

ETHICS, DESIRE, AND HUMANITY

What could one say about the present that isn't more or less hesitant? And if we go further, what could one state about a time which is *today*, that is not more or less diffuse, diversified, multiversal and transhuman?

The contemporary backdrop itself is pretty uncertain, or we could say the opposite, it is very certain!, predictable, computerized, algorithmic, and automated, even self-sufficient, which paradoxically equates to self-exhaustion that we all somehow experience.

Part of the work we carried out the past year in the Efmdp was dealing with a question posited by Maria Clara Areta as "Civilization and Its *Trans-discontents*"; that way of naming the status of collective subjectivity enabled me to think, as I remarked then, in this "meta-versed" *today* which I believe strongly lays the cards on the body's table—paraphrasing a title by Klossowski— since it is the "living currency", a vital territory yet also unarmed and always somewhat lacking.

This meta-reality becomes *realizable* through a "sea of sensations" capable of creating a new way of being in the world, sensations whose statute of registration is not as concerning as its power, its "high definition," its amazing clarity, and I dare say, its certainty.

That cyberversion of *today* is, in psychoanalytic terms, closer to actuality than the act. If that is so, such actuality would be totally opposite to the *present* of the subject which we refer to in psychoanalysis and that supposes another temporality.

On the one hand there is the *saying of the present* that points to what is being said "here and now", which locates the presence of the one who speaks. And there is the *present of the saying* thanks to which whenever something is said, it acquires existence by the fact of having been said. Among these dimensions of the *present*, made up of footprints of the human saying, psychoanalysis places some of the order of the act, i.e., between the enunciated and the enunciation.

That which does not leave traces, that which circulates without edges or accident, that which flows in constant actuality, in "streaming" mode, so to speak, becomes impossible to substitute by another element, and cannot gain symbolic existence as we understand it.

Having said this, the *present* of the discourse, the incalculable stumbling is inherent to our practice and moves away from what builds a period or season since this refers to a certain unit of register where facts take on a specific hue. For example, audiovisual series are provided to be watched in seasons, and in turn seasons wouldn't be such without the appropriate audience for which they were created.

On the other hand, in each analysis, that *today* comprises the time to speak of each speaking being who will do so triggered by the lack, if the latter is not absent.

But the fact that this *a*-temporality is dealt with in psychoanalysis —not outside time rather guided by the object *a*, that is to say guided by the resistance to enter into the word—, by no means excludes our thinking in the epochal context which *transforms* the subject effect.

If through object *a* causing the saying in its singularity the subject humanly exists, i.e., with the dignity of the subject's symptom, it will become exactly its rejection if the ethics of our practice were not supported by the function of desire.

Moreover, without reading the sources of the malaise in culture, psychoanalysis could not posit itself as the “artificial lung” as anticipated by Lacan (1973) to survive the unbreathable consequences of a society of rules.

By this I mean that it is not a question of being for or against technology because we already live in a discursive alliance between human capital and cybernetics which renders it not just into another science but rather into the creator of other means of existence, and new ways of *jouissance*. In any case, I believe it is relevant to ask oneself about the incidence this has on the subject of unconscious understood as a consequence of the language that affects the body of those sensations.

To my knowledge, posing this question encompasses the meaning of avoiding risky metonymic slippages. Perhaps no more than that.

In this *today* that tends to confuse us between symbol and mechanism, that is, the mechanism becomes not only the support of the symbol but also livens it, embodies it, as in holograms, video games, social media, or any of those machines capable of producing metamorphoses in us from 3D binoculars to scooters which when ridden become an extension of the body. Given these considerations it is necessary to make some distinctions because of their effects in the practice.

Just like the bit is not the same as a mnemonic footprint, neither the algorithm is the representation, nor information is transmission, nor the link a tie, nor Big Data the Other in language, nor digital virtuality is the virtual mirror image, nor acoustic sound is resonance, neither is format the egoic-zation, likewise, I consider that *the automatic* does not equate to the *autoerotic* just by carrying the particle “auto” that supposes the ego. What I mean is: It is not that the more automation in an individual's daily life necessarily leads to a subject being more autoerotic. Not only are they not the same, but also in my practice I was able to confirm that on some occasions the one comes to stand-in for the lack of structure of the other.

In his January 23, 1963 session, Lacan resumes the trail discovered by Freud, he says that before the mirror stage which is *i(a)*, we encounter the disarrangement of those small *a* which is still not a question of having or not having them since those objects do not participate in the egoic-zation of the real image from which they will become the remainder. In fact, this is the deepest sense we could assign to the concept of autoeroticism where it is not the outer world one is lacking, rather what one lacks is oneself, the One itself is lacking.

We know that this pre-autoerotic stage is where depersonalization phenomena lead us, and that objects, since they cannot be mirrored can only be brought together in their lack thanks to the acknowledgment of the Other of the language. Without this functioning of the language there would be no phallus (which is symbolic) or the possibility of signification (which is phallic), thus, giving meaning to that which is, for example, of the sexual order —entailing the body and its sensations— may become bizarre because it is rejected.

What may happen then —I will refer to a clinical situation I had the chance to listen to— is that secondary sexual characters which have some signification for men and women may

become incomprehensible to someone who amidst a teenage full-fledged sexual emergency states that he or she has never understood the erotic function breasts could have in a woman's body.

This failure in signification led to a pervasive de-erotization of the sexual, as well as an important lack for the subject relative to social ties, and in relation to the subject's own image, i.e., the tie to the subject's own body.

This situation was temporarily replaced with building profiles in social media which *transformed* the bodily image into something else. All of this clarifies why it was indispensable for the relationship with the other to be through the mechanism. Just like other specific consequences in the body which were from the order of mutilation.

Thus, without “*one*” (Bejahung) or “*self*,” that is, without “One-self” the One sometimes is constructed with an *automatic* image. And simultaneously —or perhaps one thing cannot be without the other— the dismembered may be clumped together consistently by an ideology that may assert a being with any nomination such power acquires.

Consequently, the *present* in our practice is in the one by one, and many times it is even without the One. Thus, in my humble opinion, I do not believe it is more psychological to weigh the purported “lack of self-esteem” of those we listen to, and faced with it, though we will not devote ourselves to putting together what the signifier didn't split and the reason for a disorganized presentation of objects, I *do* believe we bet on protecting the lack, that unfathomable real particle which is not picked up by the signifier and that, ultimately, humanizes us.

There is no formula to translate this into the act other than the *Losung* of the word, I believe it is not only by not overlapping orders of thought as cybernetics and psychoanalysis but also how ethics, which in psychoanalysis is directed by desire, intertwines these orders trying not to confuse the subject with the being, or the unconscious with ideology.

What I am saying perhaps sounds too obvious, but then...I believe none of us is exempt from becoming a little zombie.

Gisela Avolio