

TREATMENTS OF THE BODY IN OUR TIMES AND IN PSYCHOANALYSIS

JUNE 29-
JULY 03

2022

Paseo La Plaza - CABA
Av. Corrientes 1660

Buenos Aires
Argentina

Chronic of the survival of psychoanalysis in confinement: towards the formalization of the *parlêtre*

Ricardo Rojas

Translated by Gabriela Zorzutti

Two years ago I was attempting to think, for the meeting, those practices that did not develop in the simultaneity of two human organisms, in the same atmospheric space, practices which until that time were done in silence; which reduced them to a doing without possible formalization. It seemed to be about an inconfesable heresy, venial sin in which one would't fall except for certain circumstances. At the time reflecting on the conception of the body included in the *parlêtre*, seemed important to me, for psychoanalysis and also in what theses practices were affecting the development of the cures.

Today possibly exiting the pandemic and with confinement measures farther away; with the subjective sensation that time stopped for two years, here I am again thinking the same. But there is a difference, 2 years ago there was a prejudgement bouncing in my head. I did not believe that these modifications of the *setting*, could be done, furthermore when my analysis and part of my practice, faced with the difficulty of distance between the place of residence of the analyst and that of the analyzand, had been resolved with marathons of sessions in a short lapse of time, to preserve thus the simultaneity of two human organisms, as necessary condition in the development of an analysis. My analyst did it, and in the same way, so did I. The most known analysts of my school, before demands that would emerge

in their trips, would suggest, for example: “come to Paris to continue your analysis”. So, an analysis through other means was unthinkable for some.

Confinement, as a measure to reduce contagion during the pandemic, obligated analysts to close their offices and the meetings in simultaneity. I would say there were a few responses to this situation:

As usual the apparition of the orthodox ones, taking advantage of the mental health clothing, continued seeing patients and armed themselves with Hippocratic oaths to justify the risks of their exposure.

Those who justified the obligation of tending to the “*urgencies*”, of which some modified the *setting* to be able to work through other means and, given the length of the confinement measures, decided not just to give the punctual help of the “*urgency*” but rather, in order to sustain transference, as they said, do it virtually; with the hope that the process could continue once the sanitary measures were lifted, which they expected, would not last very long.

The empiric researchers also came about, who taking advantage of the fact that the situation excluded one of the modalities of the cure, proposed to research on how viable this kind of attention is, arguing that only in the attention of cases and in their afterwards exposition the conclusion on its “*effectivity*” could be found, beyond the circumstances engendered by obligation. Yet, there a variable that wasn’t considered here: how to prove effectivity in actors who did not believe in what they were doing? Those that really thought that it was something which had been imposed, but only for some time, and that, an analysis without the simultaneity of the organisms would be impossible. From the outset, the research would be spoiled and when the obligation would end, the acknowledgement of the happiness in the reencounters would allow to conclude that this is an indispensable variable, despite the attempts at formalization done, those that fail without further ado, due to an emotional affective preference.

And, lastly, those in disposition to continue the analysis despite the non simultaneity of the bodies and to attempt to think the matter rather backwards. Something like if the “*Lacan pandemic*” would have not introduced these changes in time and space and in the

use of the couch, we would have not stopped to think which is the place of time in the sessions in analysis and that an analysis does not depend on the use of the couch. That is, the non- simultaneity of the organisms allows us to think the imaginaries with which this situation ends up invested, the myths constructed around a practice that clings to its use, and what real remains before the hole of its absence. What is causal of that simultaneity of the organisms for the development of the cure? Beginning by clarifying that the cause in psychoanalysis is not that of the scientific model, as these previously mentioned researchers pretended, those who end up foreclosing the subject of the unconscious

To me particularly, that absence made me get in touch with certain signage in the teachings of Lacan:

«(...) this is only an effect, this sort of... smell of truth in the analysis: only an effect of the fact that it does not utilize any other means other than speech”¹. «Psychoanalysis is the kingdom of speech, there is no other remedy. Freud explained that the unconscious is not so deep, it is only inaccessible to conscious deepening. And he also used to say that in this unconscious a subject inside the subject “speaks”, transcending the subject. Speech is the great force of psychoanalysis (...) Thus psychoanalysis, be it what it may the function we want to attribute to it, agent of curation, formation or search, there is only one means we use: the speech of the patient. And each word demands an answer»²

It seems that speech in relation with the saying is the most important for the development of an analysis and, this without forgetting its relations with jouissance, inasmuch as fundamental principle of it. Lacan emphasises in this point, giving speech a very precise place: *«an artifice linked to the fact that there is speech and even a saying»³ «is that analysis comes by a supposition, achieves to undo through speech what was done by speech»⁴*. And regarding the knot:

¹ Lacan J., *Seminario 21 Los no incautos yerran/Los-Nombres del Padre*, Sesión del 11-12-1973. Inédito.

² Lacan J., *Entrevista de Jacques Lacan con Emilia Granzotto para El Periódico Panorama* (en italiano), en Rome, el 21 de noviembre 1974.

³ Lacan J., *Seminario 25 El Momento de Concluir*, Sesión del 10-01-1978, Inédito.

⁴ Lacan J., *Seminario 25 El Momento de Concluir*, Sesión del 15-11-1977, Inédito.

*«To the distinction of speech that often times slides, or lets itself slide, and that our intervention regarding what the analyzand is asked to bring, that is, as we say, everything that comes to mind, which does not imply that this be only bla-bla-bla, for precisely behind there is the unconscious. And this is why the unconscious is already in what they say, if there are things that make a knot, it is that there is already a saying, if we specify that saying is what makes knots».*⁵

But two things need to be kept into account: *«Not any speech is saying, without which any speech would be an event which is not the case, without this we would not speak of empty speech!»*.⁶ And *«A step backwards is necessary so it becomes interesting: what Freud discovered is that in the most minimal act of speech there is jouissance involved»*⁷.

Many notions and concepts make us revise this circumstance: the body, the *parlêtre*, the object “*a*”, the place of the “*the preverbal*” in the cure, what do we understand by “*presence of the analyst*” and by “*libidinal investment*”, etc., that is see what limps in the theory. Affirmations as the following should make us reflect whether we follow Lacan or not in his last teaching:

*«But precisely it would be about knowing what does the presence of the analyst have to do with the presence of truth. It will be easy to demonstrate that his presence is strictly proportional to the deficit of his theory, which would recover things inasmuch as the utility of the theory: when the theory fails, it only rests to say: present! There you no longer understand anything, but there I am solidly in place. This is precisely what I do: it is inasmuch as something is wrong in the theory that see myself obliged to do this presence»*⁸

I believe that the arguments of a necessary presence tremble with this commentary of Lacan. The possibility of thinking in the simultaneity of bodies would be necessary for I don't know what “*libidinal investment of the object*”, becomes untenable if we take into account the affirmation of Lacan: *«The economy of which it is about is an economy of*

⁵ Lacan J., *Seminario 22 RSI*, Sesión del 11-02-1975, Inédito.

⁶ Lacan J., *Seminario 21 Los no incautos yerran/Los-Nombres del Padre*, Sesión del 18-12-1973. Inédito.

⁷ Lacan J., *El psicoanálisis en su referencia a la relación sexual*, Conferencia dada en el Museo de la Ciencia y de la técnica en Milán, el 3 de febrero de 1973. El texto bilingüe fue publicado en: *Lacan en Italia 1953-1978*. En *Italie Lacan*, Milán, La Salamandra, 1978, pp. 58-77.

⁸ Lacan J., «*Psicoanálisis y psicoterapia*», Intervención en el Congreso de Strasbourg de la Escuela Freudiana de Paris el 12 octubre 1968, publicado en *Lettres de L'école Freudienne* 1969 n° 6 pagina 42-48

*speech.»*⁹. «Given that it is when progressing in a textile of ambiguities, metaphors, metonymies, that Freud evokes a substance, a fluid myth that he calls libido». I want to conclude that in this time in which two *parlêtres* meet in the non simultaneity of two organisms in the same atmospheric space, my certainty is that what has happened is a «psychoanalytic work» with all its letters. We have to advance more in its formalization, which would allow to precise other fundamental notions and concepts of psychoanalysis and manner in which we capture them and put them in act, so that we are not only left saying: *Present!* On the contrary, thinking psychoanalysis is the only thing that will secure its survival.

⁹ Lacan J., Conferencia de Lacan en Londres, publicado en la Revista Argentina de Psicología, pp. 137-141, de una conferencia sostenida por Lacan en Londres, el 2 de febrero de 1975.