



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

Dear Colleagues in the IF,

I am submitting to you some reflections in view of the debate on the current situation of the politics of the Lacanian field that has been planned, at the CRIF's initiative, to take place during the next international Rendezvous – marking twenty years of the IF –in the hope of opening a space for debate which others will enter.

In the course of a meeting in Paris, a colleague posed the following question: on what can we legitimately speak in the name of psychoanalysis?

It seems that our path is narrow, between two hazards, but even so, it is sure.

On the perimeter of the common politics of our democracies, debates and polemics lead to divergences that produce groups, and to open struggle that is enflamed with each decision, culminating at each election and exploding in moments of conflict. It is even the effect of democratic principle which banishes the sole One of totalitarianisms, wherever they might be, in order to make a place for multiple voices and individual rights. There, psychoanalysts are equal to other citizens; as a consequence, no unanimity can be expected for they are as diverse as them in their political choices. Thus each one has as good a reason to express himself as all the others, but none can claim to be the voice of psychoanalysis.

The School of the Lacanian Field shares the democratic principle of respect for the one by one, but the community that it constitutes is not that of the political field, rather it is its inverse. The question of the renunciation of unanimity is thus posed differently. To be clear: in the lack of a *magister* of the One, what enables us to avoid the cacophony of individualisms in competition that we see on display throughout the social

field? This is the whole problem of our orientation: psychoanalysis teaches us something that can be shared and thus, it gives us an orientation without which we find ourselves in the babel of the multiple. In principle, in a school of psychoanalysis we expect that the assumptions of the Freudian *dispositif* of analysis, and the portion of knowledge that is deposited there, will overcome particularities. In this sense, our politics “for ourselves”, as Lacan said, is a position in relation to the real – to be distinguished from the moral norms – and on the basis of this fact the psychoanalyst is an abstainer with clean hands.

This is an occasion to come back to Freud, and in a very different way, to Lacan: neither of them was mean with his opinions on the circumstances of his times, however the emphasis was not on who they were but rather, on serving analytic discourse. This is logical, for what proves to be true about the status of humans subject to language in the one by one of each psychoanalysis – we have no other universal – is no less true outside its field, where politics treats them en masse. Inversely, this is an opportunity for us to put to the test what is or is not indubitable in the teachings of psychoanalysis.

From there, from the politics of analysis taken as a compass, it is not too difficult to know about the sides taken in various situations, but that will always be on the basis of debating, in our community, what psychoanalysis teaches as indubitable on the points in question. We could, for example, say this: that we do not profess on any democracy in particular, (besides, we would not know its shortfalls) but we respect the principle, we hold to it, and we try to make it pass into act in our group at all levels – without it just being all talk. Or again: on everything that touches on the fact of the status of the subjects that he treats, the psychoanalyst can, even must, speak according to the circumstances. All social relations are included there, in the first rank of which is the family which is so much a matter of debate today. The field is thus very broad, but from where could we, as the Lacanian Field, speak on this example as on others, if it is not based on our orientation in psychoanalysis and on what it teaches us? I conclude from this that for us, social debates and the debate internal to psychoanalysis are indissociable and must go together, and that we cannot enter into the first without reference to the second.

Colette Soler, November 12, 2017
Translated by Susan Schwartz