

Cure by addition

"A cure is only possible as an accident,
as an event:
it does not depend on will or intention.
It happens. Like writing.
The more will and purpose behind it,
the more it escapes, the more it is refused."
(Claudia Masin, Heal and be healed)

Psychoanalysis was born as an attempt to cure those diseases that medicine could not cure, however, it was Freud himself who warned us about *furor curandis*, and then Lacan stated that a cure occurs by addition.

What implications does it entail that the cure, in psychoanalysis, comes as an addition? What cure are we referring to, or more precisely, what does psychoanalysis cure?

"Repeated times I have had to hear from my patients, after I promised cure or relief by means of a cathartic cure, this objection: You say so yourself; it is probable that my suffering is intertwined with the conditions and incidents of my life; you can't change anything in them, and then, how do you intend to help me? To this I have been able to answer: I have no doubt that it would be easier for fate than for me to free him from his suffering. But you will be convinced that the gain is great if we manage to change your hysterical misery into ordinary misfortune." Sigmund Freud, On the psychotherapy of hysteria.

I choose these words of the Master, spoken at the end of 1800, as a kickstart to think what psychoanalysis cures, if anything at all. I did not randomly choose this paragraph. It particularly mattered to me because I find in it an invariant position, and I understand that it's that invariant what makes the specificity of our practice: its ethics. Freud, subject of his time and unable to escape its positivism, promises, but does not promise everything. He does not promise an ideal life, without suffering, of pure happiness, but a change, a passage from the neurotic suffering to life's own suffering. He appeals to generate confidence in a job that

subjectively involves the analysis, moving away from the place of a savior or curator. The specificity of the psychoanalytic treatment, insofar as it must give rise to the emergence of the unconscious, imposes on Freud the need for a method and conditions that make it possible: the fundamental rule, essential counterpart of the assumption of the unconscious, and its necessary correlation in the analyst: floating attention. The analyst is the one who listens, within the framework of the transference, from a position of abstinence. What does he refrain from? Does he refrain from putting his phantom into play, from responding from that place to the patient's demands, from intervening from his place as subject, while it is about the appearance of the subject of the unconscious of the analysand. The analyst's desire is an empty place, it does not start from any prior ideal of health, it does not have pre-established goals of healing, nor of adaptation of the subject to a certain reality, and for this reason "the cure occurs in addition".

At present, the discourse of science supposes a progressive abandonment of the clinic. The questions that have been asked to the patient since ancient times: what is wrong with him? Since when? To what does he attribute it?, that invite us to discuss remain in the background, and in their place comes the widespread use of protocols, the segmentation of the body, and the massive dispensing of medication, together with the list of tips and techniques that seek the adaptation of the subject to the rule. On the other hand, the psychoanalytic clinic is not determined by a fixed structure, nor by protocols that determine it. The direction of the cure is not within a universal perspective, but on the contrary, it is oriented towards the unique solution that each subject can find when facing the logic of castration. The point at which each one arrives at that path cannot be anticipated. It is a matter of locating the particular logic of each patient to intervene from there, allowing himself to be taken by the transference, becoming the cause of the subject's desire as a semblance of *object a*, to produce the twists that give rise to a subjective movement that enables the passage of a saying to what's said and, with it, the changes in the subjective position of the analysand, in relation to the Other and his little others, generating new distributions in the joy

economy, a know-how with the symptom and the opportunity for a subject to discover and sustain a desire of his own. Lacan maintains that the ethical act is the one that is in accordance with the desire of the subject, and the non-ethical act, the guilty act, is the one in which the subject yields -that is to say: renounces- his desire. Have you acted in accordance with the desire that inhabits it? It is an ethic relative to discourse. Relative to the word that acts and modifies the subject in its relationship with reality. It is not a beautiful literary saying, it is not oratory or rhetoric, it is a position from which it is said, it is enunciated. Thus, the subject of speech, the subject of enunciation, the subject of the unconscious is privileged and not the subject of the statement, of understanding. With Freud we discover that words are capable of making people sick, but also of healing. How? By listening to what resonates, establishing new combinations, creating other versions, emptying predetermined meanings. This orientation directly subverts the approach of classical psychotherapy that starts from indoctrination and constitutes knowledge. It is not about the norms of which or such frame, although we can make use of them, but it will be the analyst who, with his actions, will give existence to the unconscious in each case, operating on that language, be it through interpretation, a cut or silence, so that a new expression capable of articulating the subject's desire comes into being. Listening without understanding, so that the subject can repair-recognize-the suffering, the pain, the alienation to the Other, the coagulated responses, the significant determination, the enjoyment of it; to position yourself differently. Cure, then, added to the repair, by distinguishing what could not be distinguished before, recognizing in that discourse that we believed to be our own, but it was imposed on us, the structural lack that will give rise to a new desiring and vital position.

Psychoanalysis does not cure castration, lack of being, there is no sexual relationship or the woman does not exist; psychoanalysis does not cure structural lack, on the contrary, if psychoanalysis cures us of anything, it is the deception of completeness and "nothing is impossible", so fashionable these days. Psychoanalysis cures us of the deception that subjects the subject to incessant work to cover the lack in the Other, responding to his

demand, fulfilling his mandates, making his impotence impossible by believing that everything is possible, enjoying the superego imperatives, paying with his suffering for the renunciation of his desire. And it will be in that movement that puts lacking into play, the one that causes and motorizes desire, articulated but not articulated, piercing the real through the symbolic, traversing the phantasm, separating from that primordial Other, going beyond the father to condition of making use of it, recognizing the impossible, that the subject will be able to inhabit his desire and this world, lovingly linked to others, warned of the fantasmatic points that determined him, mutating, a little at each turn of this work, his neurotic suffering to know-how with his symptom and be able to face the ordinary misfortunes that, without a doubt, life will bring him.

Gabriela Siri
May 2023