

CONGRES CONVERGENCIA MADRID JUN 2015

Vannina Micheli-Rechtman, psychanalyste membre d'Espace Analytique, Paris

What is the role of psychoanalysis in modern civilization?

What psychoanalysis still produces resistance, how it is still subversive?

1 -

The design and handling of the object in Lacanian psychoanalysis anxiety civilization.

The object is basically being involved in the analytic experience.

The object, Lacan points out in 1966, would be his only "invention". What are its implications for clinical and technical implications?

With this invention, Lacan had renewed subversion Freud's discovery of the unconscious, in the sense of an unveiling of what is involved in the structure of the speaker. But there is no information on this subject, it is unthinkable, and recalling the definition of anything borrowed from Kant, an "empty object without concept", it does not lend itself to knowledge.

Lacan defines the subject, with its status as logical or topological, as the object is missing, which is very different products or objects of civilization, which is no shortage of them, invade us, they are consumable items, disposable visible etc ...

The objects of civilization are thus respondents as the object is missing.

In radio broadcasting, when Lacan speaks of the gadget, it does not lie as an object but as a sign, a sign of boredom, the desire for something else, but he said "it says nothing about a little"

The object comes from the Lacanian conception of the subject, which as an effect of language is to be one of lack (lack of being, loss of enjoyment).

It is in a very special tie between subject and object has a "condition of complementarity" (the subject is "not without being articulated what is not language"), which is can ask the object in the civilization and social connections it establishes.

Basically, contrary to the position of some analysts, there would be no sense in my new economy psychic or subjective, but it always, ie the object, as what is lacking libido generates a seeking compensatory and obviously it is failing all compensations.

What has changed today is that objects are available for this quest, because all objects, with capitalism, liberalism, merchants are objects, even those produced by the culture, art, for example .

This view is well demonstrated already by the Pop Art, Andy Warhol with or duplication, for the series to infinity of the object, and now in contemporary art, in performance, art the ephemeral.

So the crisis of values, and today we see the global magnitude of this crisis, there is only one value: the goods.

(We would be faced with two statements, one of our civilization that says "I ask you to accept (or even buy) that I offer, because that's"

And the other statement of psychoanalysis that says, "I refuse to offer you what you ask because that's not it.")

2 -

The offer of the analyst therefore has a paradoxical character, one might say against the current values of certain today: it offers the object to its analysis, but this offer is rather to add to subtract. The art of giving the object is missing therefore requires the rejection.

"By inventing the object, Lacan has not reinvented the analysis, but it reinvented the analyst": analyst is the one to deliver the object to his analysis, failing that he would 'maintain indefinitely the transfer.

The only object that can not be lost is the missing object, which is still there even if it is hidden.

But the offer as does the analyst is therefore to reveal the ins-place for what they are, that is to say nothing of the ins-place ...

It's obviously very disturbing, very scary to see in the world today.

Hence also the very important clinical questions about how the cure to use the object, use it, to handle;

The object, "which has no idea" as Lacan says in the third, is not the object of the drive, it has no image, it has a purely logical consistency: it can approach in practice "because it is he who commands the time."

So why not take seriously Lacan's stubbornness to reject any definition of the object and always report it, not theory, but the experience itself.

Is exemplary and the hysteric, a subject that delights the lack, or a lack of passion, refusing inevitable castration, which is what makes the sign of a lack in the Other.

The "that's not" in the hysteria reminiscent of the "it's not that" of the object, but in hysteria, it is still objected to attempts to answer meaningful and pretenses offered the master. In the clinic, we find that this lack hysteric is a strong bulwark to the revelation of what the other lacks the object a.

Hence my question about the direction of the cure: how to bring an issue to mourn the subject, that is to say, to mourn something that has no representation and that 'we never had?

What is a practice guided by experience of the object? it would be a practice that is not concerned with the exhaustion of meaning, impossible, or the only nonsense, it would be a practice that meets the analysis of what does not make sense but enjoy-meaning, beyond meaning, to Beyond the fantasy, so a practice of the cut, the interpretation which aims "to take off the topic of this weight of enjoyment which he is serving."