

## Ethics and Politics of a Practice

Clara Cruglak

The way in which an analyst creates bonds with others is determined by an ethics which articulates his task with the Real motivating the analyst's practice. And I understand that the condition of possibility for this bond with others to be based on the hypothesis of the unconscious, and not on the psychology of masses, is deeply rooted in the transmission of psychoanalysis from the field of intension to the one of extension. **The core of the matter is to be found in how the unconscious experience passes to extension.**

Following Lacan's proposition of October 67, the liaison between intension and extension takes the form of a school, and a new device –the pass– affords the opportunity to read it.

Let us recall the terms at play in this liaison -the same that shape our own experience-, and which we may recognize in the above proposition. These terms are collusion, heterotopia, facticity and the three RSI registers.

In order to favor this passage of unconscious experience to the field of extension, it will be necessary to identify collusion among the three registers -Real, Symbolic, and Imaginary- gauged by means of heterotopia's three facticity parameters.

What is involved in heterotopia's three-register collusion?

The answer is how the three R.S.I. registers get into play, exercising a tension, a traction while effectively keeping the power of each register without any impingements with one another, or any power loss in their colluding function. It is a game of tensions, a "*coludere*", a game determined by three terms: segregation as facticity in the Real, the Ideal as facticity in the Imaginary register, and the Oedipus myth facticity in the Symbolic register.

Recognition of these structure terms -segregation, the Ideal, the Oedipus– intertwined with facticity parameters, makes it possible to appreciate that this is exactly what disposes and subordinates the ethical dimension of the act in extension.

It is conceivable that this should happen, but it may eventually not. This means that governing analysts collectively is not just about regulating by means of rules or statutes, but rather, functioning ethically in order to start enabling, step by step this *coludere*, this game between and among the three facticities. I say start enabling because facticity does not mean something done or given by way of a solution, something conceived of as within the order of the not realized as the unconscious does.

Thus, it is likely that the collective of analysts would resort to the singularity of the saying of every man, the saying as the fact that founds a space where, when an analyst says and speaks as a psychoanalytical discourse operator, he is staging heterotopia. Then, being alone among others, favors social bonding in work transference, and not exclusively in fraternity, the cause of segregation.

What is heterotopia? Basically, dramatically, it is "an 'other' space". Term introduced by Michel Foucault as "different spaces". Spaces which are open, just pure, simple opening. Everyone may enter those spaces, but "(...) to be honest – Foucault warns– once inside, you realize that it is an illusion, and that you have entered nowhere"<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Michel Foucault. *Topologías (Topologies)*. In: *Fractal* # 48 (January-March, 2008), Año XII, Volumen XIII. pages 39-62.

Heterotopia, in our practice –so I have come to think - is a place opened up to saying, for everyone’s saying, with the subtle property of keeping you outside solely on account of the effect promoted by the singularity of the fact of saying.

The analyst’s desire as a place highlights this point: it is a place where you are outside without knowing, but where finding yourself is having come out. That is to say, having taken that exit only like an entrance, and that entrance is exactly the psychoanalyst’s pathway<sup>2</sup>. This resonates with the ethics of *bien dire* (speaking well) the desire dwelling inside whoever means to be in that place. A place ‘other’, every single time, and which is not situated anywhere else other than within the order of saying.

This is precisely what we should not lose sight of when trying to “focus our horizon where intension knots to extension”, because that, I think, is what limits the effects of segregation. What is at stake in saying is not in the order of being, it is the dimension of doing. To do teaching. To create devices, to invent new transference devices such as are Lacano, Convergencia, the forums and gatherings -everyone participating with their own saying.

Lacan proposes a School to train operators to perform the task, engaging psychoanalysis in the world. Something which will not result from creating a worldview but rather “from our politics, our way of conceiving a certain social bond”<sup>3</sup> Which is the social bond mode that he is engaged in when he states that the unconscious is politics<sup>4</sup>

We know the effect of “consolidated group” to the detriment of “expected discourse” in Freud’s experience. Freud risks undergoing a certain standstill by focusing the association on scientific interests as a possible way to prevent the extinction of experience. One knows at what cost: it became a church.

If we are nowadays able to recognize what shapes our experience, is because collusion allows us to read the tension lines of the instinctual in the social bond, and to assume that the devices summoning us to work will organize any *jouissances* that the drive may stage. When it comes to social bonding, the “*savoir y faire*” assumption also necessitates the function we attribute to the operator in extension.

We note here that facticity must be partially at stake when we say that a psychoanalyst authorizes himself; this is facticity favoring the analytical scene. The “with others” or “before others” involves the extension field. Because holding that agonistic tension, the R.S.I., implies the facticity of the analytical act, as well as the artifices and devices we afford ourselves (invent, as I just said) for the sake of experience passing to act.

This means that there is the likelihood that it will not happen, I insist. Again, this is not a “*facto*”, a fact. The three facticities will have to go on play in order to constitute our experience in act. And, what does this depend on? It depends on what is understood when reading: “An analyst is” (exists) - above all, when we say: “An analyst is at least two”.

There is “an analyst”, and this property is what renders possible for everyone –in their own end-of-analysis experience– to witness to that existence as a form of binding a subject in it for the sake of fulfilling the function. I believe that the experience of the pass favors this. It favors it and it shelters the conditions to enable this testimony to pass.

---

<sup>2</sup> Jacques Lacan. *Discurso en la Escuela Freudiana de Paris (1967) (Speech at the Freudian School of Paris)*. En: *Otros Escritos (Other Writings)*. Buenos Aires, Paidós, 2016. pág. 284.

<sup>3</sup> Jacques Lacan Conferencia en las Universidades de los EEUU (*Speeches at USA universities*)1975

<sup>4</sup> Jacques Lacan Seminario 14 (*Seminar 14*)La lógica del fantasma (*The Logic of Fantasy*), 10/4/1967

We may state that there is no analytical act outside transference and that the passage from intension to extension requires placing the act in the political registry, and with this, we will say that the very passage from intension to extension involves a political act. The devices practiced by us in the field of extension acknowledge the political burden of treating the Real by means of the Symbolic. An operator is whoever introduces psychoanalysis in the world because psychoanalysis, apart from being a practice that attempts to cure, a treatment, if you will, is also a part of culture; hence, subject to the ups and downs of the times.

It is from this standpoint that I understand the three-facticity collusion which occurs in heterotopia. Not only does it fail to delimit an inside from an outside; it is also a place that does not allow nor aid in the configuration of a closed set. There is no possible totality; more so, if we take in consideration the dynamics of facticity: “a simultaneously opening and closing movement”. Then, heterotopia offers the necessary conditions to deactivate or to temper down the slaying power of segregation both in connection to the oppressing enjoyment of a boss or with the Ideal.

It is pertinent, and we must note, that the Convergence Congress we are holding today is in its own right, as well as sets in act, the Lacanian Movement for Freudian Psychoanalysis. It is a movement generated heterotopically, it presents the point of vortex where the bond among analysts enables dissipating group effects.

**Then, why and how would an analyst create a bond with others? Because there is a logic of ethics and a topology of experience that allows following the trail of the Real which is at stake there, to enable experience passage from the unconscious, configuring the field of extension on the basis of this privileged species of desire which is the analyst’s desire.**

Everyone realizes their analytical experience in their own way, and this is a *sine qua non* condition, only theirs, because it is in the domains of intention where nurturing of the desire specificity oriented with what it designates occurs -at the end of the game- as a desire of the analyst in the field of extension, and it is the condition of possibility which gives existence to an analyst. Thus, we remark the importance of recognizing the ethical limits of analysis, because they coincide with the limits of his praxis whenever the rank of his variants so requires. We stand warned that whenever the analyst’s desire is challenged, he may devise variants of style rather than pursue a single, coagulated, *devoir être* destination to practice his *métier*.

This extended practice has the well-focused horizon of not ignoring the incidence of the analytical act, nor the Real, which is at stake, not only in the analyst’s analysis –in the analyst’s training- but also in the transmission of psychoanalysis.

**Clara Cruglak**