



Xth Meeting of the International Forums
VI th International Forum of the School
of Psychoanalysis of the Forum of the Lacanian Field IFEPFL

BARCELONA 13/16 September 2018

Whats at stake

Preliminary text 6 - VIth International Meeting of the School Barcelona, September 13th, 2018.

Sandra Berta¹

If we suppose the moebian to that of the Psychoanalyst which operates in practice, we will have to check the cutting of the stripe. If we suppose the knot, the cutting may demonstrate the absence of relation between Symbolic, Imaginary and Real.

Lacan in 1974, together with Isaac Newton, regreted that this assumption would tell us: *I hypotheses non finger²*. The disavowal of the hypothesis being what is convenient for us to be incautious of the real. Consequence arrived by the experience, which indicates that the imaginary is stupid, the symbolic weak and both must be knoted to a real (impossible) if it is intended to make any change in the *jouissance* field.

Through misconception it is possible that we ascertain that joy is horror as well. In other words, that the joy that is produced by our work is the horror of knowledge that we overcome when affected by the real of the practice. An analyst, in its *operating* is oriented in the ambition of the real.

In the preliminary paper written to the International Meeting, Frdric Pellion³ warned us about this paradox imprinted in joy.

Lacan said that in 1977, betting on the equivoque referring to the unconscious structured as language (from Freud) and added his proposal (Lacans) of the real

¹ AME OF EPFCL, FCL-So Paulo, Brasil. Member of International College of de Guarantee (2016-2018).

² LACAN, J. (1974). *The Seminar, book 22: RSI*, unpublished (Lesson of December 17, 1974).

³ PELLION, F. Note about joy. In: Preliminary papers. X International Meeting of the Forums VI th International Meeting of the School (IF-EPFCL), Barcelona, 13-16 September, 2018 (available at: <http://xcita-if-epfcl.barcelona/pretextos-pr.html>).

unconscious and the knowledge in the real. I quote him in Closure of the Journeys of the Freudian School of Paris⁴:

It is an anti-freud (affreud) being that imagined this. After what has he imagined this unconscious to which he attributes a certain number of formations? It is not comfortable to imagine but nevertheless, the ortog must play a certain role there. What Freud said, the affreud, is that there is no su-je there. Nothing supports the su-je⁵. In other words, the jeu⁶ of the I (je) replaces what I try to enunciate today - the baffouille- -je⁷.

It is through this babbling that the *affreud* sieves in joy [*Freude*] and in the horrifying [*affreux*] of this business [*affaire*] that is the real unconscious or the speculation through which I tried to provide support to Freud, the horrifying [*affreux*] Freud; does not have any kind of sense.⁸ I add: this business [*affaire*] between joy and horror that concerns us; which we have to deal with [*faire*] in that which it shakes itself [*s affaire*].

In 1977, when Lacan had already done the modal jump to the nodal, he said that sense, in the real of the practice, doesn't depend only on *linguisteria* which is ours, but also depends on the vector to the real. In this ambition for the real, we can be persuaded that the *effect of sense* is produced by the evacuation of sense. What Psychoanalytical practice indicates is: there is no sexual relation/proportion.

Concerning the real, in 1969, what is at stake is the object *a* and, in 1977, the stuttering-stammering-hesitation. This doesn't take out the value of the object: cause of desire, surplus-*jouissance*, *abject*, *boneobject* (*abjeto*, *ossobjeto*) that keeps operating on the restriction [*coin age*] of the *jouissance* fields.

The bond (to be considered in the analysts discourse and on the histeric one) may produce this paradoxal allergy (joy and horror) modal and nodal. This *affaire* is a responsibility to those who bet in making ex-sist a school oriented by the cause of the real.

It is possible that the paradoxal joy is linked (knotted) to the enthusiasm it is not for all, but for some when they know how to make it there with the fate that the unconscious has in store for us having circumscribed the cause of the horror - his own -

⁴ Lacan, J. Closing Journeys of the Freudian School of Paris, September 25th, 1977 Unpublished+.

⁵ Su-je homophonous with sujet (subject) known (su)-je (je) literally.

⁶ Jeu: game. We chose to leave it in French in order to maintain the homophony with je.

⁷ *Baffouille- -je* homofonic pun of *bafouillage*, or either stuttering-stammering-hesitation.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

detached of all horror of knowledge⁹ Joy may also link with the satisfaction of the end: the other satisfaction with which the speaking being, for being affected by *lalangue*, builds itself from the enigma of the Other in its alterity.

As Collette Soler tells us, there is a contingency that introduces itself between the structure and its effects.¹⁰ The structure being the borromean, it falls on the articulations of the *jouissance* in the body and in the unknown knowledge of the subject. The ethical contingency may in good times [*bonheur*], make joy a permanent question that doesn't discard happiness, but questions it: What kind of joy we find in that which constitutes our work?¹¹

Bonds of work that count with the non-relation/proportion should take into account this ethical contingency: what is at stake.

Translation: Maria Celia Delgado de Carvalho

⁹ LACAN, J. (1964). Italian note. In: *Other writings*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 2003, p. 313.

¹⁰ Soler, C. *The lacanian affects*. Buenos Aires: Letra Viva, 2009, p. 16.

¹¹ LACAN, J. (1967). Speech about the psychosis of the child. In: *Other writings*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 2003, p. 367.