

A Po-ethic in act: Psychoanalysis Psicoanálisis forth-being

“The psychoanalysis continues. Founded by Freud and after Lacan’s death, it exists in his discourse. This persistence supposes a supplementary act: that of deducting from the discourse a different type of link between psychoanalysts.”.

Convergencia, a Lacanian movement by the Freudian Psychoanalysis was founded in Barcelona in 1998 by 45 psychoanalytical institutions from different places in the Americas and Europe, indebted to Freud’s discoveries and Jacques Lacan’s teachings.

Today, 25 years after, in this VIII International congress in the same city that Convergencia was founded, we come to reaffirm -from this debt that the founding teachers of this movement transferred to us- the continuity of Psychoanalysis and of Convergencia under the question, Which Ethic for the practice of psychoanalysis in these modern times?

It is a matter that in its ebb and flow implicates us, and proposes to Convergencia to go back over the known road and relaunch it. This, with the intention of sustaining a space that builds between what endures and what evolves, as the word that gives way to the foundational act: Convergencia continues and endures.

For an event to become an act, it must be confirmed a posteriori and it is equally important the effects that it produces. Therefore, the theoretical and clinical exchanges produced in the countless activities realized between the psychoanalysts and the institutions, have made the creation of multiple devices and tools a reality: workshops, national and regional workdays, congresses and physical & virtual symposiums. Programs supported from the differences and questionings articulated in the desire to keep pondering together about the validity of the current psychoanalytic discourse. These are all testimony that the founding of Convergencia was not only an event, but that it was also established in act and fundamentally, in a political act from which the institutional members are in charge of its current validity.

From a Lacanian perspective, the category of the act implies introducing something new through a cut, which brings about a fundamental shift in the practice of analysis based on a decision that has irreversible consequences for the one who sustains it. In this way, the

dimension of the act matters in the sense that it is sustained by the fact that it produces efficacy in analytic practice through a novel incidence.

Within the multiple issues involved in the analytic act, it is necessary to point out that it is not exhausted in its significant dimension, but when the object comes into play, there is a real dimension. In the Act Seminar, in the class on 3/13/68, Lacan asserts that *"it is precisely because we know that in every act there is something that, as a subject, escapes it, that will come to make an incidence."*

Although the act is on the side of the analyst, its incidence is on the subject, but on the condition that something is lost for there to be an act effect. Therefore, the incidence of the analytic act is supported in that subtraction, in that loss capable of producing a cut, and where that cut itself configures the act. The act not only includes the subject but also the object. On the one hand, it is the effect of a cut and, on the other hand, the object is what remains, what escapes the completeness of the One, producing and sustaining the void of lack. In the experience of analysis, the analyst takes on the place of the semblance as an empty place so that from there they can operate the transfer; their task is to sustain, maneuver, and impact to operate a cut. The act of the analyst is perfectly articulated with their politics, since in other terms, it is a matter of producing an effect of relocation and relief of suffering produced by the parasitic enjoyment of the symptom.

Based on these concepts, we are interested in putting them to work in relation to the following questions:

If we maintain that convergence is a movement that is constituted from a void at its center that operates as a cause and thus sustains new forms of ties between analysts. Then, this consideration entails a policy that directs the action of the movement. If the analytic act implies a new tie, the social bond is a matter of discourse, and the discourse is the terrain of politics because politics is inherent in the speaker.

For Hannah Arendt, politics is based on the fact of human plurality. However, to converge in a plurality, to sustain singularity and difference, it is necessary to maintain the void as lacking. Sustaining the lack as castration guarantees that the foundation preserves its

condition as an act and as political, as well as maintaining and producing new incidents in the movement. So, after 25 years, it is worth asking about its becoming an institutional movement. It is about how to host the void as support and engine that re-produces the movement and not allow haste, bureaucracy or the need to fulfill what was agreed upon to obstruct and silence the discomforts that the ebb and flow produce.

If each epoch corresponds to a politics and this reveals the way of managing joys and bodies, we are interested in raising the incidence of a politics tributary of the globalized capitalist discourse in this becoming of the Movement. We know that currently, it promotes action for all bodies, as a promise of happiness, and that in "the polis", politics maintains that enjoyment can be achieved. In this way, a scenario is established where everything is possible. It is a politics that, by maintaining that full enjoyment can be achieved by rejecting castration, tries to strike a fatal blow to the subjective, seeking to eliminate, flatten, and exile it. Eliminating the symptom and anguish is going back on one of humanity's greatest achievements, when, hand in hand with psychoanalysis, the speaking being recovered the possibility of discovering the desire that inhabits it, going to conquer the objects that cause its desire, and thus accessing a little more of the enjoyment of a better life. Under this panorama, and in an era where the institutional is becoming bureaucratic and sustained from the discourse of political correctness and the current master, psychoanalysis persists. So, how can we continue to sustain this political act of the continuation and persistence of Convergencia?

In the "Proposition of October 9th", we find a reference to psychoanalysis in extension as *"everything that summarizes the function of our School to the extent that it presents psychoanalysis in the world"*. The reference to the world can be read as: in-world, immersed in the world, in its culture, also in its population, with the little others. This is important because, inevitably, encounters with differences occur in the world. Now, how we deal with those differences is a crucial point because it includes different methods and possibilities from its sustenance in a "discreet fraternity" that allows for a connection with the other while preserving singularity, to the annihilation of the other as a threat. From Convergence, we

encourage a practice of this discreet fraternity that implies the possibility of establishing a bond with the other, conditioned on preserving the singularity of each one, that is, we must always try to articulate between the irreducibility of joy and castration to prevent the group or groups from becoming a mass.

In other terms, the enjoyment at play in someone who carries out a political action must be minimized. Therefore, the direction of the movement implies turning political action into an act, as an act is the foundation that involves a relationship with the other that is not based on idealization or denial of the other, sources from which the desire for submission and death of the other arises.

It is then a matter of questioning these issues that frame our practice and the social bond that we, as analysts, sustain in our institutional groupings. Likewise, of installing an interrogative position that serves as a counterpoint to totalizing and homogenizing knowledge.

Although it is in clinical practice, in the unique and singular experience of each analyst, where we sustain a politics that opposes discourses that produce subjective obliteration. The presentation of psychoanalysis in the world implies an ethics in relation to the bond that we are interested in putting to work today in this space. What does it mean to uphold an ethical-political position contrary to what manifests in today's culture, where compulsion prevails over thinking? How can we accommodate what our foundational act postulates regarding working with differences as a condition for the advancement of psychoanalysis? And finally, is it possible to conceive of a movement whose evolution is based on the rotation of the 4 discourses proposed by Lacan, giving rise to the necessary turns for the social bond to unfold in a movement contrary to the coagulated structures of meaning? In these turns relative to the discourses proposed by Lacan, it is necessary to maintain an interrogative stance that is intrinsic to the discourse of the hysteric, where the subject, divided between what they say and what they want to say, can inquire about what is happening.

If we long for the heretical flame that the Founding Act of Convergences promotes to survive and be transmitted within us, why not appeal to invention? This also requires us to address

the impasses that have arisen in the often exhausting path we have walked together in convergence over these 25 years. Therefore, we call upon:

To set aside a time for work that allows the unfolding of speech, to give space to the foundations of the political positions that are held, to allow the unfolding of the questions of what manifests itself in the form of symptoms, to aim at the desire that is the cause of our work, and to establish with it the motto that guides our journey.

The current situation of civilization has had significant effects on our movement, including the economic crisis caused by the pandemic and the war in Europe, among other things. In addition to the model of the bond with the other that has already been mentioned, we must also take into account the unprecedented advances in technology and virtual modes of communication. Screens and cell phones now mark the ways of approaching others. Chat contacts via cell phones have replaced in-person contact. It should be noted that all of this has also been transferred to our clinical work, enabling virtual and telephone sessions, and the transmission of psychoanalysis has also been done virtually. Our exchanges in institutions and inter-institutional artifacts have also taken this form. These changes in the bond with the other have had positive effects, making it possible for exchanges to occur without geographic distance and economic conditions constituting an impediment.

Having outlined the above, we want to highlight some issues that we find necessary to question in order to give them the status of symptoms. We formulate some of the questions that the development of the movement summons us to make in our experience as members. Has the haste to make things work, the rush to conclude, led us to give up the time of the word? During the CEG 2022 meeting, it is noticeable that not enough attention was given to the fact that some institutions resigned from Convergencia. Nor were the issues related to the economic situation of the world, determined by the effects of the pandemic and the war unleashed in Europe, which influenced the activities of the movement, adequately addressed. Similarly, we did not give enough importance to the fact of the absence of European institutions that, while still being part of the movement, did not participate in activities and meetings. Is it time to think about how to promote the realization of activities in

alternation in both America and Europe, taking into account the current economic conditions and promoting greater participation of analysts?

the virtual transmission of activities may constitute a means that enables greater participation, although we should not forget that physical presence is the most appropriate path for establishing the bond and the exchange.

As a Lacanian psychoanalyst, another issue to consider is the alternation of generations of analysts within the movement. Many of the analysts who promoted and founded the movement are no longer present in the leadership positions of the institutions, and their participation in the movement has been replaced by a second generation of analysts. This speaks to the fact that there has been transmission, that which acted as a cause in the pioneers and masters is recreated in others who keep alive the cause of that indestructible desire that drives us to continue working towards the advancement of psychoanalysis. From here we ask ourselves, what effects does this have on the future of the movement?

Convergencia was established on the principle that at its center there is a void that acts as a cause and relaunches our desire. To ensure that this is not just empty words, we must continue to support the commitment to a psychoanalysis that seeks to reach castration, not one that avoids it, sustained by an ethics that supports desire and its transmission.

For this annual CEG meeting, it is important for us to establish a time for work that allows for the deployment of the word, to create a space for the foundation of political positions, to enable the emergence of questions about what manifests symptomatically in the development of our work, and to direct us towards the desire that makes a cause. This is what needs to be sustained and maintained as the horizon that guides the direction of our movement. In our proposal, we find that this will enable the emergence of the new in every working meeting and in the activities we develop, thus allowing Convergencia to continue while preserving the heretical flame of its foundation.. This will enhance the possibility for new generations of analysts to take up the baton of Psychoanalysis from the Freudian discovery and the subversive transformation that Lacan contributed to the theory and practice of psychoanalysis.

As Lacanian psychoanalysts, when we title our work "A Po-ethics in Action: Psychoanalysis forth-being," we refer to an ethics that aims at a poetics. "Poises" in Greek means both creation and poetry. It is through this that Convergencia can offer a future in the sea of discourse. In Lacan's words, "to make something other than sense resonate, to make waves."

Would it be possible for us in this emblematic city with its marvelous sea, as Convergencia, to set ourselves to make some waves?