

## **VIII International Congress of Convergence.**

Victoria J. Moreno

Escuela Freudiana de la Argentina

### "Ethics and practice of psychoanalysis"

The argument with which this Congress is convened invites with some provocation to give reasons or foundations of the work of the analyst. <sup>i</sup>

We could say that from "always" it was necessary to substantiate, that there were always other discourses, other interests, certain difficulties. We can refer to the reading of "The circulars of the "Secret Committee", where we read in the different letters the difficulties that Freud and those who were with him, faced, defended, that is, differed precisely from the incipient practice of psychoanalysis.

From where can we ask ourselves then? Why the difficulties? Does it have to do with the discourse and the field that was instituted? O: Does the very practice of this discourse answer the reason for the difficulties? Let us affirm: the practice of psychoanalysis has consequences.

I start from there. In the text: "A difficulty of psychoanalysis", dated 1917, Freud clearly raises the decisive importance of the existence of the unconscious both for science and for life itself.

Adding to the text, heads a very important question, he says as follows: as psychoanalysis precisely works with "the psychic importance of sexuality and the unconscious, issues that concern us all, psychoanalysis forces us to adopt an attitude towards these problems". That is, the subject has to take a position in front of that, that if or if it is going to be found.

Let's move from 1917 to 1960.

Lacan in the seminar "The Ethics of Psychoanalysis", affirms that Freud started from an initial intuition, which is of an ethical order, adds that the work that Freud did in the Project for Neurologists is nothing more than an imprint of an elaboration that reflects an ethical thought.

We can add that the *Entwurf* is the foundation, it is the theoretical set that will sustain the subsequent developments that Freud and Lacan will make more complex.

The important thing is that there is a pivot function of *das Ding*, identify as the *Wiederzufinden*, that is, the tendency to find that lost object again.

Here we are referring to the pleasure principle governing the search for the object and imposing all possible detours.

Lacan says something like "everyone knows that the correlate of *das Ding* is that desire for incest that is Freud's great find. " That is, *das Ding* makes the law.

Now, the way in which ethical principles are formulated has to do with the principle of reality.

This search for what always returns to the same place, is linked to ethics, because ethics begins when man asks himself the question for that good that he has been unconsciously seeking and discovers the link between that law and the very structure of desire.

It is necessary that the desire be kept for him at a distance, a distance that has to do with proximity, but that is not the same, "a distance that is close to him," Lacan adjusts.

Just as in the *Entwurf* we locate the foundation of the Freudian theory regarding *das Ding*, in the text *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*, Freud finds again the field of *das Ding*, designating that which in life can prefer death.

At the beginning of this work, I proposed that the argument of this congress challenges us about the work of the analyst.

I would like to return to the idea and see if now that I quickly showed certain articulations that make conceptual development with respect to the field of psychoanalysis and ethics, to propose how we analysts manage with this decision to take a position regarding the field to which the discourse of psychoanalysis makes room.

Lacan asks and says: What are the general ethical consequences of the relationship with the unconscious as discovered by Freud? Is there an ethics of analysts? Already the plural makes the question a suspicious question.

What the analyst must give, is nothing more than his desire, but it is a warned desire. Warned about What? We answer that it is not possible to desire the impossible.

Ensuring that the subject can somehow find his good in the analysis be it a scam.

But if there is an ethic of psychoanalysis, it is to the extent that analysis contributes something as a measure of our action. What does Lacan mean when it speaks of "as a measure of our action"?

The action has a hidden meaning, typical of any manifestation of the unconscious. That is, there is a relationship between action and the desire that inhabits it and thus we arrive at a formulation of the ethics of analysis.

Ethics that is not a speculation, nor any promise, but implies the dimension of what Lacan calls the tragic experience of life.

Here, in the tragic and comic dimension, actions are inscribed. In these tragic and comic dimensions of life, we need to locate that the only thing you can be guilty of is to have yielded to your desire.

Giving in to their desire is accompanied by betrayal. Lacan says: the subject betrays his way, betrays himself, or whatever combination is possible, but betrayal intrudes there. When betrayal is tolerated, something is at stake.

So, finally, we can say that the only thing one can be guilty of is having yielded in his desire, that he mediates a betrayal, and that for the common man, betrayal has the effect of throwing him into the service of goods, with the condition "that he will never find again what guides him".

The use of tragedy, used in this seminar that I have worked on, does nothing more than emphasize the structural dimension that is played out in the experience of analysis. The tragic *epos*, that is to say the word, the narration the fiction that each analyzer deploys each time, before the enunciation of the fundamental rule, makes to take a position, as we said at the beginning of the work, before that which by just the fact of speaking, is already divided.

So, the work in an analysis, works like a rose of the winds, we could say, orienting, that field of ethics that is at stake every time an analyzer encounters those issues that cannot be ceded, that if they are ceded ... He betrays himself.

I ask then: How can the discourse of psychoanalysis not have consequences if it precisely makes room for that hidden, proximate but extimo, to have a place in the saying of each analyst?

