

Temporality of the transition between psychotherapy and psychoanalysis

"Never ask for directions from someone who knows the way, for you will not go astray"

Rabbi Nahman of Bratslav

We can all see today that it is becoming difficult to put in place the conditions for an analysis according to the classical setting, which does not mean that the requests are drying up, because the address to the 'psy' has become more democratic in proportion to the disarray and solitude of human beings, even though they are hyper-connected. But our time has become one of efficiency, objectification and the demand for a rapid cessation of symptoms or angst, a demand sustained by the multiplicity of psychotherapies backed by the ideology of happiness promoted by the consumer society.

However, this utilitarian aim comes up against the paradoxical nature of the symptom as a nucleus of truth which the subject holds as dear as the apple of his eye, even if he suffers from it, the symptom being there, as Lacan says, to make a desire recognised (or, more Freudianly, as a formation of compromise between a desire and its defence). Pretending to cure it leads to nothing or worse because the desire in distress remains there and and reappears in one way or another.

What distinguishes psychoanalysis and what does it have to do with its modalities? Is the couch three times a week essential for analytical work to take place? I don't think so. But today we need more time to unfold the coordinates of a request, to open the attention of the person who comes to the connotations of his or her word and the singular weight of words, before considering it. A time of active support during a critical life situation which will later allow the subject to carry his questioning beyond the crisis may sometimes be necessary. We must also take into account the precarious material situation of those who come to us, especially young people, without denying the value of their words through the necessary investment. The bet is on both sides and you never know in advance.

This preliminary time, which can be long, is nevertheless analytical if its aim is not the cure of the symptom and the response to the manifest demand but the opening of the unconscious

and the subject effect that can be produced. It is obvious that if this opening does not take place and if the person who comes remains frustrated by the absence of a response to his request for advice or recipes for getting better, if he cannot accept the slightest deviation from what he says, the slightest question mark, and if he does not manage to hear himself, he will leave. It is the status of the word that must change in order to pass from submission to the discourse of the master and to the master signifiers of some therapist or guru, or from simple friendly conversation without dissymmetry, to an analysing word opened by listening to its echo in the analyst. As François Perrier formulates it¹, for the analyst: *'It is not a question of response but of referral (...) to refer the signifying echo of the question such is the function of the relaunching so that the other that one is is not a functionary of a lock for the open door of the question posed'*.

Could we not say that when this opening to otherness in itself occurs, the **ethical** conditions of an analysis are put in place, whatever the modalities of the sessions?

Beyond the obvious deontological rules, the respect of the fundamental rule or that of the missed sessions, the role of the analyst is to allow the analysand to make an initial identification of something in his or her speech that will shed new light on his or her complaint in the present. This can be very small: an unexpected connection that is revealed between words or situations, a pun, a slip of the tongue, a chance discovery that triggers surprise and a certain enthusiasm for the formations of the unconscious. A requirement for truth and authenticity, beyond the concern for self-image, will then emerge, linked to this ethical dimension. The analysand realises that his word is not empty, that he is saying more than he thought he was saying, and knowing, at the beginning. He then feels more engaged in and by his word, attracted by this unknowing knowledge glimpsed, beyond all suggestion. This subjective crossing then makes possible the 'passage to the couch' because the analysand who has become sensitive to the resonance of his own words will have less need to cling to the analyst's gaze.

¹ François Perrier, "La chaussée d'Antin", Albin Michel, 1994.

This opening of the unconscious will have to be maintained thereafter by cultivating a certain suspense and a gap in understanding that will allow the re-launch of the word. It is not constant over the time of an analysis, but when it has occurred once, the transference is set up because the initial demand is displaced and seizes itself as an enigma, a quest for something else. A change of discourse has occurred, of which Lacan says that love is its sign, that is, the love of transference.

With the 4 discourses, Lacan tried to articulate, by relying on mathematical logic, the structure of what conditions the enunciations of the “parlêtres” (speaking being), thus tying the individual subject to the collective. Summarily translated into this writing, we could read the entry into analysis as a passage from different positions, for example:

From the **discourse of the master**, where the speaker seeks to obtain knowledge in order to use it and restore his mastery. He presents himself without an unconscious, the agent of an imperious discourse (S1) that puts the person to whom he is addressing himself to work in order to produce a knowledge (S2) that will allow him to eliminate the flaw that he feels or what he lacks (a). He is not divided and cannot yet subjectivise what happens to him. The place of the truth, which is unknown, is waiting (\$). In order to move on to another discourse, it is enough for the one to whom he is addressing himself to refrain from responding to the request.

From the **discourse of the hysterical**, where the speaker presents himself as dominated by his symptoms (\$) and the other to whom he is addressing himself, supposedly knowing what to do (S1), is again put to work in his place. It is expected to produce advice or a course of action to cure the symptom (S2). However, the double status of the symptom, between desire and truth which cannot be said otherwise, allows the object a to be written in the position of truth, as the cause of desire.

By working to put at work the one who speaks as a subject of his symptoms, the knowledge produced is of another nature than the one expected and it is the analysand who produces it, even if he is still unaware of being the depositary of it. The **psychoanalytic discourse** is then established when it is the divided subject who is in a position of work (\$). The agent of the

discourse, what puts him in this position, is a question about his desire and what causes it (a). Singular primordial signifiers are then produced (S1). This new discourse is supported by the unconscious knowledge (S2) in the position of truth.

Jacques Lacan added to these four discourses the capitalist discourse and also referred to a 6th discourse² that Nestor Braunstein calls the "discourse of the markets", based on technosciences and whose agent is the servomechanism (an object, device or substance that we believe we control but which controls us). I will not develop his point here, which is at the heart of the question of this congress, but I refer to his book: "El inconsciente, la técnica y el discurso capitalista"³ - and I take the opportunity to salute his memory, which is also that of Barcelona.

Nestor Braunstein alerts us to the fact that this new 'pest' discourse shares the same structure as that of psychoanalytic discourse, but only in appearance, because their functions are radically opposed, just as Lacan suggested that the psychoanalyst's discourse was the antidote to capitalist discourse and to what it can engender in terms of alienation, the opposite of the master's discourse. All the more reason to support the place of the psychoanalytic discourse in the living world of parlêtres (speaking being) who are neither robots nor images. This would be our ethic.

Sandrine Malem, march 2023.

² In his speech at the University of Milan, 12 May 1972.

³ In French : "Malaise dans la culture technologique - L'inconscient, la technique et le discours capitaliste" - Ed. Le bord de l'eau, 2014.