

## Ethics in the outbreak of the universe of discourse

The current unfolding of the analyst's desire excludes the genital drive, according to the logic established by Lacan. Considering but a single quote from the 16 January 1957 session, during the seminar *Object Relations and Freudian Structures*, the direction of the treatment consisted in reducing the partial drives to unify them in the genital drive as the ideal drive. The motive behind Lacan's logic is based on disregarding the Ego-Ideal proposed as the upper axis of the genital drive, as achieved by psychoanalysis, which could even pose class differences. For instance, how could we accept that the *Wolf Man* felt attracted to women servants?

In 1912, Freud publishes *The Most Prevalent Form of Degradation in Erotic Life*, announcing two currents for the speaking being's libido development—one tender, the other sensual—whose reunion is the only way to ensure an absolutely normal love behaviour.

During the post-Freudian development time, the function of the *Ego-Ideal* is consolidated in the unifying One of the genital drive, its *hetero* consummation being the objective of analysis, so as to dissipate neurosis.

Lacan progresses towards a beyond of the pleasure principle, introducing, through repetition, the language structure in the speaking being, who conceives the  $\$ \diamond a$  algorithm as phantasm.

This *additional One* that can and cannot be said is dismissed by Lacan during the second session of the *Logic of Phantasy* seminar, dated 23 November 1966, since an absolutely normal love reunion, uniting the tender and the sensual, is not possible. The cause is the *object a*.

Thus spoke Lacan: "c'est ça qui constitue ce manque auquel il s'agit que nous donnions la fonction logique, celui qui fait précisément éclater ce qu'il en est de l'univers du discours".

The *outbreak of the universe of discourse* makes it impossible for a subject attached to the letter as an algebra matheme, the *object a*, to unite the two Freudian currents of libido.

The *object a* causes from the most abject degradation to a position far-removed from the *Ego-Ideal*, yielding the symptom's opaqueness as the pivot of the social bond's disharmony with regards to the analysand's sexuality.

The termination of analysis proposes another dimension for the speaking being's sexuality upon considering the *outbreak of the universe of discourse*, which sustains the disharmony between a self-eroticism that is impossible to lose —as the logic implies a *not-all*— and sexuality developed to its full potential by the action of S ( $\mathbb{A}$ ).

This *outbreak* is also described in Seminar 16, *From an Other to the Other*, during the 19 March 1969 session. The drive that pervades the tracing of the Other for a transferring subject, the other as a *partenaire*, is detached from unification because it is always minus, due to an ever-resistant self-eroticism that is the object of jokes, giving rise to the existence of the unconscious.

Already in the logical time of the *Mirror Stage* we can find the impossible union of the body's One, although the illusion of the *partenaire's assent* as an other affords the *infans* a moment of joy, supposing existence.

The *Anxiety* seminar presents another dimension in assessing the *Mirror Stage*, for we should consider that the *real i(a)* never constitutes One with the *virtual i'(a)*. The real *i(a)* image *breaks out in the universe of discourse* and the consequence for the direction of treatment concerns the effect of loss in the secondary narcissism.

Whatever the sex, the Super-Ego as a return within the real of the virtual *i'(a)*, differentiated between the sexes by being negative or having the phallus as  $-\phi$ , differentiates between various enjoyments linked to the body. The loss of narcissism is linked to the literal analysis of the Super-Ego when the encounter with the most opaque of the symptom occurs, linked to a sexuality that is always discordant for all in the social bond.

Although Lacan always referred to masculine libido, through *hysterical identification* the commitment is even more proper to Woman as well. This *outbreak* that relates us occurs from women to man. No one can deny that something *breaks out* as absolute knowledge in the phallic sexual relationship, taking into account its inexistence.

The lack of a sexual relationship and the consequent *outbreak* between organ self-eroticism and the encounter with the *significance* granted by the  $S(A)$  determines a mental nullification in the speaking being, where the persistence of the Ego-Ideal's unifying consummation makes existence.

It is necessary to analyse a *fractal* matheme in discourse, that is, what has no perimeter of the  $i'(a)$  virtuality that returns in the body's enjoyment linked to the Super-Ego, to accept a nothing that persists in the phallic sexual relationship.

The *word of soul* as the soul of the torus in the *Encore* seminar is ultimately produced in such nothing, substituting the previous aphorism whereby *only love makes enjoyment acquiesce to desire*.

The direction of treatment is oriented to dismissing first the ontological of the end of a cause. It is the production of a discourse that is made fluid, linked to the *object a*, as it breaks out in the Ideal.

The *object a* persists only in the cause of the desire liable to nullification, which poses an Ideal union of the tender and the sensual. But the production of a discourse linked to drive circuits makes of existence an *infinite* that produces a *finiteness* when the supposition of the transferential knowledge breaks out.

How does the imaginary phallus appear? For Lacan, the *representing-representative* is the knot of the drive as strange attractor. There is an unexpected effect from  $S_1$  to  $S_2$  in the ordered pair: the appearance of a subject. Clinical psychoanalysis proves through settled assertions, where the strange attractor brings a discordant order to the  $S_2$  knowledge.

Between the  $S_1$  and the  $S_2$  of the ordered pair, a subject of the unconscious strengthens the  $-\phi$ , at the moment when the supposition of an  $i(a)$  *real* image sheltered by the barred subject  $\$$  *breaks out*. The  $i(a)$  *breaks out* as a narcissistic attribute of necessity, being produced by a significant chain. Its *breaking out* means the disappearance of the  $i'(a)$  remaining as  $-\phi$  if the analytic interpretation concerns the Super-Ego, impossible to fully detach in analysis.

The strange attractor is the effect of the *outbreak* and produces the passage from  $S_1$  to  $S_2$ .

The *outbreak of the universe of discourse* is a loss because it *broke* the real image of the  $i(a)$

associated with the ideal Ego. Something of the secondary narcissism must become lost for every sex as *outbreak of the universe of discourse* with various consequences.

The consequence of the verb *éclater*, brought to bear on the *universe of discourse*, concerns the singularity of each language. In Spanish and French, the verb *estallar* is different from the verb *explotar*, the verb *éclater* from the verb *exploser*.

The verb *explotar* is directed towards a subject that falls into considering others as things and its consequent effect of *surplus*, when discourse should be based on the *surplus-enjoyment* of production.

In English, there is a difference between the verbs *to blow up*, *to burst* or *to break out*, and the verb *to exploit*. I think it is no coincidence that in 1966, the year of the *Logic of Phantasy* seminar, the famous Italo-British movie *Blow-up*, by Michelangelo Antonioni, was filmed. I mean to say that Antonioni was not, as far as I know, related to Lacan's production in the logic of the *outbreak of the universe of discourse*.

Daniel Paola

(Freudian School of Buenos Aires)