

What ethics for analytical practice nowadays?

Adriana Hercman (EFA)

The birth of psychoanalysis meant an unprecedented subversion concerning previous ethics. Its ethics is that of desire, and the analyst is so much concerned with it that he is entrusted with what Lacan called a radical ethical conversion: that of introducing the subject into the order of desire.

An ethical conversion that doubles the pass taken by Freud, when - not without Descartes - separated man from the rejected subject of knowledge to place him in relation to language, and distancing himself from religion and the civilizing zeal of science to conceive the truth as a dimension that speaks, unfolds in the symptom and reveals what is not in the order of the world. Unprecedented ethics that opens the door to equally unprecedented politics, that of the discourse we practice.

Analysts have daily experience of what does not work, of the elusive residue to the image and the signifier that goes beyond words: the object *a* - what language cannot reach to elaborate the impossible of sex- is a testimony of the subject's radically divided condition. Unlike other discourses that advocate for harmony and wholeness, our practice is oriented in this fallen remnant of the division operation that disrupts the good form. Modern science replaced a "turn" by a "fall". The remnants that fall from the Other make up the different forms of the *a*: a waste that is a guarantee of the otherness of the Other, from whom it becomes a substitute.

Lacan's invention of the object *a* as a remainder functions as an unprecedented ethical indication for our practice and a tool to read and resist malaise in civilization, because it is by orienting ourselves in the remainder -real of the structure- that our practice can move something of the framework of the time in which it takes place.

The segregation of the rest as a practice is a fact of civilization. At the Conference that Lacan gave in Brussels in '68, he defined civilization by its homogenization function and its eagerness to separate the remains. He said: "Civilization is the 'Great sewer'", a sewer system in Ancient Rome that facilitated society to get rid of the waste it produced.

With this metaphor, he conveyed how each sprout of the singular, each emerging glimpse of desire, is crushed by common discourse until it is reduced, amputates it of its singularity and throws it into general circulation, where it is reabsorbed as a remainder to be recycled. What is thus excluded - under the trappings of universality - is the singularity of the subject.

After the pandemic and with the war, new forms of intervention are implemented aiming to build unifying consents: pointing out social anomies and treating them with programs adorned with humanism and bureaucracy - a necessary arm of the Common Good -, favoring the adaptation of individuals-object to the globalized market.

We can conjecture that if behavioral therapies and the cognitive model are so accepted it is because they reproduce the model that rejects the dimension of the unconscious, the symptom, the anxiety as a subjective translation of the object, and the interference of desire and reality.

Analytical practice makes an objection to this policy. The field of resonance opened with the formulation of the fundamental rule on the part of the analyst allows to listen to the ambiguity and the slips, the rest of unassimilable enjoyment that insists, the enunciation of the desire that escapes to all totalizing effort and locates in the symptom how the speaker objects the discourses that do not accept the scandal of singular positions, resists the temptation of being absorbed in an "everybody", to include the marks of its history in the uniformization of ideologies and the market.

What each society does with its remains says of the social bond it practices. The ancient Romans threw the bodies they did not give burial into the sewers that emptied into the Tiber. We know that the eagerness to eliminate the traces of the living - when it is articulated to perverse policies that seek to eliminate the similar - gives rise to practices that evoke the most nefarious chapters of human history.

If of the three factors of malaise in culture, Freud indicated that the relationship with others is what consumes the most malaise, Lacan warned about the effects that the advance of science would produce on the bond to the mode of segregation.

He was not wrong. The speeches that sustain sexual relationships as possible, promote segregation and even the extermination of the other in the name of their ideals.

In our current discourse, what goes to the place of the rest, what does not serve its universalizing purposes, represents something to be eliminated: just consider how the enjoyment that the other represents allows the current neoliberalism to justify all kinds of cleansing policies - of immigrants, the poor and all kinds of dissident voices.

The current information project - the dimension of the unconscious remains uncomfortable - has plenty of the singularity of the symptom, and the contingency of the desire situation to which it gives expression, and silencing is its effective way of eliminating.

Analysts are faced with the question of why segregation, a constitutive and structuring operation of the subject, is put into play in social ties as a phenomenon that rejects the other to the point of seeking to eliminate it. We are interested in giving rise, in our practice, to the ethical conversion that opens the way to desire instead of the enjoyment that the subject finds in domination, in identification with the rest object, harm, and exclusion.

In reference to King Midas, Lacan points out the drama we find in our practice: the analysand transforms what he reaches as a point of truth into something very different from gold: the *a*, in its four episodic substances, giving support to the most abject realities.

That remainder that falls outside of politics remains the most singular and precious to the speaker. Our practice finds that the subject *is* that remainder in play, which in the phantom determines the economy of its desire and - in *The Logic of Phantasy* - constitutes the dignity of its being.

The discourse that we practice introduces into politics what it excludes: the speaking condition of the speaker, the dimension of the unconscious, and the truth that the symptom brings. While civilization - in the name of good customs - takes care of recycling the remains to return them to circulation through human industry, the analytical practice finds the subject

reduced to the object of its phantom, striving to advance through life by erecting some judge that condemns it or some executioner that punishes it.

The subject identified to the rest is driven to an indefinite chain of significations called destiny - a figure of the death drive - that invites him again and again, with an insidious voice, to give in to his desire. The ethics of our practice opposes this neurotic fatality: through analysis, the subject will be able to find out how he has entered into this matter of the signifier, the contingency relative to the origin of the phantom, not without the detours dictated by some phantom of origin that runs in free association, in the said analysands.

The rest is ineliminable and in the experience of the analysis, it takes on the function of the active remainder that makes room for the lack, a place for the desire: the accumulated remainder as a plus of enjoying in the symptom could develop into a cause of the desire to be offered in the place of *semblant* to others, for someone who instantly became an analyst of the experience.

Object *a* is the most radical existence of the subject in which, at the end of the journey, it can be recognized as a *miscarriage of the parents' desire* - Lacan says in "*From an Other to the other*" - giving rise to another economy of pleasure, to another possible destiny.

Today more than ever, we must practice what Norberto Ferreyra called a clinic of the subject, which consists in letting the speaking body speak so that, through the work of analysis, it can separate itself from the mute and inert waste to which it is thrown today by the sewer of neoliberal productivity, it can manage the symptom in life as a singular way of providing for existence and, if desired, testify of this experience in the *Pase* device offered by a School of psychoanalysis.

The bet to another destiny, to another relationship with determination, makes the ethics of the analytic act and the ethics of a Psychoanalytical School, which is the place of its extension.

The School gives rise to the experience of a collective that is not reduced to the masses, to hypnosis and uniformity, to the possibility of participating in collective processes without

losing singularity. The ethics of School is that of analytical practice. And that is something that is practiced in the School.

Soon it will be fifty years since the founding of the Freudian School in our country. Since then, its ethical and political position is linked to a saying that "no" to any practice of objectivization of the subject and homogenization of singularities. Also, the conviction that working with others without ignoring differences gives rise to a necessary exteriority for the advancement and the future of psychoanalysis. Because it is never by talking to ourselves that we find out what we say, the practice of the bond with others allows the discourse not to close and take a complete turn.

The No - all in the basis of the bond between analysts allows legitimizing the practice of a collective that, as a subject of the individual, finds its root in the analytical experience, the foundation of the formation of analysts in the formations of the unconscious and its frame in a School of Psychoanalysis that, like the Cartel and the Pase, constitutes a transmission device whose ethics is that of the analytical act. There is School because there is an analytical act somewhere else. The School is the place where, with some others, its effects are played.