

Knowledge, Truth, Ethics

Isabel Martins Considera - Práxis lacaniana/Formação em Escola

VIII Congress of Convergence – may-2023 -Barcelona

I believe we agree that psychoanalysis is an ethic concerning the existence of the unconscious, a symptom that is logically necessary for our time. I think we also agree over the risks of its disappearance if there are no desires, at Freud's level, that sustain it at act.

The proliferation of ideologies that rule humanity, dominated, increasingly by the knowledge of the neo-liberal capitalism market, occupied with increasing the sales of illusory norms that strengthen narcissistic pregnancies and the use pretense identities that block the logical place of the radical hiatus to the existence of the unconscious. Can they lead to the disappearance of psychoanalysis?

It is certain that the interests of these ideologies over the discursive underdevelopment are opposed to the interests of psychoanalysis, which requires the development of the discursive issues. Psychoanalysis is not a globalizing discourse that promotes an all unifying, dominant, whole, to be applied. However, we can say that this troubled situation of our days, which works towards abolishing the division of the subject in relation to the unconscious, also indicates, at the same time, indicates the logical necessity for the entry of an innovative dimension of the subject. A dimension that Freud bequeathed to us from the status of the unconscious, a necessary ethic for our time.

Lacan, in his teaching, is tireless in showing how modern mathematical logic points out and conceals, in the principle, a flaw, that it does not take into account. This flaw is fundamental to our praxis, since it is on it where we collect the missing interpretation, the necessary articulation of the unconscious in discourse, in an analysis. Just remember that is through the flaw that Freud discovers the logic of the unconscious functioning and it is through the different levels of the hiatus of the flaw that Lacan situates the times of articulation, the resumptions of the paths in terms of the logical time of the unconscious, through the object *a*. It is through the hiatuses, the

intervals, the gaps that have to do with the flaw that in our field, we locate, topologically, the disjunctive conjunctions, the nodal points that relate to a real that exists, insist and needs to be resumed.

This is a real that, due to the function of unknowing that is proper to the I, can only be systematically denied, and for that, Lacan is led to formulate that the unconscious is structured like a language and needs logical time to be articulated in discourse; it is necessary to articulate the logic of negation as a function from the implementations of the unconscious act.

Resuming the hiatus, at the border between the knowledge and the truth, puts us in front the logic proper of the psychoanalysis discourse, which operates changes at this relation: On knowledge's side, the difficult and necessary change of the riverbed through which It flows; at the dimension of truth side, it is necessary to interrogate it in the form of a riddle regarding to the value of the *jouissance* of the symptom. The existence of the unconscious, not only subverts the knowledge and the subject, by producing effects of torsion and rupture in the relationship between thinking and being, provoking profound upheavals in the subject of *cogit*, but also regarding to the truth, in its structure of fiction, leads to the necessary construction of the logical framework of the *trieb* of the phantasm, related to the It; It leads to weaving the network, whose material has to do with the signifier, a network to which the subject is suspended and which relates to the material with which one works in an analysis. The logic of the phantasm and the logic of the analytic act are different, although interdependent; the analytic act is not without the construction of the phantasm.

Regarding the analytical act, is not enough for us to agree among ourselves, because there is no terms of normative principles to be followed. Lacan says that perhaps Freud created psychoanalytic societies, with the ironic characteristic functioning easily spotted, to prevent the disappearance of the psychoanalysis. The ironic question is related to the fact those whom lives profits come from Freud's discoveries are those who stifle his voice, renegading his legacy. It's necessary to remember that we, the lacanian schools, have no reason to rejoice, we are not, *a priori*,

free from the risks of such irony. I wonder: what is in it? It seems to have something that remains submerged, as if there never any psychoanalysts in the first place.

At this crucial point, Lacan was tireless to reveal the unprecedented nature of Freud's discovery of the unconscious, to prevent it from succumbing to the pretense identities which obturate the radical hiatus of this flaw, which, as I said, is systematically renounced due to the absence of knowledge proper to the self, function. At this place, where the connivance with totalitarian harassments, that covers up the topic unconscious, is prevalently strong, we must look at it seriously and place the voice. At this hiatus, related to the knowledge and the truth, when what we call the analyst present itself as countenance of object *a*, the cause of desire, in his discourse, there is no place to aspire to any oceanic totality of happiness of a transcendent knowledge for humanity, that's where we find the entrance of an ethic that has to be with the practiced responses, in this place, of the logic of castration as real.

At this point, the difference into the domain of object *a*, at the fields of the imaginary capture, which makes indefinitely return to the most fundamental illusions of the human psychology, such as, the whole as A unifying force; and, another level of logical value of the object *a*, which concerns the suspension and absence of the subject, at the logic of the phantom, and it's division, in the analytical act, leads to a watershed moment. This other level of logical value of the object *a* relates to the entrance of the phallic jouissance, the entry of the phallus as the only significant in relation to the truth of jouissance between the sexes, and concerns to the presentation of object *a* as a residue of jouissance whom in the place of the big Other, as body, allows the analyst, positioned in their discourse, make support, countenance, provide, conduct the object *a* without essence – the breast, the excrement and specially the gaze and voice – for the analyzer to analyze themselves.

In seminar 15, "The Psychoanalytic Act", Lacan develops the question of how the little *a* can star to object the universal that, at the mirroring level, always returns to the unifying whole. This is important because in the hiatus between the ideal me and the ideal to me, in relation to the ideal point, there is always a risk of closing it in the totality proper of the mirroring, what makes it slip just at the entrance of the not-hole, which

gives entrance to the analyst's discourse. Lacan shows, through Pierce, how the universal relies on a void of traces in this field, that corresponds to the constitution of the subject divided of the unconscious from the not-hole: a crucial point for the entrance of the analyst discourse, the creative power of a fiction capable of producing symptoms articulated to the Freudian thing; therefore, related to the dimension of truth, as far as the unconscious answer for them. It is about the truth that Freud, by founding the psychoanalysis, allows to speak under the name of the unconscious.

The analyst's responsibility is to be up to these types of effects with which operate in their field, where there are disturbances that are not understood or comprehended from other discourses; effects that mark a dimension of paradox and antinomy proper to the field of pulsional jouissance, in psychoanalysis. I ask: when can we say that something happened that we can call a rescaling of the truth in relation to the real? That is, something related to a passage of the truth, the impotence, the lack in relation to the real, to the real as impossible? What could this dominant forgetfulness want to say when makes the truth in relation to the real as impossible?

In the course of the end of analysis, the forgetfulness of truth, in relation to the real as impossible, is what maintains the subject, while supported by what we call the analyst as the object *a* cause of desire, that is, an effect produced by the analyzing discourse itself, protected in relation to the castration as real. This means that in the per course to the end of analysis, in the transition from psychoanalyzed to psychoanalyst, what we call analyst is the last semblance to be interrogated. It is at this crucial point for the end that Lacan not only says that the resistance is from the analyst but also situates his famous horror act.

At this point, there is a disjunctive conjunction, a junction of the truth with the subject, in which the truth protects the subject from the "self" whom causes it, the "self" that the analyst self-authorizes for his act, that is, from this essence that is the absence, without essence, that constitutes the subject divided of the unconscious. Our choice, our responsibility, in this hiatus, that has to do with the transition of the psychoanalysand to psychoanalyst, with the end of the analysis, is to face the truth or ridicularize our knowledge. Because it is by reaching the truth in relation to "the self" of

the subject, that the analyst not only authorizes themselves for the act for which they are made but also come across with the truth of the incurable desire. There is no possible identification in this place, and the analysts, as Lacan says, on what refers to the real, we are symptomatic responses to the Freudian unconscious, and we have to do with an ethics necessary for our time.

We founded *Convergencia* with the idea of converging, from the differences, towards making advance the discursive questions in the hiatus that have to do with the failure in its radicality; to develop the questions that make progress the logic, the ethics, proper to the discourse of the analyst. We are here, in Barcelona, 25 years after the founding, the same amount of time that Freud took, in his practice, to encounter with the death pulse, whose compulsive character, linked to significant repetition in relation to the sexual act and the analytical act, has the excellence, as Lacan indicates, of opening up the field of *jouissance* situated beyond the pleasure principle, fundamental for resizing the impossible as real in terms of what does not cease of not write about the sexual relation. I ask: are we today, from the effects produced in this time, in better conditions to advance with our proposal? It is certain that we depend that the narcissistic pregnancies, promoters of confusions, are not winning over the logic of castration that resizes, from the conditions of existence of the unconscious, the knowledge and the truth. However, we have, at it, something in our favor: the fact that we are still here today, insisting that psychoanalysis continues, a real that exists and insists.