

**VIII INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF CONVERGENCE, A LACANIAN MOVEMENT FOR
FREUDIAN PSYCHOANALYSIS**

WHAT ETHICS FOR PSYCHOANALYTICAL PRACTICE TODAY ?

Barcelona, 24 25 26 and 27 May 2023

Enrique Rattín

Escuela Freudiana de Montevideo

"Ethics of the real, poetic and political of the analytical act"

Lacan in 1967 proposed a failure of thought in relation to horror, of "what will develop as a result of the reworking of social groupings by science", predicted a universalization and an "increasingly hard extension of the processes of segregation" contemplated through the means of science and that the clinic allows us to glimpse "new symptoms", in relation to the context of our modernity.

These advances in science are reflected not only in a malaise in and of culture but also in an increasingly widespread practice of segregation, racism and hatred. So, what ethics for psychoanalytic practice today?

Today we face segregation and racism. It is the hatred of versions of jouissance organized by other discourses. Each speech prefers itself, its own morality and justifies itself as the best. According to Lacan, each discourse contains its narcissism and only from another discourse can one interpret what happens in a social bond. In 1973 he announced that racism was about the treatment of jouissance and its rejection from a base built on a paranoid logic.

"In the bewilderment of our jouissance, there is only the Other who situates it, but it is so to the extent that we are separated from it. Hence the unpublished *fantasmes*, when not mixed. Leaving this Other his own mode of jouissance is what could only be done by not imposing

ours on him, not having him as underdeveloped. [...] God, when he regained strength, would end up *ex-sistir*, that does not portend anything better than the return of his disastrous past" Let's say then today, that our jouissance is out of place and the jouissance of the Other is a problem, which provokes the return of a dark god who summons hatred.

In "*Television*", he suggests that it is contempt for others, it is hatred of those who differ in their jouissance, which is therefore Other, all racism implies these two affections and takes place at the collective level. Lacan called this the "racism of discourses in action." The analytical conception of the social bond posits that races are fabrications of discourses and in no way biological because they are linked to their consistency. Today we deal with the fabrication of the discourse of science, the omnipresence of its gadget's correlative to a "lack of jouissance", as he put it in "*Radiophonie*".

Combined effects of "capitalist discourse" and "neoliberal scientism" try to abandon the dimension of the subject by influencing his relationship with the language that conditions his unconscious. Impact on subjectivity from which objects of consumption could be obtained that would maintain the illusion that we would be freed from the fault that singularly constitutes us as subjects.

The domain of biological and cognitive neurosciences pretends to be in command of the social bond. Suffice it to mention the theses concerning the multifactorial organic etiology of autism, the role of neurotransmitters in schizophrenia, or the biological factor in manic-depressive psychosis.

But the human implies the subject: it is what speaks of the individual, speaks to others, and receives its being by ascertaining the existence of the Other, logical precedence of language on the subject. There will be no subject and even less will he be able to speak, if the "reality" of the infans does not meet language in the form of the discourses concretely held by his

parents, it is the construction of the *lalangue*, signifiers that represent it and words that evoke it.

His survival as a *parlêtre* depends on the Other: this is what he will imagine in shaping this Other: paternal, divine, philosophical, ideological or social political. The neurotic symbolizes this necessary anchoring in the Other in the form of a dependency that summarizes the bond with the father. It is what Freud invented under the name of Oedipus complex and that Lacan clearly formulated with his Borromean wrapping the object *a*.

Necessary beginning to the social function, a precipitate of all the solutions invented by men to account for this constitutive alienation of the subject, who when speaking escapes, the clutches of the Other subverting his discourse; alienation-separation process.

So: how to think about the ethics of the social bond without this bond falling apart in the vein of singularities?

The question of the social bond is inseparable from the structure of the subject. The neurotic is the subject adapted to modernism thanks to language. In his seminar on transference Lacan proposed an articulation of the subject to the social that anticipates the discourse: society functions by repression, which feeds the neurosis of the subject acting by *verdrängung*; But it is also what pushes the neurotic to cultural innovations, which consist in the invention of new arrangements with the *jouissance* or of new perversions which in turn provoke a new repression of society, and so on.

But psychoanalysis is revolutionary insofar as its act includes the poetic and under the ethical support of the Real, giving rise to a deep ethical dimension allowing to alleviate or make the suffering disappear. It is an ethics oriented to the subjective level of a responsibility involved in one's own suffering. Being involved in relation to one's own symptoms to the maximum extreme, is what characterizes an analysis. The field of the

jouissance that derives from there will determine the purpose of each cure: it is a treatment of jouissance and ethics that involves taking charge of it in the singular and the social.

The poetic thing is that the subject is essentially a speaking being. That's why listening is part of the word. The resonance of the word is something constitutional, Lacan proposed. From the moment someone enters into analysis, proof that that subject has always listened. The subject with his symptom carries a jouissance inscribed singularly in his speech, a symptom that may make a social bond, or on the contrary may hinder the subject to establish that bond.

There is an ethics of the real in an analysis, as well as in the possible transmission of psychoanalysis and the Real, Symbolic and Imaginary are involved. It is not mathematics, nor medicine, since the know-how there, *savoir y faire*, concerns more an artisan than a scientist. Transmitting in psychoanalysis is determined by a division that produces an irreducible remainder that puts the *lalangue* in the cause, by way of metaphor and in the passage from meaning to nonsense. It is poiesis articulated to interpretation. It is reading poetry that undermines the classical notion of verse, destroys syntax, fragments the phrase and can visually arrange language in another way (*autrement*) in the space of the written in any of the formations of the unconscious.

The implementation of the fundamental rule is an explosion of the continuity of discourse that produces an interrupted nature that reveals itself without normative functions, words are gravitating lonely and terrible with the enormous weight of their semantic density. It is a disarticulation of language, in which signifiers are distorted, multiplied and made more complex until reaching a certain hermeticism. The logical links between words are lost, which condense a diversity of latent senses and are sometimes arranged in a dream, ideographically spaced in different directions, where capital letters appear in the middle of the phrase or word. At the same time, orthography becomes idiosyncratic, neologisms and

colloquial register appear in unexpected contexts to imprint the idiomatic singularity to the poetics of each unconscious.

The political thing about the analytical act is that, in every analysis, it is about the contingent. We can distinguish those propositions which are always true necessary calls, from those which may sometimes be true and sometimes untrue, which we call contingent. For psychoanalysis, contingency is thought of positively, since it is the absence of need, while, for philosophers, contingency is viewed negatively. Contingency means not being taken completely in the order of necessity.

Contingent factors in the transfer produce a diversion of need. The analyst has a creation initiative in the direction of his desire and the analyst assumes the risk of letting repetition introduce. Ethical responsibility for the transfer is the crucial point. The pulsional (drive) life can thus be reorganized, starting from the mobilization, the choice and the creation of contingent factors.

The practice of psychoanalysis is a possibility of reflection on contingency and responsibility. It is ethical to take the transference relationship as the scenario of the observation of the contingent, of the specificity of the subject's relations with his jouissance, as the fruit of that first encounter of the body with the phallic signifier that resulted in a sexed body to the encounter with another sexed being.

An analysis leads to an exhaustion of certain jouissances, making it possible for the analyst's desire function to arise and be put into action in the analyser. The ethical thing is that there is an unconscious responsibility shared between these two places of transference, a transposition of the difficulties of love life in the space of each cure.

Montevideo, marzo de 2023

erattin952@gmail.com

