



Xth Meeting of the International Forums
VIth international Encounter of the School
of Psychoanalysis of the Forums of the Lacanian Field [IF-SPFLF]

BARCELONA 13/16 September 2018

PRE-TEXT 5

THE ADVENTS OF THE REAL IN THE PSYCHOANALYTIC CLINIC AND IN CIVILIZATION

Silvia Migdalek

The conference entitled *La troisième* [*The third*] took place in Rome, in 1974, within the VII Congress of the Freudian School of Paris. In addition to this conference, Lacan spoke at the opening and the closure of the Congress. The Congress lasted four intense days, and some of the papers presented there were selected to be published in the *Actes* of the Freudian School of Paris (1).

For many of us the 1970s were years full of political events that marked us significantly. Just a few years before the start of that decade, the French May of 1968 infiltrated the delivery of *Seminar XVII*, when university students strongly interpellated Lacan, who not only did not avoid the incisive questions addressed by the 'rebellious ones' to him, but also answered them resolutely: '... I would tell you that, always, the revolutionary aspiration has only a single possible outcome—of ending up as the discourse of the master. This is what experience has proved. What you aspire to as revolutionaries is a master. You will get one'. (2)

In my country, Argentina, during those years – to be precise, the 24th March of 1976 – the darkest period of our history started: a military coup that established a dictatorship that implemented a sinister plan of disappearance of people, kidnappings, torture, the illegal appropriation of children who were then given to friends of the régime and some times to individuals who 'innocently' chose to adopt a position of denial, as they did not want to know anything about the horror... of the advent of a real that nested in social, collective life for many years and which even today maintains the features of something that does not cease in its effects.

Simultaneously, during the same years, in Argentina Lacanian psychoanalysis expanded with great vigour, which fortunately continues to have. With many colleagues we share the thought that the study groups on Freud and Lacan that proliferated at that time became the almost only shelter where it was possible to discuss matters about which one could not talk in any other place. As it is natural in a dictatorial state, the prevailing climate was one of fear and generalized suspicion. Many had to eventually find refuge through political asylum or forced exile, after spending long years underground.

I regard these brief temporal references as important in our approach of the common theme for our work in Barcelona in 2018, 'The advents of the real and the psychoanalyst'. The relation between an advent and time is evident: it always induces a rupturing effect in the homeostatic temporality of a series – one could say like a sort of temporal funnel that in a deferred action would emerge with 'an undesired fidelity', both in the transference and outside it, that is to say, in the life of a subject. After some terrorist actions dominated by terror and the surprise factor it has been observed that a few subjects who were close to the event of an explosion, and who miraculously escaped alive, then fell into a state akin to temporo-spatial disorientation and roamed around, lost, for several hours, without being able to refer to the usual coordinates of their reality.

The advent is always of the order of emergency (*emergencia*). In Spanish this word has two meanings. On the one hand, it refers to something that has a relation with the verb *emerger* (to emerge); for example, 'to rise from the water', and also 'to sprout'. On the other hand, the noun *emergencia* refers to an accident or event that happens unexpectedly; for example, *un estado de emergencia* ('a state of emergency'). As Colette Soler has indicated, an advent may be something that is expected or not predicted, new, unexpected.

In relation to the circumstances that surrounded *La troisième* – a text that has been regarded as an introduction to the seminar of 1974-75, *RSI* – Lacan held a press conference that concerns directly one of the axes of our theme, the advents of the real. He emphasized at the time the dimension of the real of science and its consequences for subjectivity. His answers were sharp, and at certain moments they induced an awakening affect, to which today we could ascribe a striking anticipatory value. To the series of the Freudian impossibles – educating, governing and analyzing – he added the position of the scientist: 'Science has a probability. Its position is also totally impossible, but it so happens that it does not have the slightest idea of it.' (3) The only 'little emergence' that we have is that sometimes scientists become anxious, and this provides us with a clue. Psychoanalysis appeared in correlation with a certain advance of the discourse of science, and referring to *Civilization and its Discontents*, Lacan affirmed that psychoanalysis is a symptom that is part of the discontents, and then added: 'The symptom is what is the most real among the things that exist' (4).

Lacan also said that the psychoanalyst was at a time of mutation, since 'for a brief moment we were not able of giving an account of what the intrusion of the real was. The analyst remains there. He is there as a symptom, and he can only last in his capacity as a symptom. But you will see that they will cure humankind of psychoanalysis – by insisting on drowning it in sense...' (5).

Psychoanalysis, as from the event Freud-in-Culture since the discovery of the unconscious, offers us a new mode of treatment of the real: Freud and his saying [*decir*], which indicates that 'that must come to be'.

I propose a scansion of the title of our X Rendezvous and consider, on the one hand, the syntagm 'advents of the real', in the plural, as pointed out in the pretexts that have already been published; and on the other hand, the psychoanalyst, who finds himself involved with such advents in his clinical practice as well as in what is transmitted in the discourses of culture and its discontents.

Let us list then – not exhaustively, and merely as indications – some of the modes of advent of the real that our clinical practice fatally convokes: the marks of the fixation of traumatic jouissance in its irreducibility; the viscosity and inertia of the libido in the symptom; anxiety; the irruption of repetition in its dimension of *Tuché*; the questioning and positioning as cause [*la puesta en causa*] of the object *a* in the place of the agent of the analytic discourse, making the veils of identifications fall, to which paradoxically transference itself had provided a veil in its moment of

installation as the subject supposed to know; and finally S_1 in the place of production, to which by way of the analyst's desire, as a desire to obtain absolute difference, confronted with the primordial signifier 'the subject is, for the first time, in a position to subject himself to it.' (6) As Lacan suggests in *Seminar XI*, analysis requires a certain courage, as it leads, like no other praxis, to the bone of the real. Psychoanalysis depends on the real: the real that emerges in an analysis, as well as the real that is the effect of science and technology in civilization. It falls on us, practitioners of psychoanalysis, to sustain the analyst's discourse in this era of capitalism whose real is such that does not promote social bonds. Our politics/policy (*política*) must give an answer to it without ignoring its consequences, thus continuing the wager for the unprecedented social bond that Freud invented, the analyst-analysand bond that induced the advent of something that does not follow any model of the usual relations we maintain with our fellow human beings. Perhaps it was also along this path that Lacan aspired to psychoanalysis having something new to say about love, as he postulated the advent of a new love that would not disavow the impossibility of the writing of the sexual proportional relation.

Let us remark that, in the same way as in 1974 Lacan evoked the twentieth anniversary of his 'first' – the Rome conference of 1953 – our Rendezvous at Barcelona will mark the twenty years of the creation of the International of the Forums of the Lacanian Field, that is to say, of the highlighting of the clinic of jouissance and the real that traverses it. The foundation of the Forums had its origins in the questioning of the improper use of the One, and consequently of a policy inclined towards a single mode of thinking in the analytic institution. These signifiers still represent us. We shall have the opportunity of remembering it, but we shall also devote half a day to a debate on the politics/policy of the Lacanian Field today: the effects it has had; its results and this – which is not of less importance – paying attention to the particularities it has assumed in the different zones of our international ensemble. The intense political, social and ideological crises that prevail today in our world of global capitalism may be read – in part – with the powerful conceptual tools of psychoanalysis. Freud and Lacan devoted themselves significantly to the relation between psychoanalysis and politics. For us, analysts of the Lacanian field, the question concerns the politics of jouissance in its different knottings. In its entropic nature, jouissance constitutes a kind of political economy and the segregation that is intrinsic to the structure of the *parlêtre* – jouissance segregates and separates. This is not the same as racism or discrimination. Lacan said that the unconscious is politics. This means that in his consulting room the analyst works with it and with the object *a* as semblant. Outside his consulting room he may adopt any ideologico-political position, even a more or less extreme one, under the condition that it does not interfere with his listening. Today a colleague told me that an analyst had said that she would not take any patient who was a *gorilla* (a slang term that nowadays is employed to designate someone very much to the right). I think that our politics concerning the treatment of the real of segregation in the analytic institution must be subordinated to the politics of being separate while together, ill assorted disperse individuals.

THE REAL OF SCIENCE AND SEGREGATION

In quite a few places Lacan gives a warning about what could emerge from the real. In the 'Proposition' of October 1967, addressed to the analysts of the School, he refers to this matter and warns about the real of science. Fifty years have passed recently since the publication of this founding text of our principles, and we continue to be struck by the anticipatory power earlier mentioned. I quote:

[...] The real of science [...] destitutes the subject very differently in our epoch, when alone its most eminent supporters, an Oppenheimer, are infatuated by it. (7)

Today we have the neurosciences, which in their more radicalized versions discard the dimension of the subject completely and represent a powerful ally of the 'bullish' capitalist market of the pharmaceutical companies. Lacan also comments on this in the 'Proposition', where we read: 'Our future as common markets will be balanced by an increasingly hardline extension of the process of segregation' (8). In relation to the effects of universalization of science, Lacan makes out certain re-orderings of social groupings as a consequence.

Finally, Lacan refers to three 'points of exist' as a kind of projection of our horizon. This concerns what as psychoanalysts we must keep in perspective, that about which we cannot not get involved, making psychoanalysis in extension play a part, but linked to the gap of psychoanalysis in intension.

Lacan then refers, as a third incidence, that which comes from the real, and relates it to the concentration camps and segregation. He summons the psychoanalysts to take an interest in it without deviating the gaze. The real in question concerns the segregation within the analytic group and within civilization. As regards segregation, it is interesting to note that Lacan recognizes in fraternity one of its purest forms: if it is necessary to be reminded that we are brothers and sisters it is because at some point we are not so...

We must keep in our horizon the real of science and technology in our era, so as to get to know its new forms and to be able to operate on the new reals in their subjective impact through the new jouissances on offer and the proliferation of gadgets to be consumed. In *Civilization and its Discontents*, Freud expressed the view that the uncritical submission to the advances of science and technology does not automatically imply the advancement in humankind's wellbeing.

The *aggiornamento* and dialogue with the existing discourses is a task for psychoanalysis, as it is our duty not to ignore them. Science advances inexorably, although its destination is not exactly known. As Lacan points out, its effects are generally regarded as providential; that is to say: one adopts the premise that it moves in the direction of providing wellbeing to the human being. It is not a question of opposing it and claiming the benefits that could be derived from a return to the Stone Age. It is rather a question of reflecting about its effects, as Freud and Lacan did, since they transform the subjectivity of our times, and the subject must assume in their regard an ethical position, and consequently they entail an intimate judgement, a decision and an election. It is at that point that the analyst's discourse may have an impact.

Is the real that science produces the same as the real of psychoanalysis? This could be debated. At any rate, we may agree that jouissance is the real of psychoanalysis, on which we operate and intervene, producing mutations, transformations, mutating beings, inhabitants in a world that has the privilege or the misfortune of a certain condition of extraterritoriality...

REFERENCES

- (1) J. Lacan (1975). *Lettres de l'École freudienne de Paris*, 16:177-203.
- (2) J. Lacan (2007). *The Seminar, Book XVII, The Other Side of Psychoanalysis*. New York & London, Norton, p. 207.

- (3) J. Lacan (1975). Conférence de presse, 29 octobre 1974. *Lettres de l'École freudienne de Paris*, 16:2-26.
- (4) Ibid.
- (5) Ibid.
- (6) J. Lacan (1977) *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psycho-Analysis*. London, Tavistock, p. 276.
- (7) J. Lacan (1995). Proposition of 9 October 1967 on the Psychoanalyst of the School. *Analysis* 6, p. 8.
- (8) Ibid, p. 12.

Translated by Leonardo Rodríguez