

Inglés.

Freudian Ethics for Psychoanalytic Practice

Silvina Hernández

The call to this Convergence congress is given through a question. "WHAT ETHICS FOR PSYCHOANALYTIC PRACTICE TODAY?" whose response is anticipated in the argument proposed by the invitation.

Based on this argument and after an institutional work on the matter, my answer to this question arises. What ethics? Freudian ethics, which I will call Don't forget Freud. This phrase, in English, was the title of an exhibition that was held in 2018 at the Sigmund Freud Museum in Vienna, in Freud's house. And that my colleagues on the Board of Directors brought to Mayéutica for us to work on.

What can be said about this beautiful phrase: Don't forget Freud.

First, to highlight the importance of the translations of Freudian texts for their preservation. Thanks to the translations into Spanish and English, they survived the great wars.

I highlight this point because of the importance that we give in the Convergence movement to languages, to the translation of the works; an effort that is worth making. Today our translated works can appear on social networks, on web pages and have a reach that brings unexpected connections.

Second, the ambiguity of the phrase, since as it is not found in a specific context it can be translated in several different ways: don't you forget, do not forget, referring to an individual or a group of people, and they are all valid.

Third, the contradiction or the paradox in the meaning of the phrase, since forgetting is something that happens, that cannot be controlled from consciousness. To which it is added that the sentence is preceded by a NO, so we know that we are denying something that we want to affirm.

Forgetfulness is also the condition of remembrance, it would be impossible to speak if we did not condense into words or concepts, all the ideas that make up an object, facing the impossible of saying everything, and the failure of what we believe to say as true.

Freud is an occurrence because he locates the conflict that sexuality, as a complex and as a trauma, causes in the human being, generating effects in the body that cannot be explained by the organic and that do not depend on consciousness or will. The presence of this conflict in our analytical practice appears every day, the issues of sexuality and gender are one of the marks to be highlighted in the sayings of our time.

Freud must "invent" the concepts of the unconscious and the drive to be able to say something about sexuality. In addition, with *The Interpretation of Dreams* and *Psychopathology of Everyday Life*, he brings neuroses closer to the normality of the human being.

The psychopathology that interests psychoanalysis is that of the everyday, and the tool to address this cause is language. Because we are speakers and it is the language itself that causes the suffering that it denounces.

So the ethics that corresponds to psychoanalysis is not that of the sovereign good, as Lacan says in the seminar on Ethics, but that effect of the incidence of the Freudian discovery, which places the speaker desiring an object, closer to the thing, in the sense of *Das Ding*, than to the truth and the good of philosophy. This unconscious desire is towards the mother, as a forbidden and incestuous object. Lacan says in that seminar that Freud provides an answer to the moral crisis. Where philosophy and religions introduce into the ethical question the "sovereign Good" or the supreme Good, Freud puts the *Das Ding*. Since the mother is an object lost in origin, incestuous and prohibited.

Freud inaugurates the cure for neurotic suffering with the symbolic use of words. Many years later, Lacan would say that language cannot be used unless it is admitted that it is linked to something that pierces the real. "The efficacy of language is based on the function of what I have called the hole in the real." Seminar 23 page 32.

Let us call these the initial conditions from which a subject is constituted.

The subjective structuring is no longer only defined by the "rigid times of the Oedipus" in the manner of Lacan in seminar 5, but by the possibility of starting from certain initial conditions. For which there is only the possibility of deviating. In the manner of the theories of chaos from which psychoanalysis draws after Lacan.

These theories pose a problem very close to our work, we could think of a temporary knot in the intrinsic difference between action towards the future and the integration in the present of the experience of the past. (Ilya Prigogine and Isabelle Stengers. *The New Alliance*.) It is not a linear time.

A child comes into the world in certain initial conditions and after that everything is a drift, a detour, cuts and connections, in the development of the Oedipal drama and with those who perform the father/mother functions, as they play different roles, towards their desire and *jouissance*. From there their sexual identity and their own exercise of sexuality will derive, subjective, phantasmatic, located in a certain time and place.

Modes of jouissance that have an epochal imprint, but this has a risk with respect to current practices, which is to assume an equal subjectivity of "today" for all contemporaries and that in this context the singularity of one on one is lost. Hence the craftsmanship of our work.

Just as Lacan modifies his ideas regarding language, he goes from the predominance of the symbolic to the hole de-in the real, what does not change is that sexuality and death are for Freud, even after going through the Oedipus complex, the living rock of castration. Something of the impossible endures as real.

This Freudian concept is close to the Lacanian Real of his last seminars, where he maintains that the only thing that pierces that Real is language. Let us take into account for example the number of terms and words we need to talk about the practices of sexuality today. All we have to explain...

So starting from Freudian ethics, how to think about clinical practice today, Lacan gives us a novelty in seminar 23:

"In analysis... every subject reveals that he is nothing more than a supposition. I mean that the subject as such is always divided. It is a question of accounting for what constitutes the real of this division." This is the novelty. "On this matter we need to return to Freud, since he was the one who opened the way for this to be apprehended". He says: "Freud achieved the intention of telling the truth about man" and he clarifies that Freud, a bourgeois gentleman of his time, who believed at the beginning of the 20th century in all the benefits that science was going to bring humanity, still places the human being as non-rational.

And Lacan makes his contribution, adding that the truth, like the subject, can only be told in pieces, "half-said." This is the real of subjective division. Lacan in class 2 of seminar 23 (9/12/75)

Lacan presents a definition of language in a different sense than that of communication or of the tool of the message, he expresses that the only way of thinking about the use of language and its effectiveness is thinking of it as what pierces the real, as what operates the capture of the real".

In Mayéutica we call this way of working with the language: the Reallanguage.

In closing:

Poetry, or better yet, the poets teach us to use words and they show the effect they have.

Let us take nature as an example, as the poet Cristina Rivera Garza says in her book on Mexico and the trips of Juan Rulfo: "It is a known fact that the landscape is only half natural. What happens between the horizon and the gaze: that is the landscape."

Meaning that the landscape is between a place that does not exist in reality, the horizon, and an involved subject that watches. And she goes on to quote Rulfo saying that the poet had the need to invent his own landscape, which can only be realized in writing.

Rulfo says in his notebook, quoted by Rivera Garza:

"There are too many untranslatable things,
thought of in dreams,
intuited,
to which one can only find their true meaning with the original sound...the color.
Ineffable. The language of the ineffable.
The adventure of the unknown.
To invent a landscape
or a new landscape of a country"

Cristina Rivera Garza. *Había mucha neblina o humo o no se qué. (There Was a Lot of Fog, or Smoke, or I'm Not Sure What: Walking with Juan Rulfo)* Ed. Penguin Random House. 2017

Barcelona, May 2023