

VIII International Congress 2023.

Convergence, Lacanian Movement for Freudian Psychoanalysis.

Abstract

**“Ethic (s) and act: The Analyst ´s position”**

The particularity that the clinic of our times imprints on our practices turns into an essential matter the reconsideration about the analyst’s position regarding his act. In the context of the subjectivity that inhabits us, from which ethic does the analyst’s act sustain itself today?

Convergence 2023

**“Ethic (s) and act: The Analyst ´s position”**

**Analía Meghdessian de Nanclares.**

The particularity that the clinic of our times imprints on our practices turns into an essential matter the reconsideration about the analyst’s position regarding his act. In the context of the subjectivity that inhabits us, from which ethic does the analyst’s act sustain itself today?

I want to emphasize the logical dimension of the inclusive disjunction since, to my knowledge, it is not possible to talk about the particularities we face outside of what the analyst’s responsibility implies concerning his act, which creates an ethics and a politics that for psychoanalysis is none other than the one oriented towards the subject of the unconscious.

I find on this gathering of analysts the occasion to regain and to converge the signifier value of these terms, whose futile circulation might degrade their value.

In the cultural context of these times, influenced by the variants of discomfort that the times imprint, what are we referring to?

For it, it would appropriate to bear in mind some markings of the origins and to think the invariants that provide support to our endeavor, like the repetitions that, under the diverse epochal garments that symptoms reveal, try to undermine this fundaments.

Freud repeatedly notes that psychoanalysis is founded on his distinction from hypnosis, on the abandonment of the hypnotic technics for free association.

This is not a mere path. It is an inflection point, a radical shift of position between what we might consider as the passage of the word and the body of the Other to the own word and body. And to place on the heart of our practice the reason that is on the cause of the division of the subject. A matter to which the analyst heads to in order to operate over what opposes this effectuation.

Thusly, on the voyage from language to word the misalignments inherent to this journey reveal, on one hand, the not-naturalness of being a speaking subject and the inexorable dependence of the subject to the Other to the extent that the subject is founded on a forced and necessary alienation so as to not fall onto an absolute abandonment, as revealed on diverse clinical expressions.

But being a subject of language does not by fact or by right guarantee to be a subject of word, to the extent that **living does not equate to existing.**

Ethics and analytic act encase a particular interest on the formation of analysts centered on the necessary inquiry regarding the legitimacy on which the context of the present times is founded on.

It is on said direction that I propose we think the legitimacy of the analytic act and the ethics that detach from it for the formation of the analyst, as ***the renewed passage through that scriptural limit in relation with the cause that makes him divided, that is only granted by***

***the analysis of the analyst without which it wouldn't be possible to maintain the question for the subject on the transference alive. This is our starting point.***

Each period on the formation of the analyst invites to a few clarifications. That there is no final, complete formation that rounds up the analyst's knowledge. That the knowledge clarified by psychoanalysis is knowledge produced on the act, determined on the place of the truth. And that said knowledge is only updated on transference, since the analyst as passer of the real of his castration on the analytic scene and condensing pole of enjoyment, spawns the necessary and real trust to guarantee the movement from "I don't think" there where it was towards the there where it was "I am not".

It is regarding this movement that I place first on the analyst's side, from which I depart in order to form the following question.

What is the value of said considerations in the context of the subjectivity of our times?

Our times find themselves tinted by skepticism, the ubiquity of values, the thirst for fast success, the illusion that everything is possible, a ravenous consumption and the despairing need to "belong" at the price of "ceasing to belong to oneself". Primacy of the universal and universal thinking over the singularity of the subject with regards to his desire.

Lack of tolerance when it is not the razing of differences that it carries, as an unavoidable effect, the renewed versions of segregation. That is to say, the permanent renegation of the distinctive traits and the radical hole on which the subject structures himself.

Inhabited by the renovated version of suggestion a new form of biopower has created, through diverse sophisticated technologies, docile bodies related to veiled forms of alienation on behalf of a freedom that only leads to the worst, spawning due obedience. ***There is living, but there is no existing.***

Isn't this a renovated form of hypnosis, the subject of the I alienated on the screen of the Other, to which we see ourselves being taken by the discomfort on the culture of our times?

Psychoanalysis, by being another element of the arid sociocultural fabric we are living in, is not exempt of the subjective effects of the times. And it is of ethical competence to ask ourselves about the incidence that on it the reals of our times promote, on which the dimensions of pleasure and desire tend to equalize, the paternal establishing function of legality dilutes and, as a corollary, favors the promotion of a void whose objective is to sustain the permanent dilution of the structure.

This kind of indiscriminate between the misgovernment of pleasure and the law of desire, **a disjunction that psychoanalysis should inscribe spawning a literal instance between pleasure and knowledge**, gives way, for many years, to the most diverse clinical manifestations. What has changed?

Certainly, the subject of our times does not introduce himself with what we might call a classic version of neurosis. He doesn't arrive wondering about the reason for his symptom or the cause of his suffering since, well in tune with the times, he can only show himself. And he also takes to an extreme limit of the imaginary order a *monstration* that, by revealing the insufficiency of necessary and sufficient symbolic resources – to block the real that bursts in on his subjectivity – presents itself or rather on multiple fragmentations all him pure vileness thrown to the unlimited void, of the most various forms. He negates or rather reneges – through this way precisely – which is on the cause of his own constitution. Unknotted, misappropriated from his divided essence, he is summoned to the feast of anything goes.

Suicide attempts on teenagers, compulsive acts, the violence of young people, psychic torment, moral humiliation, bullying, anxiety, the necessity to inhabit ourselves on another body and to name ourselves differently, among other expressions, are the absolute proof of this enjoyment

structure to which we should add the lack of social instances from whose legality an order could be supported that limits the overflow of the real on which our subject finds himself dragged into.

These clinical manifestations, that belong to the field of language and don't participate on the order of the signifier, since they are disaffected from the operation of castration they don't end up having the adequate phallic measurements, would then exclude an analyst's intervention?

While these conditions don't create an analyst, on the classic sense, they don't exclude him from the possibility of impacting and operating precisely there in front of the outcome of enjoyment, because of his presence on the real. The limit that these manifestations present does not equal the unattainable.

To promote, as a first step, the rearrangement of the outcome of enjoyment, relocate the subject on a frame from which a no might be inscribed into. Rejection of the paradoxical satisfaction of enjoyment that makes room – on a second step – for desire. It becomes necessary for the delimitation of an argument and an indispensable illusion for the life of the subject. To suppose this would contradict the essence of our act, to direct the subject to castration, would be a reading error if we don't depart from the notion that, to operate, to produce a cut, it is necessary to specify the conditions between the subject and the Other. This is what I call to spawn necessary literal instance, that will allow on another step to script, again and again, the lack between paradoxical satisfaction that the enjoyment of the Other imprints and the unavoidable law that desire demands.

Abstinence is not the answer for these circumstances. And the analyst, because of that permanent and sensitive manner that analysis grants him taken to his limit regarding "what is and what is not", wouldn't he be enabled through this to have an impact in the face of the clinical real of our times?

Could this be the ethics that regulate and organizes the acts of the analyst today?

