

Make Do

The call of this congress expresses the concern for the current relevance and competence of psychoanalysis. It is also an invitation to open a debate on the ethics that guide our practice in terms of the subjectivity of the times.

The subject cannot be thought outside the cultural ground he/she inhabits. This is the time of the decline of the models that question the cause, according to Jameson or, as can be read in the writing of the capitalist discourse formalized by Lacan, the reign of the illusion of obturation of want by means of consumption in a subject that rejects the S1 and, as a consequence, distances himself from unconscious determination. The demands for analysis are formulated in different ways according to dominant ideals that change, just as the forms of discomfort vary. These are also times of nostalgic psychoanalysts of a past when numerous clients lay down on the couch four times a week, eager to get to know themselves and to undergo an interesting subjective experience.

Now, whether the opening produced by the discovery of the unconscious about treatment of the psyche remains in force does not depend only on the characteristics of the time. If psychoanalysis questions the position of the beautiful soul that eludes its own implication in that which it criticizes, then let us ask ourselves what we psychoanalysts have to do with the complaint about the validity of our practice, given that psychoanalysis does not have an assured future neither for its prestige nor for its beautiful eyes. "The analyst's mission is to confront the Real", Lacan affirms.

Mission does not summon an enlightened handling of persons or groups. Beyond the diversity of demands, it is an expression that places the analyst in the experience as such, that refers to his function as a task to confront what is not working and has the Real as the effect of an exigible meaning. *Mission* and *exigible* firmly express an orientation when thinking about our practice. *Mission* makes us know precisely what the analyst's task is and

exigible sounds as a necessary requirement of the effect of meaning. Now, considering that the Real excludes meaning, what can be the Real of an effect of meaning? This effect will consist in narrowing it "on condition that it is in the right way, in narrowing it by a knot and not just any knot". Borromean logic that articulates the three registers insofar as meaning is transmitted by means of words that are not without imaginary curvatures or without a remainder *still* to be signified. It is a question, then, of "knowing how some words operate" that allows us to read in another way, not so much from the beautifully constructed discourse but, taking the joke as a model, that which produces resonance through ambiguity. Also *the pas de sens*, the difference between full speech and empty speech, the distinction between statement-enunciation and the tendency to a new signifier as an edge that by definition is never reached, the ideal horizon of something that makes no sense. In the facts, the dynamics of this operation is put into play through the course of an analysis of those who speak with direct or indirect experiences, relate dreams and fictions, tell what is told or hidden from childhood past sometimes felt as if they were someone else's, the opinions of significant characters that became the beacon that guides and marks what is right and what is wrong, the matters of love, pain, maternity and paternity, ambitions, power, hope... It is a long process of saying that summons the analyst to dose anguish, to order the signifiers of trauma, of the family story, of childhood history, of parental positions, identifications, to delimit pleasure. This work brings into play the diversity of the analyst's interventions, including suggestion, assuming that, as Lacan points out, interpretation and suggestion are inherent to discourse. As if looking for a certain complicity among analysts of all times, Freud used to say already in the last years of his practice "every analyst knows..." that we intervene in different ways to sustain the analytic work and produce effects in the cure. There is not, then, a single valid intervention of the analyst.

Another position before the practice is the one that degrades the symbolic to a mere play on words more or less ingenious and reserves the only intervention of the analyst to tune in to the sublime tone of the Real. Theoretical ideals and transference links especially

in the community of analysts in fact sustain such a procedure, but unfortunately its spillover also reaches those who simply demand to be analyzed because of what is not going right in life and who neither understand nor have to understand that their analyst expects a demand for analysis "per se" nor have to be vigilant to go straight to the core of the Real. Attempting to conduct the analytic experience without the necessary Symbolic-Imaginary support is a pretense that assumes hierarchies in RSI and imagines, as if it were possible, a form of purity of access to the Real that ends up being external to the subjective suffering of the one who demands the analysis.

We read in one of Lacan's best known aphorisms "it is *indispensable* for the analyst to be at least two, one to have an effect on the cure and the other to theorize it". Like the expressions *mission* and *exigible*, mentioned above, the term *indispensable* also indicates what is necessary to sustain in a practice that also includes, it is clear, the elaboration of concepts and the revision of their tools, a term that Freud used to illustrate the analyst's know-how. In tune with this tradition, from the 1970s onwards Lacan opens a half-open door to approach the Real of the clinic with a pragmatism that overhangs his reflections on experience, in contrast to the once more complex approaches to the scope of the cure. He states, then, that psychoanalysis is not progress and defines its scope as a practical bias to feel better. This is not a minor statement since it alludes to the singularity of each client, whatever it is for each one to feel better, either to change neurotic suffering for common unhappiness according to Freud, or to make this uncomfortable situation of being human more tolerable, according to Lacan.

Every cultural moment is appropriate to pursue the efficacy of our practice. The act of searching limits, by definition, the incentive of supposing psychoanalytic theory to be a sealed regime. From the expressions "making do" and "knowing what to do with the symptom" (*Savoir y faire, savoir faire avec le symptôme*) Lacan establishes another status of knowledge, different from the accumulation of knowledge about oneself that is achieved in any psychotherapeutic and psychoanalytic practice. However, the importance of the

differential value lies in the fact that such knowledge "must not only serve to avoid being fooled by the same story again", such knowledge must be accompanied, Lacan adds, by knowing how to get out (*savoir en sortir*) or more precisely by an introductory knowledge, by knowing how to enter (*savoir y entrer*). According to *connoisseurs*, they are all colloquial expressions in the French language. *Savoir y faire* is used when speaking of someone who has a certain cunning in performing in life and achieving goals. It suggests having the acumen to get by in an awkward situation or at least one with no obvious solution. *Savoir y faire avec* has more the sense of "making do with what's there". We can think that *avec* presents the problem and therefore we will have to procure the elements to cope with it, even if it doesn't mean to solve it. The adjunction of "y" is the particularity of a pronoun that replaces a place or an abstract thing, an idea. It marks the singularity between the knowledge and the act, there, every time.

Psychoanalysis does not produce a technical knowledge about sexuality, nor does it produce a know-how about the unconscious, a mental weakness that concerns us all. Somewhat more limited, the endgame of analysis is to know what to do with the symptom, Lacan also uses the verb *se débrouiller*, to unravel the tangle that is not without shaking off the comfortable corners of the story with which one is deluded. To cope each one in ourselves and on our own, without acquiring a universal method or technique for all, that is to say, "without taking the thing in concept". Ultimately, a particular knowledge as a result of going through analysis.

Lacan claimed that the Real is impossible to be thought. Alain Badiou, who was interested in the concept, told us psychoanalysts in Buenos Aires that the essence of the Real consists in the fact that it cannot be fully thought, and following Lacan it does not cease to not be written. With different resources, many times without finding them, Lacan sought to the point of stubbornness to show and demonstrate this impossibility, an elaboration that allows us in some way to imagine, to give meaning to the Real at least on the concept level. It is worth clarifying that through the analysis itself it is possible to access the conviction of the impossible and a better understanding of the theory. From his declared position as a

analysand in the Seminar, in an intimate tone Lacan said that he has had confirmation of the Real as the possible waiting to be written. We note something of a personal revelation in this, a conviction different from the intellectual one, closer to knowledge in the flesh that gives a glimpse of his singular conviction of the impossible.

It is a fact that the Real understood as that which does not work, as individual and social suffering in any of its forms, has been a constant in any time and crisis of humanity. In the face of this history, even though psychoanalysis was a newcomer, it opened the opportunity to deal with psychological discomfort, to position oneself before castration, with what there is and what there is not, to make do with the symptom. Lacan never expressed himself on how to know how to deal with the knot in practice, but he warned that it is not a matter of repeating drawings, but that they should basically be useful. It is easy to infer the damage to the current prestige and the permanence of psychoanalysis in the future if it does not deal with discomfort, that which does not work in life. This is a necessary condition for the psychoanalytic experience not to be reduced to a few.

Grupo de trabajo:

Beatriz Bernath, Jorge Golberg, Marina Di Carlo, Hugo Dvoskin, Gabriela Pedrotti, Alberto Fernández.