: Hanna Limulja's *Uma etnografia dos sonhos Yanomami: O desejo dos outros* [*An Ethnography of Dreams: The Other's Desire* (2022)] and Geni Núñez's *Descolonizando Afetos: Experimentações sobre outras formas de amar* [*Decolonizing Affections: Experiments on other ways of loving* (2023)].

Psychosis and Animism

Let us now turn to the reception of Amerindian perspectivism by Christian Dunker, a Lacanian psychoanalyst, and our critique of his use of an animist model applied to the diagnosis of psychosis.

13 Cf.: <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cSVt5Q8hr18>>. Accessed: 12 jul. 2024.

14 Souza Junior (2022).

15 Here I'd like to draw the reader's attention to the writings and research by Pedro Magalhães.

In 2015, Dunker published *Mal-estar, sofrimento e sintoma [Discontent, Suffering, and Symptom]*, where he partially incorporates a critique of psychoanalysis in Brazil¹⁶. Perhaps driven by a decolonial critique of French psychoanalysis, the author sought to incorporate native elements (Amerindian perspectivism) to formulate a Brazilian Lacanian psychoanalysis. However, this exercise in dialogue does not allow for reflection on the pertinence – and, for some, the impertinence – of applying psychoanalytic methodologies to the social sciences. Historically, psychoanalysis has been applied to Brazilian society associated African and Afro-Brazilian religions with psychotic delusion, a practice criticized by Roger Bastide (1974).

Dunker construes an applied perspectivism to conceptualize psychosis as less deficient through a psychosomatic perspectivism, aiming to address experiences of indeterminacy, or what Lacan termed “one of the most interesting facets of the Real” (Dunker, 2015: 294). This represents an appropriation of elements from a cannibalistic and anti-speciesist metaphysics, integrating them into modern metaphysics to address issues that Lacanian psychoanalysis itself has already identified.

Dunker’s rejection of the “ontological turn” and post-structuralist anthropology ultimately strips Amerindian perspectivism of its ontological autonomy – its intellectual, “spiritual”, and cosmopolitical sovereignty. This allowed the author to anchor perspectivism in Claude Lévi-Strauss’s structuralist anthropology, rejecting the influences of Pierre Clastres, Gilles Deleuze, and Félix Guattari, which are fundamental to Eduardo Viveiros de Castro’s formulation of Amerindian perspectivism. By distancing himself from the mechanisms of conjuring the One (Deleuze and Guattari, 1997), Dunker remained within the ontological domination exerted conceptually over the Indigenous peoples of this land.

Structuralist anthropology is, as we know, linguistically based anthropology. Dunker’s choice of structuralism meant bypassing the “ontological turn” and describing perspectivism with new eyes for Lacan’s theoretical body – in short, transforming cannibalistic metaphysics into a “turn of gazes” towards the subject of knowledge¹⁷. This ontological denial allows Dunker to transform the

16 Christian Dunker’s latest book, *Lutos finitos e infinitos [Finite and infinite Mournings]* (2023), will not be discussed in this article.

17 Contrary to Dunker’s exercise, the “ontological turn” also announced the analytical subordination of social reality to the reality of the respective World. This has dethroned the modern subject’s universality in knowledge because the equitable existence between Worlds in relation required the descriptive attitude of other “subjects of knowledge” and other knowledges, such as the cannibal cogito (Viveiros de Castro, 2015). Philippe Descola (2023) suggested, in a different direction, describing bodies and intentionalities, towards physicality (action devices) and interiority (self-reflective dimensions), as these are variable realities in different ontologies.

theme of the “inconstancy of the savage soul” (Viveiros de Castro, 2002) into a discursive conceptual equivalent (Dunker, 2015: 385), with neo-Hegelian features and a new unity in the discursive field. Thus, although the author does not cite it, we understand that he acts towards a comparison between the “cosmological pronouns of Amerindian perspectivism” (Viveiros de Castro, 1996) and their subsumption under the concept of semblance in Lacanian psychoanalysis.

The “semblance” is a deictic that needs to be practically decided by the progress of the crossing of perspectives and encounters. It is also a unit in the Real, as its linguistic support is the function of the letter. Just as the function of clothing for the Amerindians signifies where there is unity (letter), we cannot discern its identity, and where there is identity (deictic), we lose it (Dunker, 2015: 388).

With the aim of conferring an anti-condominium existence to the Amerindians (Dunker, 2015: 385), the author refused, however, to recognize the essential: cannibal metaphysics is an anti-state and non-subjective cosmology (Viveiros de Castro, 2011). By refusing to acknowledge its own anthropology and ontology, Dunker fails to make an accurate comparison, does not outline irreducible worlds, and ignores what constitutes a cosmology against the state: a war against the dissolution of differences and a war against ethnocide.

Incorporating the approach of the “multiple versions of the father” from Lacanian theory, without rejecting the “totemic version of the father” (Dunker, 2015: 165), Dunker opens Lacanianism to multiple affiliations and symbolic variations, attempting to shed the necessary relationship to naturalistic ontology. Moreover, his writing posits a political proposition for Brazilian psychoanalysis, suggesting a connection between experiences of hyper-regulation in condominiums, the desire for servitude, and the experience of indeterminacy as crucial themes for the clinic as a means of social critique. Within the realm of Brazilian identity, it seems to reflect on a national dilemma, perhaps under clinical listening: authoritarian nationalism and the illusion of national identity.

Although Dunker aligns himself with a leftist psychoanalysis allied with Amerindian peoples, it is essential to remind readers that Amerindian cosmology against the state presupposes a war machine against ethnocide and the fixation of nationalistic representations intertwined with the conservative organs of coercive power’s subsumption to the One, the nation-state (Clastres, 2003).

Due to a misunderstanding – or refusal – of the proposition of a “Brazilian identity” without a center within it, Dunker assumes an Oswaldian thesis of the incorporation of the “Indian”, when the exact opposite is at stake. In Oswaldian

anthropophagy, it is about the devouring of the “greens and yellows” by the “Indian”, in a true Carib revolution¹⁸.

Contrary to Freudian psychoanalysis, which is refractory to animism, Christian Dunker finds in contemporary anthropology and Amerindian perspectivism an extractivist means to enrich Lacan’s work. The author does not equivocate in his listening and, in failing to do so, does not sustain ontological self-determination, subjecting Amerindian perspectivism to the One of Lacan.

Brazilian Identity and the New Universal Religion?

Finally, let’s examine the Jungian reception of Amerindian perspectivism. As is known, the body of reflections on deep ecology, ecopsychology, and eco-spirituality rekindled the consideration of animism within analytical psychology from the latter half of the last century (Roszak, 1992; Tacey, 2005; Hillman, 2010). In Brazil, the Jungian milieu has also dedicated itself to the theme of the Brazilian soul, mediating theoretical dialogue through assimilation, a term with psychological and political connotations. This necessitates our focus on the psychopolitical aspect of national assimilation.

Roberto Gambini’s work, *Espelho índio: a formação da alma brasileira [Indigenous Mirror: the formation of the Brazilian soul]* (2000), was undoubtedly a landmark within the field. By engaging with the title, his proposition simultaneously denounced colonization – referencing the mirrors handed to the Indigenous by colonizers – and the Brazilian narcissistic refusal to equally acknowledge Indigenous participation in the country’s future.

However, we disagree with the nationalistic psychopolitical debate that renders the indigenous present solely for their integrative function in the Brazilian psyche. The genetic fusion, biological fusion, and cultural assimilation have not sufficed to resolve the modern Brazilian consciousness’s drama, allegedly requiring a “deep fusion at the psychological level” (Gambini, 2000: 25).

We recognize the contributions of studies on psychic projection and the possibilities of healing through integrating the split parts of the psyche. Nonetheless, associating the psychopolitical proposition with the theme of assimilation to the populace is politically misguided. This is especially pertinent given that the defining characteristic of colonial, imperial, and republican-military projects – including the one we currently endure, and which Darcy Ribeiro could not foresee – was the assimilation of diverse existential possibilities into the

18 Andrade (2017).

economy. This entailed the dissolution of differences in the colonial-slave enterprise, the imperial labor reserve, or sub-citizenship within Brazilian capitalism. Contemporary parallels include the notion that a “good Indian is a self-entrepreneurial Indian”, as suggested by Bolsonaro’s neoliberal fascist regime.

One should emphasize that even when acknowledging the projection of the dissociated modern Brazilian, hanging images (*imago*) on the “Indigenous hook”, achieving a perspective akin to that of the Amerindian peoples of the South American Lowlands is not intrinsic to Brazilian identity. To suggest that the grand utopian task for the 21st century in Brazil is to reach the final purification of the mixture (Gambini, 2000: 30) is a contradiction. Opposing to this Jungian alchemy, we remind that the cannibal metaphysics and ways of existing and differing of the Amerindians do not invite us to the One and to Brazilian Identity; rather, we understand that the cannibal *cogito* invites us to the multiplicity of existential possibilities, inspiring a territory of permanent genesis of modes of existence.

However, it is clear that the so-called “ontological turn” occurred after Roberto Gambini’s work (Gambini, 2000) and can only be situated in relation to later critiques within anthropology. The same cannot be said for the work *Morte e renascimento da ancestralidade indígena na alma brasileira: psicologia junguiana e inconsciente cultural* (2020), organized by Humbertho Oliveira.

It is also important to remember that the cannibal metaphysics and animist ontology of the Amerindians comprise differentiated social, political, and cultural organizations. In other words, we do not access Amerindian animism via the dissolution of the modern individual, as Amerindian animism is not even equivalent to the undifferentiated animic background. In Jungian terms, these millenary societies have arduously individuated individually, collectively, and spiritually, they have individuated the Amerindian forms, their becomings. Regarding their modes of dissolution and composition of collectives and individuals, Amerindian perspectivism is not a doctrine of souls, as animism was once understood. The language of Amerindian perspectivism is the body, “assembled”, adorned, etc., by ethnically differentiated peoples; for some peoples, for example, spirits have different points of view because they have unique bodies.

Humbertho Oliveira states: “We act at the interface of our three mythic sources: indigenous mythology, Afro-Brazilian mythology, and popular myth” (Oliveira, 2020: 9). The author describes acting at this Brazilian interface from a detachment of thought or symbolic economy concerning the corresponding social and (cosmo)political organizations. I cannot agree with the author’s interpretation because the interface achieved through approximation, collages, partial mixtures,

ultimately dissolves the social and political organization of the peoples, rendering the confrontation between modes of existence and difference invisible.

For me, Jungian readings encourage us to think that integration and assimilation remain central elements. Gambini, in the preface to *Morte e renascimento da ancestralidade indígena na alma brasileira* [*Death and rebirth of the Indigenous ancestry in the Brazilian soul*] (2020: 23), emphasizes that we can take pride in our ancestry as the proto family of Brazil. Tereza Caribé's (2020) observations on the assimilation process also do not incorporate the recent ethnic insurgencies challenging national integration, a topic addressed, however, by Andrea Cunha (2020). Duque, on the other hand, suggests that Amerindian peoples live within the *unus mundus*; in his words: "For them, the soul of the world is a reality, and we are immersed in this wisdom even without recognizing it" (Duque, 2020: 171). Or as he further suggests, "the need to open ourselves to Indigenous culture, to learn from them to reintegrate ourselves into the soul of the world" (Duque, 2020: 181). Some reflections reduce Amerindian cosmopolitics to a superior living version of Jungian convictions or depth psychology, turning the "pajés" into true artisans of a universal cosmo-religion.

For me, it is not a rejection of the reality of miscegenation or syncretism but rather a rejection of a regime of correspondencies between the national syncretic experience and Amerindian societies. The experiences and cosmopolitics do not compose the Same: it is about emphasizing the modes of existence and differentiation between these ontologies.

Jungian and post-Jungian readings target anthropocentrism and open up to animism. However, Hillman's proposal to reverse psychology's vision towards the poetic and polymorphic gods tends to selectively appropriate indigenous cultural expressions, abandoning their economy of reciprocity, social, and (cosmo)political organizations – namely, anti-capitalist and anti-speciesist.

Thus, the proposition of a theophanic psychology (Hillman, 1992: 429) has its legitimate field of action within the psychic area, but in seeking it within the Western tradition (Hillman, 1992: 24), it radically differs from the modes of existence and differentiation of Amerindian cosmopolitics. Moreover, this proposition dialogues with the growing interest of young people worldwide in the soul's archaeologies within new eco-spiritual movements (Tacey, 2005). In this context, our question falls on the modes of incorporation and symbolic archaeology within modern and capitalist societies.

Again, focusing on psychopolitics in Brazil, wouldn't the incorporation of Amerindian animism within this capitalist society possibly result in the reordering of animism within its structural inequalities, such as those of class, gender,

and ethnic-racial? For this reason, paraphrasing an assertive Ailton Krenak, given the broad desire for deeper political transformations in Brazilian society, the eco-spiritualist alternative within this modern and capitalist society is reduced to personal vanity.

Final Equivocations

We believe that this equivocation of listening has provided us with an exercise in decolonizing the imagination, delineating worlds that are irreducibly relational. While mainstream Freudian psychoanalysis insists on formulating a modern science that is refractory to animisms, Dunker's proposition, on the other hand, exerts a conceptual extractivism that enriches the modern world without acknowledging the intellectual, spiritual, and political sovereignty of the metaphysics and cosmopolitics of the Indigenous peoples of this land. Faced with the two forms of psychoanalysis, analytical psychology has its own animism but offers it to fuse the differences.

In dialogue with the ontological self-determination of peoples, we propose psychoanalyses and psychotherapies of the misinterpretations of listening between knowledges, sciences, and philosophies. These should be opposed to the war between schools and situated in the sparks between ontologies – an individuating listening. It is precisely these differences and sparked potentials that provide us with new meanings, as we proposed in this exercise of misinterpretation. Perhaps, a psychopolitics opposed to ontological narcissism and ethnocide can form an alliance in the diversity of modes of existence and difference, in frank protest against the “final offensive” currently directed at the Amerindian peoples in Brazil.

References

- ALMEIDA, Mauro. Anarquismo Ontológico e Verdade no Antropoceno. *ILHA*. Florianópolis, v. 23, n. 1, 2021.
- ANDRADE, Oswald. *Manifesto Antropófago e Outros Textos*. São Paulo, Companhia das Letras, 2017.
- BASTIDE, Roger. *Sociologia e psicanálise*. São Paulo, Melhoramentos; Edusp, 1974.
- BASUALDO, Carina. Uma nova versão do mito da horda parricida: As estruturas elementares do parentesco, de Claude Lévi-Strauss. In: FUKS, Betty; BASUALDO, Carina and BRAUNSTEIN, Néstor (Eds.). *100 anos de Totem e tabu*. Rio de Janeiro, Contra Capa, 2013.
- BRAUNSTEIN, Néstor. O pai primitivo e o pai digitalizado. Do Urvater ao Big Brother. In: FUKS, Betty; BASUALDO, Carina and BRAUNSTEIN, Néstor (Eds.). *100 anos de Totem e tabu*. Rio de Janeiro, Contra Capa, 2013.

- CLASTRES, Pierre. *A sociedade contra o Estado*. São Paulo, Cosac & Naify, 2003.
- CUNHA, Andrea. Pacificando o encontro com a origem ancestral. In: OLIVEIRA, Humbertho (Ed.). *Morte e renascimento da ancestralidade indígena na alma brasileira: psicologia junguiana e inconsciente cultural*. Petrópolis, Vozes, 2020.
- DANOWSKI, Deborah and VIVEIROS DE CASTRO, Eduardo. *Há mundo por vir?: ensaio sobre os medos e os fins*. Florianópolis, ISA, 2017.
- DELEUZE, Gilles and GUATTARI, Félix. *Mil platôs: Capitalismo e esquizofrenia*. v. 5. São Paulo, Editora 34, 1997.
- DESCOLA, Philippe. *Para além de natureza e cultura*. Niterói, Euduff, 2023.
- DESCOLA, Philippe. *Outras naturezas, outras culturas*. São Paulo, Editora 34, 2016.
- DUFOURMANTELLE, Anne. Totem e tabu: Freud, Wittgenstein e o arcaico. In: FUKS, Betty; BASUALDO, Carina and BRAUNSTEIN, Néstor (Eds.). *100 anos de Totem e tabu*. Rio de Janeiro, Contra Capa, 2013.
- DUNKER, Christian. *Mal-estar, Sofrimento e Sintoma: uma Psicopatologia do Brasil Entre Muros*. São Paulo, Boitempo Editorial, 2015.
- DUQUE, Gil. Cosmomediação: Unidade e Confronto no plano do anima mundi. In: OLIVEIRA, Humbertho (Ed.). *Morte e renascimento da ancestralidade indígena na alma brasileira: psicologia junguiana e inconsciente cultural*. Petrópolis, Vozes, 2020.
- FREUD, Sigmund. *Totem e tabu: contribuição à história do movimento psicanalítico e outros textos*. v. 11. São Paulo, Editora Companhia das Letras, 2012. (Obras Completas).
- FUKS, Betty; BASUALDO, Carina and BRAUNSTEIN, Néstor (Eds.). *100 anos de Totem e tabu*. Rio de Janeiro, Contra Capa, 2013.
- HILLMAN, James. *Emotion: A Comprehensive Phenomenology of Theories and Their Meaning for Therapy*. Evanston, Northwestern University, 1992.
- HILLMAN, James. *Re-vedo a Psicologia*. Petrópolis, Vozes, 2010.
- GAMBINI, Roberto. *Espelho índio: a formação da alma brasileira*. São Paulo, Axis Mundi; Terceiro Nome, 2000.
- GAMBINI, Roberto. À guisa de prefácio: a identidade brasileira e seu drama oculto. In: OLIVEIRA, Humbertho (Ed.). *Morte e renascimento da ancestralidade indígena na alma brasileira: psicologia junguiana e inconsciente cultural*. Petrópolis, Vozes, 2020.
- GONÇALVES, Lucila de Jesus Mello. O campo e o capim: investigações sobre o sonhar nos Kamaiurá. Doctoral Thesis, Social Psychology, Universidade de São Paulo, 2019.
- GONÇALVES, Lucila de Jesus Mello. *Na fronteira das relações de cuidado em saúde indígena*. São Paulo, Annablume/Fapesp, 2011.
- LATOUR, Bruno. *Investigação sobre os modos de existência: uma antropologia dos modernos*. Petrópolis, Vozes, 2019.
- LÉVI-STRAUSS, Claude. *As estruturas elementares de parentesco*. Petrópolis, Vozes, 1982.

- LÉVI-STRAUSS, Claude. *Totemismo hoje*. Petrópolis, Vozes, 1975.
- LÉVI-STRAUSS, Claude and ERIBON, Didier. *De perto e de longe*. Rio de Janeiro, Nova Fronteira, 1990.
- MARQUES, Luiz. *Capitalismo e colapso ambiental*. Campinas, Editora da Unicamp, 2015.
- MATAREZIO FILHO, Edson Tosta. O que Lévi-Strauss deve aos Ameríndios. *Ponto Urbe*. São Paulo, v. 16, 2015.
- MIELI, Paola. Totem e tabu: nota sobre a função do pensamento no aparelho psíquico freudiano. In: FUKS, Betty; BASUALDO, Carina and BRAUNSTEIN, Néstor (Eds.). *100 anos de Totem e tabu*. Rio de Janeiro, Contra Capa, 2013.
- MORAES, João Antônio Pentagna. Literatura e Cosmopolítica. *Artecompostagem'21*. São Paulo, 2022.
- MORAES, João Antônio Pentagna. O outro encantado no pensamento indígena: uma escuta clínica. *ClimaCom*. Campinas, year 8, n. 20, abr. 2021.
- NASSIF, Jacques. Entre Freud e Lacan, há Bataille. In: FUKS, Betty; BASUALDO, Carina and BRAUNSTEIN, Néstor (Eds.). *100 anos de Totem e tabu*. Rio de Janeiro, Contra Capa, 2013.
- OLIVEIRA, Humbertho (Ed.). *Morte e renascimento da ancestralidade indígena na alma brasileira: psicologia junguiana e inconsciente cultural*. Petrópolis, Vozes, 2020.
- SEDES SAPIENTIAE. Live III – Laços afetivos: de Freud ao contemporâneo. *Youtube*, 19 jun. 2021. Retrieved from: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MkFTfo6-AS4&t=5900s&ab_channel=InstitutoSedesSapientiae>. Accessed: 19 jun. 21.
- SEIXAS, Flávio Carlos. A criação de órgãos psíquicos auxiliares na clínica e nos rituais iniciáticos indígenas. *Abrapso*, 2023. Retrieved from: <https://www.encontro2023.abrapso.org.br/trabalho/view?ID_TRABALHO=2533>. Accessed: 13 jul. 2024.
- SELIGMANN-SILVA, Márcio. Totem e tabu: o “mito científico” da era das catástrofes. In: FUKS, Betty; BASUALDO, Carina and BRAUNSTEIN, Néstor (Eds.). *100 anos de Totem e tabu*. Rio de Janeiro, Contra Capa, 2013.
- SOUZA JUNIOR, Luiz Alberto de. Lacan com Krenak: perspectivismo enquanto laço social. Undergraduate thesis, Psychology, UniCEUB, 2022.
- TACEY, David. *The Spirituality Revolution: The Emergence of Contemporary Spirituality*. London, Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2005.
- VIVEIROS DE CASTRO, Eduardo. *Metafísicas canibais*. São Paulo, CosacNaify/N-1, 2015.
- VIVEIROS DE CASTRO, Eduardo. O intempestivo, ainda. In: CLASTRES, Pierre. *Arqueologia da violência*. 2. ed. São Paulo, Cosac Naify, 2011.
- VIVEIROS DE CASTRO, Eduardo. O Anti-Narciso: lugar e função da Antropologia no mundo contemporâneo. *Revista Brasileira de Psicanálise*. São Paulo, v. 44, n. 4, 2010.
- VIVEIROS DE CASTRO, Eduardo. *A instância da alma selvagem e outros ensaios de antropologia*. São Paulo, Cosac & Naify, 2002.

VIVEIROS DE CASTRO, Eduardo. Os pronomes cosmológicos e o perspectivismo ameríndio. *Revista Mana*. Rio de Janeiro, v. 2, n. 2, 1996, pp. 115-144.

Data de recebimento: 03/09/2024

Data de aceite: 07/11/2024

Como citar este artigo:

MARONI, Amneris. Ontological Narcissism and Ethnocide in the Psychoanalytic Area. *Contemporânea – Revista de Sociologia da UFSCar*, v.14, p. 1-18, e141369, 2024. DOI <https://doi.org/10.14244/contemp.v14.1369>