

The ethics of psychoanalysis, between intention and extension.

I thank "Convergencia. Movimiento Lacaniano por el Psicoanálisis Freudiano", for this new invitation to think together about psychoanalysis, to the Escuela Freud Lacan de La Plata for almost 19 years of psychoanalytic work; and to my companions: Lucía Pose, Alejandro Pignato and Marcelo Edwards for this journey together that produced in me some questions that I will try to address in this writing.

First question: Why has psychoanalysis, despite being a very resisted discourse, survived the attacks to which it has been subjected since its invention, back in 1895, and even until today?

Why, despite the vast offer of therapeutic procedures based on scientific, psychological, religious or even magical doctrines, does psychoanalysis persist, remain valid and effective?

Finally, a reissue of the question that Lacan poses at the height of seminar 11: What is it that makes someone decide to carry out an analysis?; In what way, how do you forge that desire to analyze others?

These questions lead us to the question of analyst training; And I say question because I understand that it is necessary to keep this question open, that the training of analysts does not fall into an imperative, but into a question that makes the foundations of psychoanalysis itself.

In our talks held during this time with my colleagues in the group, the question arose of why do analysts need to meet, debate, dialogue, question, reflect on what we do in the clinics?, "interlocute" about our clinical practice; base from which any theoretical questioning starts. We read, study, investigate, because we start from the fact that the

theory of psychoanalysis is not a dogma; nor the parish analytic associations – although they are usually called that.

The training of analysts is a product that is gestated in the Freudian tripod and that is "linked" to the analytical institution. The Freudian tripod remains the ethical underpinning of analyst training; Not because it's the right thing to do, but because it's necessary.

Those gathered here know, from having gone through experience, the importance of the place of the other in our training as analysts... if not, at this time, we would be walking around Barcelona.

Those others before which an analyst is authorized, some others, who are not just anyone. Those others are not just anyone. They are others who have gone through the experience of an analysis; that they have encountered the limit that castration prints, that they have done a job with it ... And that enables a mode of social bonding a mode of social bond that is unprecedented, and that is sustained in the desire as an agent.

The analyst's analysis.

An analysis is what is expected of a psychoanalyst, -said Lacan- and links, in this way, clinical experience to training. It is from analytical work that a subject is warned of his division, and of the impossibility that the real imprints on human existence. It is in the analysis where each one, in front of the real, finds his know-how with the "meaningless of life".

And it is in the analysis where that unprecedented desire is forged, which is the desire of the analyst, logical operator of the psychoanalytic cure. That desire emerges and is reissued in the analyst's analysis. There is no other way. Without that logical operator in function, there is no psychoanalysis.

The analyst's analysis is a necessary condition, but not sufficient.

Both Freud and Lacan warned about it, promoted the meetings of analysts, stressed the importance of the place of the other in our formation. That is why they founded institutions; They emphasized this issue, the social bond between analysts.

The history of the psychoanalytic movement testifies to the difficulties or "resistances" that have had to be dealt with in trying to frame the training of analysts in different institutional forms. Psychoanalysis resists institutionalization, Safouan said to us, And I understand that it is the discourse that resists, breaks with common sense, promotes movement.

In the "Proposition of October 9, 1967" Lacan refers to the training of analysts as a community of experience; that is affected by the real. What is the real stake in analyst training? What does this have to do with the ethics of psychoanalysis?

Here we enter the theme that summons us on this occasion.

I titled my work this way: "The Ethics of Psychoanalysis. Between intention and extension", because I understand that it is in that "between" where we could locate the torsion that links ethics: between what is produced in the analysis, -in the intention- and what is transmitted in the extension, in a permanent feedback.

There we locate the ethics of psychoanalysis, which applies to both intention and extension. An ethic that places castration at the center of the issue as the logic of Not All; that is, that point of impossibility that is law for everyone.

Where other discourses delude that everything is possible - "Just do it" - the discourse of psychoanalysis comes to say that there is a limit. The limit, the lack, relaunches the desiring movement.

Is it no coincidence that Convergence is a "Movement", a Moebian movement where convergence is linked to divergence, the shared and the singular.

The important thing is to sustain the movement. And that task is not without discomfort, without difficulties.

Keeping psychoanalysis alive is a job that requires a permanent interrogation, it implies locating the symptom and reading it. If we place the problem on the outside, and on the others; We have little left to do.

However, if we put the emphasis on the social bond between analysts, on the investigation and transmission of the crucial questions of psychoanalysis; whether we accept the responsibility that concerns each of us with regard to psychoanalysis and its transmission; Then we will glimpse a future, new paths to travel.

CLAUDIA LUJAN

MAY 2023