

## **"Crisis in the Culture"**

It took two centuries to the German language to hold the opposition between the terms civilization and culture (1) when Freud dissociated himself from the picture of referential knowledge and put it to talk. We place there the most difficult discursive pass to produce: the displacement of the university discourse to the analyst discourse, progression of the term knowledge in the *semblant's* place to the truth's place.

Now it is expressed in the only term *Kultur*, -that the German language articulates to *Bildung* relating to the building of social and cultural formations- the conceptual tension persists. We find it indicated in the disenchanting way in which Freud indicates the devastating effects of the civilizing tendency over "the culture communities".(2)

Lacan takes the topic again in Brussels, when he raises the issue if the ethics of the psychoanalysis keeps up with its times (3), and he concludes saying that his only reference is the real of the experience, *the head of the bed, where his patient talks to him.*

The analysis is a time to talk. The fundamental rule formulated by the analyst opens a field of resonance, in which the analysand, subject of the experience, is the one who has the opportunity of finding his own way of saying.

The analyst's discourse was born with the capitalism and it can be considered as its interpretation. The resistances have never been absent. At his moment, Freud objected Rank when he proposed to establish the tempo of the analysis to the "time is money" of the American dream (4). So that, he argued the reasons of the new discourse whose importance more than the words that articulate it, is given by the logic that regulates it and its effectiveness in its saying.

For Freud, we know that the social bond is founded in a resignation of the *jouissance* that we call castration. It's an operation which substracts the *jouissance* that the *parletre* gives in to live in a gregarious way, and that as impossible real, it will return as truth in the knowledge's failures.

Each social bond implies a policy of the *jouissance*, a way of dealing with that structural discomfort that, as it originates in the incompatibility between the *parletre's* sexed condition and the language field - that no civilizing project could cancel it.

Lacan resorts to the hegelian phenomenology to make of the unconscious a discourse, and of the master a significant. (5) The unconscious as a discourse, implies inter alia that it is only in what we

say otherwise, as the master is reduced to a significant, it shows the impossibility of its coating by a representative.

The ethics of the analyst's discourse recognizes the unconscious' dimension as the unique master (6). Undoubtedly, it is always the most resisted, in and outside of the analytical community.

In the *Proposition of October 9 1967*, Lacan sought to unravel the logic of the discourse conditions in which the analyst inscribes his practice. So, he was aware of the effects that the science pushes and the technological advances produce in the bond and he was also aware that these effects sprouted as critical future, specially as a way of segregation.

Some months later (7), he distinguishes the civilization by its homogeneous function and its desire to separate the rests, that considered useless. As he had predicted what could happen with his *Écrits*- that would end as consumer goods in magazine kiosks-, he also pointed out how each outbreak emerging from the singular, is crushed until it is reduced, then after it is amputated from its singularity, it is thrown to the general circulation to be reabsorbed as a rest to be recycled, this all is done by the homogeneous project.

If the civilization is "the great sewer", - process by means of which, in the name of morality, the rests are recycled and they return to the circulation by means of the human industry-, the psychoanalysis meets the subject identified to that fallen body object, to which his being and dignity is reduced. The subject "is" that rest object that in the phantom determines the desire's economy.

The analytic experience finds each one determined as divided subject by that object that Lacan called "*a*" object and respect of which each one is singular as he is alone.

At the end of the analysis, the subject will be able to recognize himself in that which he has abandoned of himself in the form of irreducible bone, in that truth of the castration of which he is incurable.

In Milan (8), Lacan wrote the torsion of the master's discourse which he called the capitalist and that finds its most extreme expression in the actual neoliberal discourse. It is not about common markets anymore, but it is about globalization and the segregation as the separation of the rests which led to the starkest elimination.

This minimal sliding of terms which separate one discourse from the other has enormous consequences both in the clinic and in collective phenomena.

We wonder about the calculable effects on subjects and bonds when the master significant hesitates or ceases to operate and the effects when – contravening the impossibility we mentioned – the master incarnates in some name or power.

What goes to the place of rest in the current discourse, which does not serve its universal purposes, represents something to eliminate: the dimension of the unconscious, the singular of the symptom and the contingent of the desire situation to which it gives expression. A policy that, as Norberto Ferreyra often says, silences and kills. -

The discourse we practise objects that policy. The field of resonance that opens, let us listen in the mistake, in the lapsus, that rest of inassimilable *jouissance* that insists on, and the enunciation of the desire which escapes from the universal discourse.

The world goes, it goes in its function of world while the analysis focuses on which it doesn't go, on the real (9).

As manifestation of the real as living beings, as what emerges from the mark of the language in the body, the symptom digs a gap in the discourse, prevailing that doesn't accept the scandal of singular position.

With the symptom the *parletre* resists to be absorbed by the world, to include the singular marks of his story in the standardization of the market.

The ethics we practise seeks to reestablish the dimension of the unconscious resending the analysand to his singularity. Only in this way, he could be aware of his determination and -by the long way around the transfer with the analyst- substract consistency to the master significant that govern him and let them fall to the production place, causing "new air" in the structure, a modification in his *jouissance* economy.-

By analysis, it's about believing in the unconscious and getting by with the symptom in life, of what is testified in the device of passing in a school.

To maintain the validity of the unconscious takes a deep political scope, not only because the prevailing discourse aims at its elimination, but fundamentally because today there are those within the psychoanalysis who propose the expiry of its dimension.

The only imprudence that has never let us down is not to trust anything but the experience of the subject (10).

Today, analysts are concerned:

-collect the effects of that experience, the one that has us as analysands, the analyses that we conduct and those that are derived from the device of the pass in a school - and transmit them, both in the analytical community and outside it.

-resist any attempt to mute the symptom with maneuvers that feed it with sense, suppress it with behavioral modification strategies or the administration of drugs that silence it.

-To return to Lacan to point out the deviations that degrade the dimension of the unconscious and widen the ranks of the neoliberal discourse devoted to the annihilation of the speaking condition of the *parletre*.

-advance in the practice of the bond that joins us that, unlike a 'community of culture' or a globalized association that gravitates around a master, creates a 'community of experience' that hosts fertile differences in a bet on the future.

To keep being there to make say, to keep the psychoanalysis going.-

*Adriana Hercman*

### **Escuela Freudiana de la Argentina**

---

(1)The book "The process of civilization" by Norbert Elias is an unavoidable reference when it comes to tracking the genealogy of the conceptual conflict between these terms, locating its actors and the singular paths with which it is expressed in the different languages. Elias, N. "*El proceso de la civilización*"; Fondo de Cultura Económica, Mexico, 1989

(2) Freud, S, "Consideraciones de actualidad sobre la guerra y la muerte", Ed Amorrortu, Tomo 14, Bs As, 1983

(3) Lacan, J. "¿El psicoanálisis es constitutivo de una ética a la medida de nuestro tiempo?, en Discurso a los católicos, Bs As, Ed Paidós, 2007

(4) "Análisis terminable e interminable", Ed Amorrortu, Tomo 23, Bs As, 1980

- (5) Lacan, J., El Seminario, Libro 17, El envés del psicoanálisis, Bs As, Ed Paidós, 1992
- (6) Salafia, A., *Lalengua*, N° 31, Publicación de la Comisión de Enlace de Buenos Aires de Convergencia
- (7) Lacan, J., “Mi enseñanza, su naturaleza y sus fines”, en *Mi enseñanza*, Bs As, Ed Paidós, 2007
- (8) Conferencia de Lacan en Milán, “Del Discurso psicoanalítico”, del 12 de mayo de 1972
- (9) Lacan, J., “La Tercera”, Bs As, Ed. Manantial, 1988
- (10) Lacan, J., “De nuestros antecedentes”, *Escritos I*, Bs AS, *Siglo XXI Editores*, 2008
-