

CONVERGENCE, LACANIAN MOVEMENT FOR FREUDIAN PSYCHOANALYSIS.

BARCELONA 2023

**Which Ethics for Current Psychoanalytic Practice?**

Presented by the Sigmund-Freud Psychoanalytic School in Rosario

**Psychoanalytic *Praxis* Today**

Stating that psychoanalytic *praxis* is geared to that bone of the real through the symbolic enables us to uphold that it is not possible to perform it without the supporting *moebian*, intension-extension movement.

The analyst's training implies the enactment in the extension of a School, Association, conversation with others, Conferences, Convergence. That which is accounted for and shown in discourse, analytical *praxis*.

From that point we will address the questions that convene this meeting because although we do not stop inquiring about the 'subjectivity of the time', these are questions that make up the core of the Analytic Discourse as one of the discourses which, insofar as the reverse of the *Master* Discourse, turns by way of the effect of the analytic act to the Hysteric Discourse as the analysand's position.

In the round of Discourses, the capitalist Discourse does not cease to place obstacles to the possible symptomatic dimension which, as the desire-*jouissance* articulation, breaks the S1 S2 relationship pushing away *jouissance*. We underscore the fact that, even when the capitalist discourse prevails, the other three discourses may encourage turns that enable the establishment of the analysand's position.

So what does conducting a treatment today entail? The analyst's presence, by lending his or her body to listening acts as support, the semblance of the object enabling the analysand to speak. The analyst offers to make room for speech and thus encourages the role of contingency.

It is not a question of deciding and proposing “to be” *the semblance of*, rather to be available for what the speech of the speaking being imposes, because *semblance* is the effect of the analysand’s discourse.

Without the singularity inherent to the subject, there is no signifier that represents it for another signifier. Lacan produces a passage of the structured unconscious as a language to reframe the unconscious like that which accounts for the *parlêtre* insofar as it speaks, it enjoys!: *Jouis-J’ouïs*, a homophony that enacts what we typically call the phallic jouissance, provided that you always respond ‘I listen’ to the exclamation enjoy!

That passage by Lacan implies sustaining the difference between the language and *lalangue* which includes the drive, if there was investment of the drive, whereas the unconscious knowledge is knowledge that sustains itself with and against *lalangue*.

What types of resistance do we currently face in our praxis?

We can consider the effects of the pandemic, that Real we faced which traversed, and still traverses or even more so, the analytical praxis in post-pandemic times.

Though it was possible to open up -not remain in that prison- and consider the virtual space through phone sessions, video calls, Zoom and other possible applications involving the screen given that the voice is one of the forms of presence, when the time came to open up to face-to-face encounters, i.e., for both the analyst and the analysand to put the body on the line and not just the voice, we perceive effects we can name such as “refusal” (*Ablehnung*). It is in fact about the analysand ‘refusing’ to put his or her body on the line by suggesting virtual sessions when confronted with an obstacle that may arise and the need to place the body on the line in the scheduled session. We also observe a request for rescheduling sessions, and the tendency of the analyst to satisfy that demand. A kind of inertia took place during the pandemic which created a continuity of that virtual modality still present today. Thus we question it as a way of refusing to put the body on the line, by the analysand and also by the analyst when answering to the demand and continuing with online sessions, session rescheduling, and other situations which could be questioned as resistance on the part of the analyst.

These as well as other situations brought up once again the question in our School about the analyst's body and gave way to numerous discussions which included analysts from other institutions. The body of the analyst is part of the analytic scene insofar as the analyst is the operator of the framework comprising it. We know it is not just any scene, what is spoken there cannot be said in any other place, and as the master would say, it is the place of "the other scene" .

In the analytic scene the sexual relationship is excluded. "The analyst, insofar as analyst, has no body." Or his or her body has no *Erscheinung*, that is, the manifestation of what is his or her own.<sup>1</sup> The presence of the analyst is therefore required for the manifestations of his or her body not to become present. The analyst in the place of the dead suspends his or herself. Nor does listening occur like in any other place. So Lacan's teaching regarding the analyst's position as mentioned at the beginning, directs, and renews our questions.

Precisely one of the issues this meeting proposes to inquire on relates to temporality: less sessions, but also a way of not entering into analysis when the symptom dissolves or when anguish disappears. Also, the session rescheduling demand is an issue connected to temporality. We know that entering into analysis entails a series of operations that are not without the subject's desire to make progress while prevented from certain satisfactions that leave the subject on the sidelines of life. We may say that it goes from the instant of the glance to the moment of concluding skipping over the time for understanding. Without the logical time for understanding the moment of concluding will not necessarily lead to the haste inherent in it, but rather entail something else linked to compulsion. The time for understanding is of paramount importance during the course of analysis. Since the first Freudian topic, the written arrow in "the comb" scheme shows temporality in the process of any psychic act, as compellingly shown in the work on dreams. Lacan with "The Assertion of Anticipated Certainty" furnishes a valuable tool on logical time.

---

<sup>1</sup> Yankelevich, Héctor: Lógicas del Goce. "El marco del análisis y el cuerpo del analista," Cap 1.[The Framework of Analysis and the Body of the Analyst, chap. 1] Page 20. Ed. Homo Sapiens. Rosario. Argentina, 2002

The analytic act entails the logical temporality of the moment of concluding insofar as the moment for understanding has done its job allowing the analyst to create such act enabled by the analysand's work. Thus it is not a matter of passages to the act or encouraging acting out.

The narratives of Hilda Doolittle<sup>2</sup> relative to her analysis with Freud in *Writing on the Wall* convey the “knowing-how-to-do” of the analyst when listening with floating attention and, *après coup*, account for the fact that “the desire of the analyst” function was at stake. When she brings “her visions” to analysis, Freud actively intervenes asking about the size of the images, how long they lasted, if she had her eyes open or closed, what was their shape, if in some cases they could refer to goddesses, and which one of them? We see them (in the reading) go from the couch to the glass cabinets where the Professor kept his collection of valuable archeological and artistic objects, choose a figurine, and go back to the couch with it, giving shape to the figure, the hieroglyphic writing, to that which had vaguely appeared in the visions.

We spoke about the necessary time for understanding that entails discourse without words but not without language, that the screen works as a screen contrary to the presence, which is also endowed with temporality and space, the real of the office, the couch, the hand shake or kiss; and from the analysand, getting there, greetings, gestures, among other things when considering the arrival at the scheduled session.

The testimony of Suzanne Hommel<sup>3</sup> in analysis with Lacan contributes to the following questions. She lived through a war and post war, hunger, horror, and anguish. During one of her first interviews she asks whether he could remove that pain despite knowing the answer. Lacan's gaze made her understand that she had to live all her life with that pain. One day she was telling him about a dream: “I wake up at 5 o'clock”, and adds, “it was at 5 o'clock that the Gestapo came to get the Jews in their homes.” When hearing this Lacan does an act, he jumps from his chair, goes towards her, and very gently caresses her cheek. His act,

---

<sup>2</sup> Doolittle, Hilda: Tribute to Freud. (letters) “Writing on the Wall” Page 49 Colección Tauro. Schapire Publisher. Buenos Aires 1979

<sup>3</sup> <https://youtu.be/ai6zzNoVkJU>

a *geste à peau*, though it did not diminish the pain it changed it into something else. 40 years later, when she recalls that fragment of analysis she still feels that *geste à peau*. It was a gesture that appealed to humanity.

It is thus possible to create each time, if the framework of the analysis as said earlier is well laid out and if each analyst upholds his/her practice from such position, according to the logic of the four discourses.

Susana Splendiani

By EPSFROS