

Freud's Contributions to Education: Authority and Seduction in the Pedagogical Relationship

Maria Aparecida Morgado

Retired from Psychology Department, Federal University of Mato Grosso (UFMT), Cuiabá Campus, Cuiabá, Brazil

Email address:

morgadom@terra.com.br

To cite this article:

Maria Aparecida Morgado. Freud's Contributions to Education: Authority and Seduction in the Pedagogical Relationship. *Advances in Sciences and Humanities*. Vol. 9, No. 3, 2023, pp. 121-128. doi: 10.11648/j.ash.20230903.15

Received: September 22, 2022; **Accepted:** October 27, 2022; **Published:** September 6, 2023

Abstract: The present work consists of a research of a basic nature with a qualitative-descriptive design of the experience report type. The experience reported was the result of the assignments as an undergraduate professor in Psychology at the Federal University of Mato Grosso. Three Experience Reports were heard, later three Teacher Profiles were elaborated, based on the types of experience referring to those collected, in sequence, bibliographic research was undertaken to support the theoretical discussion. The unconscious psychic elements that structure the pedagogical relationship are discussed, in order to show that they can favor or hinder the exercise of teacher's authority, when this is replaced by seduction. The dichotomy between intellection and affect in the teaching-learning process is problematized. Based on the key concept of Identification, conceptualized by Freud, the child's prototypical relational experience can impose an overlapping of pedagogical authority by parental authority, in the field that links transference and countertransference. The teacher will be able to act with a predominance of affection and respect, creating favorable conditions for the transference field and the seduction that emanates from it to favor teaching and learning. Thus, the seductive domination of original authority is broken when the teacher does not react to the student's ambivalent transference expectations and evokes his tender affections to help him work. In these ideal situations, the teacher emphasizes the knowledge that legitimizes his pedagogical authority. The decisive question of the pedagogical relationship is posed. Even if he seeks to deny his own relationship — working to overcome the student's intellectual dependence — The teacher always moves on the thin border between authority and seduction.

Keywords: Freudian Psychoanalysis and Education, Identification, Transference and Countertransference, Seduction

1. Introduction

The Pedagogical Poem by the Ukrainian pedagogue Anton Semionovich Makarenko exposes the following: "Pedagogy, as is well known, energetically denies love, considering that it should only appear when the failure of educational influence has already been fully evident" [1]. The author states that school education takes almost exclusively into account the intellectual and cognitive abilities involved in teaching and learning.

This predominant orientation can be observed in undergraduate courses, aimed at teacher training, and also in technical-scientific training courses, as seen in the pedagogical disciplines of Psychology courses. It is assumed that the teacher meets the basic conditions to teach, the almost exclusive focus falls on the student, then conceived in rational terms. Generally, such understanding resorts to Didactics,

Teaching Methodology and Psychology of cognitive-constructivist nuances, in order to provide theoretical and technical support [2]. But this is still not enough, because the relationship that the student has with the elaborated knowledge is preceded by his relationship with the teacher. And this human relationship is not based on reason or intellection, but rather on emotion: an emotion that is contrary to the rule, an irrational emotion, an unconscious emotion that does not occur without reciprocity. Consequently, by focusing almost exclusively on the student, the dominant understanding hides rather than shows the pedagogical relationship in its complexity [3].

The teaching practice based on seduction covers up a subtle and covert refusal to socialize cultural goods. Seduction — somewhat intellectualized, somewhat eroticized — intensifies the emotional field of the pedagogical relationship and results in an abusive form of authority exercise, as the work of

teaching and learning is secondary. Therefore, the pedagogical problem of authoritarianism is linked to the psychoanalytic phenomenon of seduction [3].

A competent teacher is considered to have the basic conditions to teach. It is understood that the minimum intellectual conditions qualify the student to learn. But, often, the student does not learn because the teacher does not teach properly, as he is oblivious to the reciprocal unconscious revival of the childhood past that interferes with how he teaches. From this emotional exchange, a field of unconscious communication is configured that can hinder the purposes of the pedagogical action.

From this perspective, this article is a theoretical reflection based on an account of a teaching experience report which addresses the unconscious determinations of teacher-student relationship, focusing on seduction and the psychic processes that structure it: identification, transference and countertransference.

2. Method

The present work is a qualitative-descriptive research of an experience report type. Three Experience Reports were heard, later three Teacher Profiles were elaborated, based on the types of experience referring to those collected, in sequence, bibliographic research was carried out in order to support the theoretical discussion.

The experience reported is the result of the author's attribution as an Undergraduate professor of the disciplines of Psychology at the Federal University of Mato Grosso. This compilation has a special meaning, because – in its relationship with Psychology of a Psychoanalytic hue – Pedagogy has obscured – and even denied – the indisputable contributions of this branch of knowledge: in the Structure and Practice of Teaching. Therefore, it is necessary to present the contributions of Freudian Psychoanalysis to Education.

3. Results and Discussion

By its very nature, the school privileges the intellectual processes involved in the teaching and learning process. On the part of the teacher, in general terms, it is considered that the competent professional committed to the social purposes of Education meets the basic requirements for teaching. On the part of the student, in general terms, it is understood that the minimum intellectual conditions qualify him to learn [3].

It is likely that this educational perspective contributes to determine an orientation that can be observed in pedagogical training courses. In them, Educational Psychology, focused almost exclusively on the student, ends up giving greater emphasis to the cognitive dimension of psychic development processes and learning processes. In the conceptual support sought in Psychology, Didactics and Methodology, also focused almost exclusively on the student, they end up giving emphasis to the same cognitive dimension [3].

This results in at least two gaps. Firstly, it loses sight of the fact that, in the traditional pedagogical context, the

relationship that the student has with the elaborated knowledge is preceded by his relationship with the teacher. Second, it loses sight of the emotional dimension necessarily involved in the teaching-learning process [2].

Perhaps Educational Psychology lacks sufficient consideration that the work of teaching and the work of learning are possible thanks to the relationship between teacher and students and that, therefore, the privileged focus on the second constitutive pole of this social relationship obscures it rather than illuminate its complexity and its possibilities. Perhaps it still lacks taking on the responsibility of showing Didactics and Methodology that, ultimately, Teaching Practice will leave something to be desired as long as the emotional dimension of the pedagogical relationship is not also considered.

After all, one often sees the use of this dimension when the pedagogical practice fails to achieve its ultimate goal: that the student appropriates knowledge. Again, however, disregarding the entirety of the relationship, the focus is on the student. In addition to disfiguring the problem, this partial approach gives rise to the illusion that it is based on psychological science, when, above all, it results from the reductionist operation that so often attributes the failure of the educational enterprise to alleged emotional traumas of the learner — as if dissonances of this order were common to human psychic life in general.

The cultural and scientific tradition that dissociates intellection from affect competes to authorize underlying mistaken interpretations to this type of "psychologist" perspective, based on the atomization through which the part was taken for the whole. In the beginning, instead of granting the proper place to emotion, it is approached as a last resource, when perhaps there is no more possible pedagogical interference [3].

However, the student very often does not learn because the teacher does not teach properly. Beyond his professed commitment to the emancipatory purposes of citizen education, beyond his mastery of specific content, beyond the psychology of the school, which he assumes to know reasonably, beyond the use of Didactics and Methodology, the teacher misses elements that interfere problematically in how, and what, he teaches.

In part, these elements derive their effectiveness from the systematic denial of how much they contribute to structuring the pedagogical relationship. They report on affections that the student invariably deposits in the teacher and to which the latter invariably reacts. From this emotional exchange, a field is configured, in which affections are reciprocated without the subjects involved being aware of it. This field is not exclusive to teacher-student relationship, but to human relationships in general. In the classroom, unlike a love relationship, for example, it is desirable that the foreground is devoted to the socialization of knowledge.

It turns out that the foundation of the teacher's authority is pedagogical. In other words, it extracts its authority from the mediation it provides between the student and the cultural contents. If the relationship is structured in such a way as to

privilege the exchange of affections in detriment of contents, mediation will be inadequate: another authority will take the place of pedagogical authority. This overlap results in an abusive way of exercising authority: the teacher hides knowledge instead of presenting it to the student; covertly, he refuses to socialize the cultural goods he has appropriated [3].

Such overlap denounces the existence of determinations of pedagogical practice that escape conscious theoretical-methodological choices. Recurring processes, on one hand effective because they are systematically denied while also structuring the pedagogical relationship; on the other, effective precisely because they are unconscious. From them derives the seduction that, like a smokescreen, covers the veiled refusal to socialize knowledge. To them must be attributed the intensification of the emotional field that relegates the work of teaching and the work of learning to the background.

This crucial question, derived from the pedagogical field, shows that subjectivity escapes any methodical attempt when insufficiently addressed. It imposes, as it is understood, the link between the pedagogical problem of authoritarianism and the psychoanalytic phenomenon of seduction [4]. Yes, because the problem refers to seduction as an unconscious process that distorts pedagogical authority. Even though these two fields of knowledge still have little dialogue, possible intersections between Education and Psychoanalysis can support the so sought and essential balance between objectivity and subjectivity.

As it is well known, psychoanalytic theory gives capital importance to the child's relationship with her parents, understanding it as a prototype of subsequent social relationships. In this original relationship, in which childhood sexuality/affection is constituted in the field of the parents' sexuality/affection — grown adults and, therefore, more active —, the process of seduction is established [5]. In the seducer-seduced pair, the baby occupies, at first, the most passive pole and has, in this inequality, its first relationship of authority. The development of this relationship, in which seduction and authority are constituted at the same time, is based on identification — an unconscious process through which, taking the parents as models of human beings, the child introjects their psychic characteristics [4].

This theoretical approach — which understands the original relationship as prototypical of other social relationships — allows us to investigate the links between the child's initial experiences and the seduction that is configured in the pedagogical relationship. Especially regarding the question of authority, it allows us to investigate to what extent identification with the teacher depends on how they were structured and how the original relationships of the parties involved were overcome. Decontextualized from its scene of action, the original relationship of authority can be re-edited in place of the pedagogical relationship. In order that this seduction overlaps the intellectual work, two unconscious psychological operations are necessary: transference, referring to the affects of the past relationship that the student deposits in the teacher, and countertransference, referring to

the teacher's reaction to the transference affections of which he is depository [4].

This work summarizes the findings of the research that investigated the psychological-unconscious determinations of this abusive form of the exercise of pedagogical authority, based on seduction. It can be questioned that the investigation is based on Psychoanalysis to face the educational problem in question and that other psychological theories would allow approaching the emotional dimension of the teacher-student relationship. Absolutely. However, besides being the first to study the human unconsciousness, as far as it is known, psychoanalytic theory is the one that has systematized it in greater depth. After all, what gives life to the established cut is the inescapable task of showing how much the intervention of unconscious processes can make it difficult to achieve the objectives of pedagogical work.

Identification is an unconscious psychological process in which the infantile subject is constituted by taking another person as a model; it implies the most primitive form of emotional bond. It is installed before the object relation itself, that is, before the differentiation of the ego from the id, the moment at which the object is situated as independent. It is installed, therefore, before the configuration of the Oedipus complex [5].

Once psychic differentiation is established, libidinal cathexes are directed to the object. One of the parents — or both, to whom the child was initially linked by identification — is now taken as the object of sexual love. The process culminates in the Oedipus complex, which, in its simplified form, implies assigning aggressiveness to the other parent taken as an obstacle to the possession of the sensual object. But, in fact, the other parent, as well as the cultural interdiction of incest of which it is representative, hinders the possession of the object. Furthermore, the child still does not have the physical and mental conditions that would allow her to carry out this first efflorescence of sexuality [6].

Another way out will have to be found. Part of the erotic and destructive pulsions is acted upon by repression; another part is sublimated into socially valued interests, apparently free of sexual and destructive content [6]. Only the tender feelings of respect and affection remain in consciousness, now intensified in a compensatory manner [7]. Such renunciation of eroticism and destructiveness, which favors the Oedipal resolution, actually implies a regression to the original identification, when there was no object relationship and narcissistic libido — or ego libido — had not yet been transformed into object libido. This second moment of the identification process, in which the original feelings are regressively intensified, is called secondary or regressive identification. It also contributes to the ego formation [8].

In this process, it is not just the ego — always in search of the impossible harmony between the id's instinctual interests and the demands of reality — that is constituted from identifications. Within the ego itself, another psychic instance is differentiated. It is the superego. Also the heir to the identifications, it performs the function of self-observation of the ego, the function of conscience — which judges and

sanctions the action of the ego on the world — and the function of evaluating the ego against an ego ideal. It is gradually structured apart from the ego from which it originated [7].

The superegoic instance derives its strength from the original identification and the Oedipus complex, as well as the prominent position it comes to occupy in relation to the ego. It grows because, during the repression that took place in the regressive identification, it assimilates the rigidity and severity of the parental imagos that come to take the place of the libidinal cathexes abandoned by the id. More specifically, the installation of the superego is the result of desexualization based on the successful identification with parental authority: it represents the internalization of cultural coercion that was previously exercised from outside, in the beginnings of the psychic differentiation process, when — ignoring the anatomical sexual difference — the infant could not distinguish between the mother and the father [9].

It is not only to identification with parental imagos that the superego owes its configuration. To this identification, those ones connected to people who later occupy the place of parental authority are assimilated. Although they also contribute to character enrichment, such later identifications hardly promote significant changes in the first ones, which have long been rooted and, therefore, responsible for the essential characteristics of the superegoic domain. Considering the psychic characteristics introjected from the original identificatory link and those introjected from the later identificatory link, it is understandable why the superego is held responsible for the continuity of traditions and for the persistent maintenance of ideologies [7, 9].

However, not all the severity, rigidity and conservatism of the infantile superego are extracted from the parental superego. This psychic domain, heir of the Oedipus complex, is structured in close dependence on how this triangular conflict unfolded. The more intense the erotic demands and the destructive demands, the more the superego enlarges to contain them, in the contribution it makes to the repression that propitiates the Oedipal dissolution. Thus, the configuration of the superego depends on how the destructive and erotic impulses were equated, until they metamorphose into identifications [9].

The dynamics of the relations between the egoic and the superegoic domains, as well as the pressure that one can exert against the other depend, therefore, on how the identifications were imprinted on them and on how, in this game of forces, the ego manages to position itself in reality. However, the complex process does not take place at a level that can be grasped by consciousness. Conscious respect and affection express the only position that the child can have in front of the parents, because of her total initial dependence: submission. In order to preserve the integrity of the ego, there is usually not the remotest memory left of the implacable antagonistic passions, hidden behind these civic feelings [8, 9].

In submissive respect and affection, parents are taken as models of what the child would like to be. Firstly paradigmatic, they are then transformed into what the child would like to

have, to love or to destroy. In this second differentiated position, the bond is no longer tied to the subject, but to the objects. However, the resulting conflict will impose the repression and sublimation of these intense Oedipal feelings, concomitantly with the regressive intensification of the original identificatory bond [9]. Thus, psychic differentiation is based on an uninterrupted coming and going of the drive inhibited in its sexual purpose and the directly sexual pulsion, so often mixed with the also interchangeable destructive, inhibited and uninhibited pulsion.

Ego and superego also operate unconsciously in order to be able to withstand the intense pressures to which they are constantly subjected: on the one hand, the demands posed by reality; on the other, the overwhelming instinctual demands of the id [7]. Originally unconscious, the latter is alien to reality, to the distinction between past and present, to cultural morality and contradiction. Guided by the pleasure principle, he is only engaged in the tireless fight for the pulsion discharge [8]. As a result, most of the human psyche is unconscious. The identifications that differentiate and structure it leave in the ego and superego the precipitate of what must be forgotten and what can be remembered.

Another form of identification contributes to the enrichment of the psychism. It is partial or tertiary identification, in which no libidinal investment of an object is involved. Derived from the perception of characteristics shared with other people, it promotes friendship ties, the formation of groups and, therefore, the development of social feelings. Based on inhibited sexual and destructive pulsions, it favors tenderness and respect from which social bonds and formations are established and consolidated.

Because of their inhibited erotic and destructive underpinnings, the mild civic feelings prevalent in these social relationships can easily turn into sensuality or hostility: the uninhibited pulsion supersedes the inhibited pulsion. This plasticity of both, articulation and pulsional exchange, allows tenderness and respect to be transformed into eroticism, or hate, and vice versa — as can it be seen, for example, in friendship when metamorphosed into an erotic relationship, or a hostile relationship and, in the latter, when metamorphosed into friendship. Even so, identification must be distinguished from sensual love and also from hostility. Identification, in its infusion with sensuality, underlies the lasting bonds of friendship that facilitate collective formations. The same does not occur with sensual love — lasting only if mixed with tenderness — and with hostility, unfavorable to group coexistence [10].

Original identification, regressive identification and partial identification constitute the psychic personality, in the process in which ego and superego are differentiated from the id [11]. The structure of these three domains, as well as the play of forces between them, is substantiated in heterogeneous feelings, fed by the interchanging inhibited and uninhibited pulsions. Prevented from materializing due to the repression that occurred in the Oedipal dissolution, these intense instinctual demands start to press to achieve conscious representation. As a trigger for the identification process that

led to submission to authority, the original relationship implies, therefore, frustration and a tireless attempt to achieve the postponed satisfaction.

Prototypical of all the others, the original relationship can be re-edited with each new relationship made by the subject, moved by pulsional demands that were once frustrated. Because of this dynamic, subsequent authority relationships update the original relationship [12]. When they merge with it, when they are added to it, when they are superimposed on it or when they replace it, these current relationships bear the antagonistic feelings of the first and the conflicts provoked by such antagonism. Therefore, the coexistence of tenderness, affection, respect, sensuality and aggressiveness represents the emotional inheritance imposed on current authority relationships by the original relationship.

Transference refers to the unconscious psychological operation whereby the referred affects from the original relationship are brought into the current relationship [12]. This founding relationship therefore determines the way in which the subject places himself in the new relationships. Reprinting themselves as a cliché, the original prototypes that come to the scene can then be remodeled, as external circumstances and the specificity of the present relationship allow [13].

Note that the relationship of authority is just one of many in which this cliché can be reprinted. It is fundamental to the problem analyzed here, because, as we have seen, the extreme initial need, as well as the almost exclusive contact with the parents, or with their substitutes, imposes submission on the child: only to them can the child dedicate all her tenderness, all her sensuality, all her aggression and all her respect, because they are the only ones who can provide for their needs.

Because it structures and channels the various human feelings, the authority relationship represents the pole around which all other relational prototypes will be configured. Therefore, it monopolizes the set of ulterior emotional interests, creating the psychological conditions that favor the prototypical re-updating. Had the subject managed to satisfy all his instinctual demands, he would not need to compulsively return to the moment when they were interdicted.

Pulsion is understood by psychoanalytic theory as a borderline concept, between the somatic and the psychic. The pulsional source comes from the imperious bodily needs that, causing tension, send signals to the psyche that are transformed into representation. Determinants of the course of human erotic life, at the end of a random and complex evolution, the sexual pulsions are organized under the primacy of genitality that culminates in puberty — the second efflorescence of sexuality [14].

In general terms, it can be said that this organization is engendered in specific regions of the human body. At the beginning of psychosexual life, the erotic pulsion is made up of a series of partial pulsions that seek satisfaction independently of one another. Then they turn to the most stimulated regions of the body, called erogenous zones. Initially, they converge to the oral region, then to the anal region, and finally to the genital region. Such subordination to

the last region does not overcome the strength of the partial pulsions: just as they are integrated into the genitality, these pulsions can also be detached from it, or else they can escape any organization. Even in the psychosexual development considered normal, in which there is greater subordination to genitality, there remain marks of this mutability and this pulsional polymorphy [14].

Psychic representatives of sexual pulsions subordinated to genitality, and psychic representatives of pulsions sublimated to non-sexual goals express themselves and develop because they are admitted into consciousness. Psychic representatives of the partial pulsions, rebellious to this systematization, are vetoed by the conscious personality. Prevented from development, they touch consciousness only if expressed as fantasies. Such an action of repression is not enough to contain the imperious pressure they exert, trying to fully ascend to this psychic level. They achieve this goal when, in the present relationship, the prototypes of the original relationship are updated.

The prototypical re-edition depends on the extent to which the person in question (friend, lover, boss, teacher) fits into one of the psychic series already constituted by the subject. This inclusion — of the person in the stereotypical relationship cliché — can follow the model corresponding to the image of a father, mother, sister, brother, among others. In this way, the updating of the prototype takes place at the level of conscious representation, based on unconscious representations. Emotions experienced consciously, as if derived from the current relationship, originate from partial pulsions whose representation has been banished from this psychic level.

The psychic expression of the sexual pulsion, the libido now cries out for satisfaction interdicted at the earlier stage of childhood development in which it became partially fixed. The adequacy of the other person to the psychic series already constituted is possible because, by nature, unconscious processes are unaware of the guiding logic of conscious processes. For the pulsional demands of the unconscious — the realm of the illogical, amorality, timelessness, the coexistence of opposites — it makes no difference whether the relationship and the moment of life are different ones.

Current conditions always contribute to the fact that the original relationship is not faithfully reproduced in the present relationship. However, whatever combinations are established, the latter will at least have to bear the transfer of the former's ambivalent feelings. Ambivalence, whose intensification dates back to the climax of the Oedipal conflict, is characterized by the coexistence of a libidinal amorous investment and a hostile investment, directed at the same time towards the same person: feelings of love and hate compete in the constitution of the subject, and of objects. Remaining in the unconscious, the demands on which these affections are based would peacefully cohabit. As they force their way into consciousness, the emotional conflict so characteristic of human relationships takes place.

Structured in the identification process, ambivalence is imprinted on the subject's personality as an affective *a priori*,

always revived. The intensity and nature of the affections involved determine whether the transference contributes to favoring or hindering the objectives of the new relationship. When positive, predominantly fueled by mild feelings of tenderness, it favors the achievement of these goals. When negative, if predominantly fueled by intense erotic feelings, it makes it difficult. It also makes it difficult when negative, predominantly fueled by intense hostile feelings.

The ulterior relations of authority evoke the most primitive identificatory bonds, founders of the original relationship, because, in one way or another, they also involve dependence and submission. Effectively responsible for the survival of the fragile baby, the adult imposed himself on him as an authority figure at that inaugural moment [12]. This prototype, the pole around which all other relational models were configured, feeds on intense ambivalence because the pulsional frustration brought about powerful feelings of hate. It is because of this that, in addition to bearing the positive transference of original tenderness and sensuality, the current authority relationship also has to bear the negative transference of hostility.

Countertransference refers to the unconscious psychological reaction to transference affects. The one who is the target of it has gone through a process of psychosexual constitution analogous to the one that includes him in the primarily established psychic series. He reacts to the primitive feelings of which he is a custodian, because he has also experienced the tenderness and respect derived from the original identification with his parents. Then, he also made them objects of sensuality and destructiveness, abandoned in the Oedipal dissolution and replaced by the compensatory intensification of those civic feelings that come to predominate in regressive identification.

In this way, the transferee subject also faced the frustration of erotic and hostile demands, repressed to ensure the fragile integrity of the ego, constantly threatened by precariously reconciled antagonistic pressures: demands of the id, limitations of reality and interdictions of the superego. The resulting ambivalent and nostalgic libidinal structure makes the affects that are intended for him reach his unconscious. He reacts to this without realizing it, updating fixations, unearthing relational prototypes, revolving primitive conflicts [3].

The transference reaction completes the field of communication among the unconscious aspects of the parties involved. Without the constitution of this transferential field, configured by the prototypical re-edition, there would be no possible human relationship. Authority relations intensify this field because, structured from the reissue of the most primitive identification prototypes, they impose the transference and countertransference of the ambivalent feelings of the original relationship. As they involve dependence and submission, these relationships tend to provoke the reciprocal revival of intense erotic feelings and intense destructive feelings, which override the mild feelings of tenderness and respect.

As an enabler of human relationships, the transference field produces, paradoxically, a problematic situation with which the two poles involved will have to deal with. The analytical relationship, critical of other social relationships, aims at the

transferential dissolution. In this relationship, in which transference and countertransference were first detected, the aim is to progressively overcome this field that usually goes unnoticed in other relational contexts. Unlike the analytical context, it can be said that the other contexts stimulate the prototypical re-edition of the original imagos, transformed into social ideals. The re-signification of the prototypes can occur in these other relationships, without any conscious effort from the subjects involved.

Institutionalized authority relationships have peculiarities that make it difficult to perceive the transference field. The previous institutional definition further accentuates the authority component — the one who has the most to say, the one who best knows what to do —, anticipating the constitution of this field. At the same time, such anticipation conceals the affects involved — for the one who occupies the hierarchically superior pole and for the one who occupies the hierarchically inferior pole — because the relationship is carried out as if the transference field preceded it. This is what happens in the pedagogical relationship.

The seduction in the teacher-student relationship derives from the transference field. The context of this relationship produces transferential and countertransferential expectations that evoke the most primitive identification prototypes. The teacher is formally invested with authority, by the educational institution and by society, regardless of their actual competence to teach. Similarly, the authority to educate children is legally conferred on parents. Asymmetry is assumed between the supposed superior level of knowledge of the teacher and the supposed inferior level of knowledge of the student who, constituted in this intersubjective process, hopes to overcome the asymmetry in the former. Seeing him as the one who can provide him with knowledge, the student chooses the teacher as the authority. When teaching, the teacher supposes to materialize the authority that the student attributes to him. Thus, the asymmetry between teacher and student refers to the initial polarity between the parent — who knows and provides — and the child, who wants to know and be provided for [10].

Even in situations considered ideal, in which the formal pedagogical authority relatively coincides with the real pedagogical authority, the transferential field can make it difficult, or even impossible, to achieve the proposed objectives. The student may include the teacher in a hostile psychic series, manifesting, for example, the self-disinterest of someone who does not recognize pedagogical authority. Concomitantly, this negative transference can activate hostile unconscious nuclei of the teacher who, instead of working on the contents of the class, reacts countertransferentially, promoting, for example, a verbal confrontation.

Intellectual curiosity, so necessary for teaching and learning, is an important constitutive element of the psychic personality. Between three and five years of age, the child who asks about everything manifests a sexual curiosity sublimated into intellectual curiosity. This curiosity stems from the perception of the anatomical difference between the sexes, the source of all her questions regarding the sexual relationship between her

parents and her own origin. The sexual theories she constructs in response are mirrored in the corresponding characteristics she observes in herself, in her parents, in other children and in animals. As the child's anatomical constitution has not yet produced the sperm or the female sexual orifice, essential for the reproduction of the species, the child is left without the nexus that, giving reality to his eccentric sexual theories, would unravel the existential enigma underlying all curiosity.

In addition to sublimation, children's curiosity also faces the action of repression. Because of these two processes, the child asks about an infinity of things that apparently have nothing to do with sex. At the height of the Oedipal conflict, the intense erotic feelings and intense hostile feelings deposited in the parents are repressed to meet the demands of external reality and the demands of the superego. All questions concerning sexuality go through the same process of repression. Prevented from expression, the pulsional demands of the id cry out for satisfaction and, for that, they reach the conscious representation through disguise, whose content does not reveal the true interest of the question.

In this conflictive moment, when she cannot have her parents - to love or to destroy - the regressive intensification of the affects of the original identification imposes on the child the choice of the social sexual role he will play. The process that structures this role — from the anatomical characteristics observed in the parents and the emotional model offered by these adults —, while defining their place in the world as a sexual place, competes to determine the course of their later investigative activities.

The desire to know and the desire not to want to know are then linked to the paths and misdirections of the Oedipus complex. If the repression was mild, the pulsional representatives can ascend to consciousness metamorphosed into intellectual curiosity: being open to investigation implies, ultimately, wanting to know about oneself, about one's sexuality. If the repression was intense, there is no possibility of sublimating disguise for the instinctual representatives, who will have to remain unconscious: being closed to investigation implies, ultimately, not wanting to know about oneself, about one's sexuality, because a simple question can be dangerous for the ego.

The repression that took place at that moment softens, but it does not suppress the intensity of the antagonistic feelings and sexual curiosity relegated to the subterranean of psychic life. The superego receives a new contribution: from objects of love and destruction, the parents return to the condition of model of the first identification, ideal models from which the ego will be permanently evaluated. Seduction achieves its victory, because it imposes on the superegoic instance the fascination submitted to parental authority: constituting itself in the image of the parents — internalizing their demands for love of them —, the infantile superego seductively shows that it is ready to receive their love. From then on, the subject's expectations regarding himself and others pass through the scrutiny of this identification.

The inaugural psychological basis of the teacher-student relationship, the transference field cannot constitute the point

of arrival. The libidinal energies and the destructive energies trapped in the reissue of the original prototypes need to be released so that they can be channeled into intellectual work. When reliving primitive love and/or hate, the student also relives the moment when, fascinated and terrified, he bowed to parental authority, assimilating its restrictive superegoic characteristics. Imprisoned in the ambivalent passion for the teacher, he has the critical functions of his superego weakened: knowledge is relegated to the background and parental influence takes the place of pedagogical influence — transference reiterates seduction. When he reacts contratransferentially to the student's transference, the teacher proceeds as if the affections he is targeting had been exclusively evoked by him. At the same time, he meets his childhood fixations and those of the student, seducing him to fulfill, out of love and/or hate, his own superegoic expectations — parental seduction supplants pedagogical authority. In this abusive form of exercising authority, pedagogical mediation and intellectual curiosity are replaced by reciprocal seduction [3, 7].

The seductive domination of the original authority is broken when the teacher does not meet the transference expectation of the student. He accepts your tender affections, to help you work. He also accepts erotic transference and hostile transference, but abstains from responding to them. It adequately exercises its pedagogical authority, because it puts the knowledge that legitimizes it in place of the contratransferential seduction. This genuinely pedagogical action, which can favor the predominance of mild feelings of affection and respect — sublimations of eroticism and hostility — produces favorable conditions for the transference field and the seduction that derives from it to stimulate intellectual work [3].

This seems to be the critical point of the pedagogical relationship, a relationship that seeks to overcome intellectual dependence and which, if disfigured by the compulsive revival of instinctual demands, may not achieve the proposed objectives. It is therefore necessary to clearly differentiate two modes of negation. When intense and reciprocal love and/or hate predominate, the relationship is denied because students and teachers cannot articulate themselves in the teaching and learning experience. When civic transferential and countertransferential feelings predominate, the pedagogical relationship also tends to be denied, now, in a dialectical way: it dissolves at the exact moment when it is fully consummated.

4. Conclusions

The pedagogical relationship is shaped by ulterior authority relationships that evoke the most primitive identifications because, in one way or another, they also involve dependence and submission. Effectively responsible for the survival of the fragile baby, the adult imposes himself on him as an authority, in that inaugural moment of psychic life. As we have seen, this relational prototype feeds on the intense ambivalence resulting from frustration. This is how the current relationship of authority bears the positive

transference of tenderness and sensuality, as well as the negative transference of hostility.

The teacher will be able to act with a predominance of affection and respect, creating favorable conditions for the transference field and the seduction that emanates from it to favor teaching and learning. Thus, the seductive domination of original authority is broken when the teacher does not react to the student's ambivalent transference expectations and evokes his tender affections to help him work. In these ideal situations, the teacher emphasizes the knowledge that legitimizes his pedagogical authority.

The decisive question of the pedagogical relationship is posed. Even if he seeks to deny his own relationship – working to overcome the student's intellectual dependence – the teacher always moves on the tenuous border between authority and seduction.

References

- [1] Makarenko, A. S. (1986). Poema pedagógico [Pedagogical poem]. São Paulo, Editora Brasiliense, I e II, 76.
- [2] Morgado, M. A. (2011). Autoridade e sedução na relação pedagógica [Authority and seduction in the pedagogical relationship]. *Psicologia da Educação*, (32), 113-130.
- [3] Morgado, M. A. (2017). Contribuições de Freud para a educação [Freud's contributions to education]. In: Placco, V. M. N. de S. et al. *Psicologia & Educação – revendo contribuições*. São Paulo: Educ.
- [4] Morgado, M. A. (2020). Contribuições de Freud para a educação [Freud's contributions to education]. *BIUS-Boletim Informativo Unimotrisaúde em Sociogerontologia*, 21 (15), 1-17.
- [5] Freud, S. (1915/1980). O inconsciente [The Unconscious]. In: Edição Standard Brasileira das Obras Psicológicas Completas de Sigmund Freud. Trad. de Órizon Carneiro Muniz. Rio de Janeiro: Imago, 8, 185-245.
- [6] Freud, S. (1905/1980). Três ensaios sobre a teoria da sexualidade [Three essays on the theory of sexuality]. In: Edição Standard Brasileira das Obras Psicológicas Completas de Sigmund Freud. Trad. de José Octávio de Aguiar Abreu. Rio de Janeiro: Imago, VII, 123-250.
- [7] Freud, S. (1923/1980). O ego e o id [The ego and the id]. In: Edição Standard Brasileira das Obras Psicológicas Completas de Sigmund Freud. Trad. de José Octávio de Aguiar Abreu. Rio de Janeiro: Imago, XIX, 11-83.
- [8] Freud, S. (1980/1938). Esboço de psicanálise [Psychoanalysis sketch]. In: Edição Standard Brasileira das Obras Psicológicas Completas de Sigmund Freud. Trad. de José Octávio de Aguiar Abreu. Rio de Janeiro: Imago, v. XXII, p. 165-237.
- [9] Freud, S. (1923/1980). O ego e o id [The ego and the id]. In: Edição Standard Brasileira das Obras Psicológicas Completas de Sigmund Freud. Trad. de José Octávio de Aguiar Abreu. Rio de Janeiro: Imago, XIX, 11-83.
- [10] Freud, S. (1920/1980). Além do princípio de prazer [Beyond the pleasure principle]. In: Edição Standard Brasileira das Obras Psicológicas Completas de Sigmund Freud. Trad. de Órizon Carneiro Muniz. Rio de Janeiro: Imago, XVIII, 11-85.
- [11] Morgado, M. A. (2012). Transferência, sedução e autoridade na relação pedagógica [Transference, seduction and authority in the pedagogical relationship]. *Revista Espaço Acadêmico*, 11 (131), 25-31.
- [12] Freud, S. (1921/1980). Psicologia de Grupo e a análise do ego [Group Psychology and the analysis of the ego]. In: Edição Standard Brasileira das Obras Psicológicas Completas de Sigmund Freud. Trad. de Christiano Monteiro Oiticica. Rio de Janeiro: Imago, XVIII, 87-179.
- [13] Freud, S. (1914/1980). Observações sobre o amor transferencial [Notes on transferential love]. In: Edição Standard Brasileira das Obras Psicológicas Completas de Sigmund Freud. Trad. de José Octávio de Aguiar Abreu. Rio de Janeiro: Imago, v. XII, p. 205-223.
- [14] Freud, S. (1980/1912). A dinâmica da transferência [Notes on transferential love]. In: Edição Standard Brasileira das Obras Psicológicas Completas de Sigmund Freud. Trad. de José Octávio de Aguiar Abreu. Rio de Janeiro: Imago, XII, 129-143.