

pi_wainsztein_silvia_in

ABSTRACT: The horizon of our current experience conducts us to examine the fundamentals of a transmission to provide an account of our wager for the future of psychoanalysis, which founds a new ethics, an ethic of desire, with absence as its motor. If as Lacan says, psychoanalysis is intransmissible and we are forced to reinvent it, the cause of desire as the trace of a print supports a politics of psychoanalysis.

Ethics of desire – Politics of psychoanalysis¹

Silvia Wainsztein

ETHICS OF DESIRE

Seduction pierces all of us that participate, whether voluntarily or involuntarily, in these times of ours. They are, considering that the current imperative moves towards enjoyment, whose effect is hedonism, individuality, objectification, degradation of knowledge, homogenization, effects that are pierced by fundamentalism, on any of the above-mentioned fields. Current manifestations deprived of the function of ethics. We are talking about a new morality, imposed by the power of “modern” Masters. A morality that dictates the principles of good and evil. Its success depends on that the certainties they spread offer temporary appeasement to human beings until the real of discomfort imposes itself.

Lacan, on his article *Function and field of word and language in psychoanalysis* exposes an explicit recognition of desire's openness to an otherness on which the subject depends for his constitution as a desiring being. This goes in the opposite direction of what individualism postulates.

¹ Presented on the VII International Congress *Which ethics for the psychoanalytic practice nowadays? Convergence, Lacanian movement for Freudian psychoanalysis*, Barcelona, May 24-27 2023.

This carries a loss of humanity so big that it does not leave any room for dignity.

Psychoanalysis establishes a new form of ethics, an ethic of desire whose motor is absence.

It is through the glimmer of desire that an ethic presents itself, both on intention as well as on extension, that psychoanalysis proposes and points to from the perspective of the subversion of the subject, by offering additional paths that traverse the way of desire.

This takes us, necessarily, to look over the bases of a transmission to provide an account of our wager for the future of psychoanalysis.

A question that challenges us analysts to question our incidence on the culture that inhabits us, every time the Real bursts in like an explosion that shocks our ways of addressing the subject, as the object of psychoanalysis.

He is not just any subject. He is the subject of the unconscious, the subject of desire that, alienated on his parasitic joys, resorts to –on a best-case scenario – to an analyst whose function will be, among others, to guide his destiny to desire's horizon.

Which ethics? That is a question about our disagreement with the Real, from our place as analysts.

These new visages that, on occasion, produce such a perplexity on us that they sketch other folds on the analysand discourse, challenge us analysts to read the letters that, sustained on transference, touches what is real of the unconscious.

The subject's ghost responds to what breaks in from the Real shaking his structure, responding to the desire of the Other, as a response to the demand that The Real requires from him. Our intervention will be effective if the current scenes link to the scene of Life, of what is vital, sustained on some desire. It will not be without the place we provide to the unfolding of the word that, thanks to the effect of discourse, will be able to recreate the scene, the place where the subject will find his truth. The small truth of each other, if it is listened and read on the words of the analysands, will be conducive to the construction of

the scene, as long as we don't mistake transference scene with the framing that on past times was imperative to bear in mind.

Resistance to psychoanalysis is not solely from the discourse that emerges on each time period as a given truth. They are inherent to our own praxis, both on intention as on extension.

Warned of a Real that questions us in a different manner each time, our question is related to the "know how to do there". As long as we bear in mind the singular and individual ethic that each analyst holds and bets on the subject. His orientation is not without the "desire of the analyst" function.

There is a distinctive trait regarding the "desire of the analyst" function. I highlight this because it concerns a position without which a cure doesn't produce the efficacy of emergency of the subject. This function is sympathetic to the ethics of psychoanalysis, and its pertinence results on such a position that becomes the praxis of a discourse and that has as a premise a horizon that signifies the end of analysis. It is a position that involves a responsibility focused on a cure: introducing the subject on the order of desire, where the analysand won't give in to his desire and the analyst may sustain his desire to analyze.

In *Radio and Television*, Lacan surprises us when he says that the desire of the analyst is a determined desire, marking a categorical difference with the modalities of desire of the neurotic, unsatisfied, prevented, procrastinated. Asymmetrical positions that find common ground on the aphorism "there is no sexual rapport."²

The desire of the analyst is a desire that results from a discourse unveiled by Freud. Lacan, regarding the transmission of the Real that is at stake on the analysis experience, develops the algebra of discourse addressed on his seminar *The other side of psychoanalysis*, and he manifests himself on the psychoanalyst's discourse.

² cf. Jacques Lacan. *Psychoanalysis: Radio and television*. Barcelona, Anagrama, 1977.

On the analytic device, the analyst directs the cure by placing himself in place of the *semblant* of the object that causes the desire of the analysand. But it is a *semblant* that distinguishes itself because the object *a* presents itself without the ghost's wrapping, to allow the placement of the surplus of enjoyment that alienates the subject when he disrupts the knotting of the RSI records.

The ethic of desire is solidary to the subject's good-say, since it institutes itself on the signifier articulation, parting from the relation of the subject with the Other. Lacan places the desire of the analyst as a desire from absolute difference since an analysis will mask as good-say the singularity of the forms of enjoyment of each subject. I highlight this singularity as a counterpoint for the social, political, military discourses that tend to the homogenization through single thought, the fundamentalism that obedience to the Master carries.

The three passions stated by Lacan block the subject of desire, since the prevalence of enjoyment that is at play on each of them is of such a magnitude that the only thing that remains is the appeal to dark gods embodied by figures whose motor is the power provided by the other of the social bond. This means, for the analyst, to be able to refrain himself from the three passions that Lacan mentions: the passions of love, hate and ignorance. We know how these passions affect the bodies and how they bring out to the open the relation of solitude with enjoyment, aiming to make the Other exist in exchange of, on some cases, their own lives.

So, in this context, which option does psychoanalysis offer? How does it affect the culture that inhabits us and which transmission is it?

These questions refer to the second half of this article's title: *politics of psychoanalysis*.

POLITICS OF PSYCHOANALYSIS.

The point of view I will take regarding this title is the issue of the transmission that involves the politics of psychoanalysis.

Lacan proposes on *Closing of the IX Congress of the Freudian School of Paris* from 1978 something that moves us analysts to leave our comfort zones.

“The way I consider it now, psychoanalysis is non-transmissible. It’s very annoying. It’s very annoying that each psychoanalyst is enforced –for he is enforced – to reinvent psychoanalysis.”³

In that same lecture, he tells us:

“The subject transmits himself and himself through the bias of his identifying signals.”⁴

Today, on this post-pandemic period, the relevance of the question regarding ethics has an extremely important validity. Not only through the effects we notice, but through the discourses that imbue the subject under the form of certainties that alienate him on a knowledge that goes against all formation and transmission, since its style is training. For intimate relations, for paternal and maternal roles, for the so-called new sexual identities, for familiar relations, and the list is infinite. And... on some cases, for the figure of the psychoanalyst that, standardized through the mimicry of some guru from each of the many schools that proliferate around the world, degrades the seed of our trade onto a practice distorted at its core. If truth states how the subject responds to the Real, this articulation proposed by Lacan settles both the question as well as the challenge of calling into question when someone analyses. Analysis is conducted on the setting of the variables that each time period has to offer.

³ Jacques Lacan. Closing of the conference “The transmission”, *École Freudienne de Paris*, July 9th 1978 – unpublished – Translated to Spanish by Carlos Ruiz for the *Freudian School of Buenos Aires*.

⁴ *Ibidem*.

The marking of the Other's desire remains inaccessible to the subject. Only through the course of an analysis some traces will be able to be located. However, this marking is not a destination. A subject, through analysis, might be able to take an active position facing this marking and do something with this.

The cause of desire as the trace of a print produces transmission. This marking provides singularity and difference. This, ultimately, constitutes a style, this series of particular markings with which a subject transits through life.

The subject is played to that luck that implied the transmission he received from a desire (the one of his parents), a desire of which he is both result and consequence. Each analyst must reinvent the way through which psychoanalysis might persist with its breakthroughs and its setbacks. This is the commitment to the Freudian cause.

And what does this "invention" involve when we refer to the transmission of psychoanalysis, a subject that reunites us on the convergence of words that, far from pointing to the homogeneity of ideas, enriches us through their differences? It is related to the unconscious knowledge that throws fragments of real, and it is each analyst responsibility to pick them up, if he can. Invention is subsidiary to the enjoyment of language, of the barred woman, of a not-all knowledge, of a knowledge of the unconscious whose discovery is the challenge we face on our daily practices.

Psychoanalysis teaches a knowledge that tries to be not encyclopedic and the transmission is the transmission of a desire. A knowledge that tries not to be encyclopedic is a knowledge traversed by absence, by the logic of incompleteness and not by cumulative erudition. That is what makes possible for what is transmitted to be interrogated. On the same teaching act there is a back and forward of knowledge.

Which desire is in transmission? It is the desire of the teacher, the desire of the analyst, the desire of those that were bitten by psychoanalysis.

To conclude, a phrase I wrote on the introduction of my last book:

“The best tribute we can make to our masters of psychoanalysis is to transmit our imprint of the legacy we received. It is a way to think about the ethics of transmission, of which those of us who recognize ourselves as analysts are responsible.”⁵

⁵ Silvia Wainsztein. *The three times of sexual awakening*. Buenos Aires: EFBA, 2021.