



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

FROM GAYA SCIENCE TO JOY¹

BY CLARA CECILIA MESA

“What joy do we find in that which constitutes our work?”²

What does Lacan refer to? what joie, what joy is Lacan talking about?

An important question because there have not been few affects that Lacan used to refer to the act known to the analyst: sublimation, as the only possible satisfaction at the end of the analysis in Seminar VII; depression at the end of the analysis in the Proposition of the Pass in 67; the satisfaction of the end in the Preface to the English edition of seminar 11; or the enthusiasm of the Note to the Italians, among others.

To get a little closer to this question, I refer to the place from which it starts: the “Address on child psychosis. In it, the question about the joy was not alone, but posed in a correlative manner with sadness, "a sadness motivated by a contained

¹Translated by Natalia Bulla, reviewed by Clara Cecilia Mesa.

² Lacan, Address on child psychosis from October 22, 1967. In Other Writings. In Spanish: Paidós Editorial, Buenos Aires, 2012. Page. 389. Text not established in English. Compare with French version or Spanish translation, or, for English see the link:
<file:///C:/Users/clara/Downloads/19671027%20Lacan%20Child.PDF>

joy until summoning the feeling of incompleteness where it should logically be located"³ and in the context of an ethic: The ethic in which the subject is constituted, "so as not to run the risk of forgetting that in the field of our function, in its principle, there is an ethic"⁴

This ethic of joy seems closer to the Spinozian ethic than to the tragic dimension of Antigone. Lacan has gone from the tragic dimension of desire to joy.

In Spinoza, the joy is the affect that leads to change from a state of less perfection to one of greater perfection, which means two things: first, for him, "perfection and reality⁵ are one and the same", maybe we should not force things to say that in Spinoza as in Lacan, nothing is missing on the Real, the Real is what is and it cannot be any other way; consequently, second: Joy is what leads to persevere in being, his particular way of expressing the "become what you are". It opposes to any aspiration to an ideal perfection, the aspiration of "those who prefer to dream with their eyes open" or to live with their eyes closed. (Clamor of humanity!)

So, Lacan refers to *gai savoir*? The joyful knowledge that opposes moral cowardice, as a sad passion of those who do not want to know? We know that this knowledge is linked to the "enjoyment for deciphering the unconscious". This is undoubtedly a vital movement of the analyst's action, from cowardly sadness to the joy of searching in the unconscious for *varieté* that, as truth and variety, deciphers the singularity of a truth that the subject does not want to know. But is it enough? Does this enjoyment of decipherment not leave the analyst in the position of the music lover, in Bousseyroux words, numbed himself in the “mélodit”?

³ Ibid Page 391

⁴ Ibid. Page 384

⁵ I refer to the notion of reality in Spinoza, which can only be known by the third genre of knowledge. The other, for him, is mutilated and deceptive.

Therefore, that joy counts, but it's not enough, is there another? The reference can evoke a satisfaction ...

Lacan hopes that the sadness is not on the side of the analyst who has proven by his own analysis that to enjoying decipherment has no other purpose than the escape of sense / flight of meaning.

A displacement then, towards another satisfaction, a satisfaction that is not deceived by the lying truth.

It is a change of perspective, there is an essential way and it implies the Real expressed in his *Address* under the formulas of "*being-for-the sex*" and *castration*: joy or sadness are defined then, by the possibility that analysts have to be able to face their task in front of them. Thus, Lacan questions the analysts:

"Are we nevertheless at the level of what we seem to be, by Freudian subversion, called to sustain, namely, being-for-the- sex? We do not seem brave enough to sustain that position, Not joyful enough either.

Which, I think, proves that we are not yet fully ready. And we are not on the basis that psychoanalysts say too well to endure knowing it, and that thanks to Freud they designate as castration: the -being- for-the-sex"⁶

It is clear that the question that Lacan addresses to analysts, is a kind of "undead analysts, go letter! (lettre suit!)"⁷, are we up to our task or not? It is from this reissue of Lacan's call to analysts that we propose to question the guarantees of our School and its response to discourses.

⁶ Ibidem, pág. 385

⁷ Lacan, The Third ("La Tercera", title of a conference; in French is "La Troisième")

Here are the questions that encourage the debates for the VI International Encounter of the School.⁸

- What, in our function as a School, pertains to each of the discourses?
- How do we control our processes of selection and guarantee in the School?
- How do we situate them in the order of discourses, it being understood that none go without the other three with which it closes the orderly round of desire?
- How does the fifth discourse, that of capitalism, intervene there when it undoes this round in order to impose itself alone?
- How can psychoanalysis offer to treat the impasses of the subject if contemporary discourse is sustained by not allowing it in?
- Between monastic retreat, with its threat of fragmentation, and imposture destined for collective retaliation, what strategies can be adopted to keep the reconquest of the Freudian and Lacanian fields alive?

⁸ Marc Strauss. *The School and the Discourses*. “What joy do we find in that which constitutes our work? VIth E Scholl Presentation, Barcelona 2018 in: Wunsch 17