

**International Colloquium of Convergencia Lacanian Movement for the Freudian
Psychoanalysis
Borders: Psychoanalysis and Displacement
June 25th - 26th 2021 New York USA**

Psychoanalysis in extension and extraterritoriality

The proposal for the *International Colloquium of Convergencia Lacanian Movement for the Freudian Psychoanalysis*, in New York (USA), has stimulated an important debate among the colleagues of three Argentinian institutions: *Círculo Psicoanalítico Freudiano*, *Encuentro Clínico Laciano*. *Asociación Psicoanalítica*. *Rio de La Plata*, and *Escuela de Psicoanálisis de Tucumán*.

After reflecting on the formulation of the Colloquium's title "Borders: Psychoanalysis and Displacement", and having tracked references via emails, we found a paragraph of the proposal that mentioned that the title comes from topics discussed at General Liaison Committee -Paris 2019. On that occasion, the thematic axis revolved around an established and accepted difference between culture and civilization. Therefore, we hope that today's presentation nears the purposes that have motivated it [1].

Within Psychoanalysis, we can consider two aspects concerning borders: the borders within Psychoanalysis and those outwards. Now, let us make small clarification by mentioning some of the facts in the history of Psychoanalysis regarding its borders. Around 1902, informal meetings started in Freud's office each Wednesday; a group of young doctors met to learn, practice and spread Psychoanalysis. In 1910 the Nuremberg Congress made it necessary to formalize these meetings, thus establishing the first regulations, the first "borders" for Psychoanalysis.

This institutionalization, which could be considered a framing of a practice, coincided with a moment of expansion of Psychoanalysis. Every year several Psychoanalytical Societies were founded in different European and American cities. This growth did not develop without conflict, both internal and external. According to Freud, our practice was called "the plague"; the medical establishment felt this expansion as a threat; it was proposed that only doctors could practice psychoanalysis. These discussions occurred outside and inside the psychoanalytical movement. Here we have another form of "border" presented as a question of legality.

Moreover, there is the degree question, who authorizes the analyst? In 1926, Freud answered with the text: "The Question of Lay Analysis". Signaling the proper and the improper, Freud tries to open up, to displace the border implied by the obligation of being a doctor to practice Psychoanalysis. Could we ask if under the question, "whether lay analysis or not", was already at stake what Lacan will set out concerning the analyst's authorization? We can say that the issue of borders within the psychoanalytical movement has its history, and today, it still compels us. The boundaries or frontiers of Psychoanalysis allow us to consider its connection and differentiation with other discourses and practices. On the one hand, it may be necessary to differentiate what psychoanalysis is not; on the other hand, it is important to review how Psychoanalysis has been permeable to the discourses of philosophy and psychology. Discourses that have crossed their borders, "back and forth". Freud was interested in building bridges with other disciplines, considering that the practice of healing was not the only possibility of Psychoanalysis. We see this clearly in his work, through the research he has carried out in the analysis of painting and sculpture of Leonardo Da Vinci, in Michelangelo's Moses, or in Shakespeare's Hamlet, among many others. Questions and speculations on Freudian "Applied Psychoanalysis" from Lacan's work remain open, but these same considerations may refer to his analysis of Hamlet himself or James Joyce's work.

Although the word "border" recalls the notion of space, we should also consider time. Time as processes displaced and modified by conceptual debates throughout the history of Psychoanalysis: the question of Psychoanalysis' institutionality and the critic of the "American way of life". These debates updated psychoanalytic theory and practice, the analyst's function,

and the image (i (a)) that he makes of himself, his ideal ego, and idealization. What model of the analyst emerged back then? We are interested in borders that refer to how Psychoanalysis relates to social issues, other disciplines, and events as reality; about which can something be said or not? Hence, we refer to matters that are not those of the analytical device of the cure. However, it is in treatment that it is possible to verify societal and cultural influences.

In his Seminar on "The Ethics of Psychoanalysis", Lacan pointed out that the "American way of life" was present in the mode of consultation. Lacan also considers the question in his text, "The Situation of Psychoanalysis and the Training of Psychoanalysts in 1956", referring specifically to the analysts and the International Psychoanalytic Institution (IPA) and its subsidiaries. In his "Twenty-fourth Lecture" (from "Introductory Lecture on Psycho-Analysis"), Freud maintains that the psychoanalytic technique applies to different issues. Thus, we wonder: is there agreement on Freud's statement? Instead, there seems to be a consensus on Psychoanalysis as a practice of cure. Nevertheless, when considering other possibilities, the cautions and rejections about what is and what is not Psychoanalysis and the analyst reappear. The interest of Psychoanalysis in other discourses was not only from the beginning; those other discourses participated in the construction of Psychoanalysis, the case is the same with Psychoanalysis' partaking in political and social issues. Thus, a way of "preserving psychoanalysis" has developed as a striking renunciation for current conflictual social problems, leading to a form of indifference concerning what could correspond to Psychoanalysis in this field and what psychoanalysis could obtain conceptually and in practice. However, paradoxically, when going through the *Convergencia Act of Foundation* and the *Addendum II*, we find three points worth exploring:

First quote: "It will be just as important to offer to the analysts here assembled the possibility of constituting a political force for supporting their social registration in the various contexts where they act". Some questions arise: Does this trace a border? And if so, what would it be? Is it about the relationship between psychoanalytic discourse and other discourses?

The second quote is from the Act: "As psychoanalysts, we are committed to finding an adequate response to today's new forms of civilization's discontent". But... What does it mean to find an "adequate response" from Psychoanalysis, given that other questions arise here? Would the answer imply responding from what "psychoanalysis teaches us" about these discontents? And in any case, in what way would we approach them, and how do we "enact" them, departing from the Convergencia Institutions? The question is not hollow; it also implies the urgency of the demand, since in the Third quote, in the *Addendum II* of the *Act of Foundation*, explicitly stated that: "In case of an urgent political situation, Convergencia will respond as soon as possible". Several of the pronouncements made over the years regarding DSM IV were made ad referendum of this Act, which was voted in 2002. But if this is so, why go back to these references? Because today they are still valid, as they are matters of concern, and require permanent discussion. In our debates, we wonder: who has the answer? Us (the analysts with our own name) or the institutions, of which are members, who have the answer? Isn't it necessary for us analysts to rethink these issues within the Movement? Perhaps in our psychoanalytical institutions, we do not authentically discuss these questions. These institutions usually establish some coercive conventions that are imposed as "mandates to be upheld by their members", for example: "on what should we speak, and on what should we not!" The threat of scientific ideology is present as a limitation. There are themes in Psychoanalysis such as the Formulas of Sexuation, centered on the function of "exception", and the "Not-All", where Lacanian formalization contributes to Freudian Unconscious logic, to the rigor of mathematical logical formalization displacing the phantasmic ("pseudo-scientific and ridiculous") version of the phallic signifier as penis. This significant psychoanalytical contribution is not standardized in some places, such as in a social debate with feminist groups in charge of managing policy. There are obstacles in clarifying the desiring subject that inhabits the speaking being. These barriers prevent intervening on what medical science establishes at birth when it grants the assignment of gender. The absence of this debate necessarily sets aside mental health (hospital, health

centers, psychiatric hospitals...) to the property of medical or psychological knowledge.

The Act of the General Liaison Committee meeting in Tucumán (Argentina) in 2018 reaffirms the need for the Institutions to make these pronouncements. Although the Act is, on the one hand, clear about the questions it suggests Institutions should utter: questions on borders, frontiers, and limits of Psychoanalysis (if we use these concepts interchangeably as synonyms); on the other hand, it clashes with the political ideologies of psychoanalysts. Those political ideologies presented as "borders", "frontier", and "insurmountable limits" between psychoanalysts, invoke a dimension follows the lines of imaginary aggressiveness and love-hate [*hainamoration*], as a sign of that what was "forclosed": "what has not been allowed to be of the real"

Perhaps we psychoanalysts should seriously question ourselves about our "training", that is, about our analysis (intention), and ask ourselves: to what extent the Oedipal ideology, "symbolic facticity" (as Lacan used to call it in his "Proposition of October 9, 1967") has limited the focus of our analysis on imaginary identifications, and on the Ideal Father, fostering, without knowing it, group leadership and phenomena within psychoanalytical institutions that promote group structures constructed like the Army and the Church, where imaginary obscenity threatens work and production.

Are not these facticities, the symbolic and the imaginary, those that, according to Lacan, decisively limit "our relations with the outside, or more precisely, with our extraterritoriality"?[2] Lacan affirms in the "Proposition" that positive science and medicine are what drives petty- bourgeois family in societies, without it taking notice. Is it not in this sense that Lacan speaks about the all too real facticity of the concentration camps, in those horrific crimes against humanity, that we see emerge "the reaction of precursors to what will unfold as a consequence of the rearranging of social groupings by science and, notably, to the universalization that science introduces into them"? Lacan affirms, "The increasing extension of segregation processes will balance our future as common markets"[3].

It was concerning the idealization (central question addressed to the Subject-supposed-to-know in the transference) and the group phenomena in Institutions that Lacan articulated a "border" device, which he called a "hinge", the Cartel. He established the Cartel as a way to become involved in the Freudian School of Paris. We only want to indicate here the key formalizations that Lacan gives us as testimony in his extensive work, placing a resounding limit to the psychologization of the Unconscious, to the segregation that exists due to the *jouissances* of the Subject, that are of the real: a) the Cartel with the +1 function (empty set), which embodied or not, gives an account of the effects of the Subject, from the work and the product of the members of the Cartel. b) Another of Lacan's great inventions (apart from *object a*): the Discourse of the Analyst, of the University, of the Master and of the Hysteric. The Discourse of the Analyst that new mode of social bond that he invented to address that "impossible to say and write that is the real", "There is no sexual relation". It made it possible for psychoanalysis to find a place in logical-mathematical science, outside the symbolic-imaginary, where only signifiers and significances are produced. From here also, the "impossibility of the real" is approached from Topology and the Knots theory, from the "Not-all", from the formulas of Sexuation and the *Sinthome*. Lacan will say in his Seminar 20 "Encore" (1972-73), concerning the Freudian text "Civilization and Its Discontents", that the discontents to which Freud refers, is that "The truth sought is the one that unavowable concerns the law that regulates *jouissance*" [4].

[1] Questions about psychoanalysis, its limits, and the possibilities of extension on the current problems of society

[2] Lacan, J. "Proposition of 9 October 1967 on the Psychoanalyst of the School"

[3] Ibid.

[4] Lacan, J. (1999) *Encore: The Seminar of Jacques Lacan: Book XX*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, pp. 92

Bibliographic references:

Freud:

Freud, S. "Introductory Lectures on Psycho-Analysis" In *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, Volume XVI (1916-1917)*, London: The Hoggarth Press
Freud, S. "The Question of Lay Analysis" In *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, Volume XX (1925-1926)*, London: The Hoggarth Press
Lacan, J. "The Situation of Psychoanalysis and the Training of Psychoanalysts in 1956" in *Écrits*, New York, London: W.W. Norton & Company

Lacan:

Lacan, J. *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan: The Ethics Of Psychoanalysis. Book VII*, New York: Norton & Co.
Lacan, J. "Proposal of 9th October 1967 on the psychoanalyst of the School"
Lacan, J. "The Act of Foundation of the École freudienne de Paris (1964)"
Lacan, J. "Television : 31st January 1974"
Lacan, J. "Radiophonie: recorded on 8th April 1970"
Lacan, J. *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan. Book XX: Encore 1972-1973, On feminine sexuality, the limits of love and knowledge*, New York: W.W. Norton & Co

Other texts:

Act of Foundation of Convergencia Lacanian Movement for the Freudian Psychoanalysis
Act of the General Liaison Committee meeting, Tucumán, 2018
Act of the General Liaison Committee meeting, Paris, 2019
Questions about psychoanalysis, its limits, and the possibilities of extension on the current problems of society

The writing of the present text was carried out by Guillermo Ferreiro (Círculo Psicoanalítico Freudiano), and it is the product of the following sources:

1.-Six meetings in which participated the following analysts:

Jorge Risso (CPF), Carolina Fábrega Solsona (CPF), Marcela Ospital (CPF), Guillermo Ferreiro (CPF), Cecilia Domijan (ECLAP), Milva Fina (ECLAP), Liliana Chiappini (ECLAP), Pablo Vallejo (EPT), Elsitá Nader (EPT), Virna Correa (EPT), and Mariano Paz (EPT).

2.-Texts and notes by :

Milva Fina(ECLAP), Liliana Chiappini (ECLAP), Virna Correa(EPT), Pablo Vallejo(EPT), Elsitá Nader(EPT), and Guillermo Ferreiro(CPF)