

Title: Neutrality - Abstinence. Between the vicissitudes of praxis and our ethics: the analyst's desire.

What ethics for psychoanalytic practice today? Broad question which I will try to approach adding other questions, as current, as those formulated by Roberto Harari regarding Lacan's Ethics Seminar: "what is the bond that unites the problems addressed with ethics?", and with more strength "...to what extent does ethics impact psychoanalysts as such?"¹

The Freudian principles of Neutrality and Abstinence, given certain epochal events, particularly what happened with the pandemic, the modality changes in the attention of our analysands, as well as other particularities of the clinic, often have to be made more flexible, but how can we understand this clinical implication?

Based on the experience of analysis with a child, in which I had to respond, given the connotations of the case and despite considering that the clinical situation of the analysand was not what was required, to a demand from the legal discourse. Given that the analyst's work is not exempt from social demand and given that these maneuvers (pre)-occupy us a lot, it was interesting for me to think about where and what orientation we give to these responses. I place in the notions of neutrality and abstinence two axes from which I could guide myself oriented by the foundations sustained in the Hypothesis of the Unconscious, understanding these as what constitutes "our ethics".

We know that there is no subjective constitution in which a desiring position is taken without the appearance of a law. In our discourse, a (paternal) law, which in its different versions and within the framework of language, brings the dimension of the Other that allows a subject to register in a singular way where "the word is affirmed in truth"². Also constituting is the plane of the dimension of jouissance, which, as analysts, we cannot neglect, remaining in a naive position pretending to "do good".

¹Harari R. Ética. Texto establecido por Manuel Rubio

² Lacan, J. "Posición del inconsciente", Escritos 2. Pág. 818. Buenos Aires. Siglo XXI (1985)

From Freud and his "Advice to the doctor"³, Abstinence and Neutrality, are the principles by which the analyst "removes any conscious interference with his ability to pay attention and abandon himself entirely to his unconscious memories", leaving aside his affections with in order to carry out an operation according to the "rules of the art". Freud encourages the analyst to "use his unconscious as an instrument of analysis" and to maintain a share of frustration, as a small remainder that, as transference support for the analyst's function, paves the fertile ground for interpretation.

Lacan's teaching, from some passages taken from his Writings, highlights neutrality as "that means by which we leave room for the Other, beyond the other to make a non-being ne-uter, neither one nor the other of the other." that they are there The analyst shuts up to leave the word "⁴. Around 1969 Lacan distinguishes the position of the analyst as the one that is indicated by the object a, "there is the only meaning that we could give to analytical neutrality, that of not participating in the passions, which makes it be in that uncertain zone where he is vaguely in pursuit of following the putting of what there is of knowledge that nevertheless he has to repudiate"⁵

Following this line, R. Harari makes a very interesting articulation placing neutrality very close to calculated hesitation, as a way of dealing with the "cataleptic rigidity" into which we sometimes fall. This move opens up the game, in an insightful way, to the difference between neutrality and abstinence. Thus, "castration through", many times, to sustain abstinence, the analyst must "calculate" how to get out of his neutrality. This "abrogation" says Harari, that is, this rise of an "analyst's non-partiality" for the opposite, is what this vacillation is about, which stands out, moreover, for its paradoxical condition and for its result as essential and incalculable remainder for being of the Real. "This hesitation must be differentiated from the passage to the act, since it is not accidental, nor unexpected, nor does it occur, nor does it mark a conclusive moment; configures an intervention in act".

³ Freud, S. Consejos al médico sobre el tratamiento psicoanalítico (1912) T. XII. Amorrortu Editores

⁴ Lacan, J. El psicoanálisis y su enseñanza (1957). Siglo XXI Editores.

⁵ Lacan, J. Seminario 17. El reverso del psicoanálisis. Pág. 145. Paidós. (1999)

Harari states, if it is an act, and what is expected of the analyst is to "commit" analytic acts, by the fact of naming the intervention in an act it must necessarily include some trace not contemplated by the analytic act conceived in the usual way. It is precisely with respect to this that the "calculated hesitation" shines, asserting itself on occasions, sometimes more than an interpretation. Observation says Lacan, and not "technical advice" to warn how the analyst must preserve for the other the imaginary dimension of his non-domination, of his "necessary imperfection".

Zulema Lagrotta and Edgardo Feinsilber⁶ also distinguish neutrality and abstinence, they understand neutrality in relation to the transference and the analyst as its support. Neutrality is not the absolute lack of relationship but rather the non-identification of the analyst with the object of the transference. On the other hand, they place abstinence on the side of the analyst's jouissance, beyond the jouissance referred to his person. It refers to the jouissance of his presence, which at one time Lacan called "analyst's desire", insofar as he described it, not as a pure jouissance, but as the one with which the maximum difference between I and the a is achieved, between the ideals and the object cause of their fulfillment.

Starting from the vicissitudes of praxis and in a direction of the treatment that is determined by the analyst's desire, one cannot "know anything". This scope becomes crucial for the maintenance of that place of skepticism that allows sustaining a subjective position⁷. In Seminar 24 Lacan tells us that "the neutrality of the analyst is precisely this subversion of meaning, namely this kind of aspiration not towards the real but for the real"⁸.

In this way, absolute neutrality only hides the presence of desire.

Consistent with this, for Harari, a clinic where the transference comprises an innovatively Real scope, where the analyst's forces can transcend interpretive hermeneutics, and where the implementation of analytic acts not governed by the exclusive "evaluative neutrality" is feasible, for all Therefore, said psychoanalytic clinic may be able to face the

⁶ Lagrotta Zulema, Feinsilber Edgardo. Finales de análisis. 1 ed.- Buenos Aires, Letra Viva (2008)

⁷ Harari, R. Palabra, violencia, segregación y otros impromptus psicoanalíticos. Catálogos Editora.

⁸ Lacan J. Seminario 24. Clase del 26 de febrero de 1977

challenges posed by the epochal changes to subjective positions, provided that the place from which it must operate is preserved.

From this point of view, our ethics cannot be other than that of our foundations, while, as J. Nassif⁹ refers, since it does not have to do with the "rights of man" they cannot concern individuals in general but rather to the subjects taken one by one in the particular of a situation, escaping from a discourse that would form a "social bond" according to the definition of the term "discourse" by Lacan. That is why we do not make a case of an analytic situation, to the extent that we avoid the possibility of the emergence of a "generalized Symbolic".

⁹ Nassif, J. Un buen casamiento. El aparato del psicoanálisis. Ediciones de la Flor (1997)