

Love, hatred and ignorance¹

Ana Virginia Nion Rizzi²

To celebrate the International Convergence Colloquium, organized by Ceba, the argument Love, Hatred, and Ignorance takes us back to a crucial, current issue in the context of the involvement of psychoanalytic institutions in the polis. Psychoanalysis has suffered greater permeability from the harmful effects of other non-analytical discourses. This implies that the analytical discourse draws from the wellsprings of others, but the interesting thing is that it can bring it back to "its mill". Analytical discourse can move into different fields, but the blurring of the difference could perhaps evoke a fall, or an expulsion from our own field.

The exacerbation of affections by social readings has consequences, which deserve to be revisited. However, this does not imply that the passions should be liquidated, as we grapple with them daily in our clinic.

It is worth paying attention to the fact that "[...] the subjectivity of his time is reached on his horizon". (Lacan, 1953/1998, p. 322 [our own translation]) and make the necessary distinction that this Lacanian statement is not synonymous with identification, much less being permeable and sensitive to any and all demands of the "actuality of the time", and if we do not respond "sensitively", it could seem that we are treading in ignorance.

Operating out of love rather than through the analytical discourse can lead to a continuation of other discourses that debilitate psychoanalysis. Love, understood as the eros drive, where it is added to, intertwined, and incorporated, can show its deadly face.

With the incorporation, in the continuity of borders, discourses are homogenized, giving the false impression of responding differently to this moment that some call "new", "current". This "new and current", which is spoken of, can have the effect of extinguishing the symbolic marks that gave the discourse an identification or identity. Thinking about remaking the knot or being able to stop at what we are talking about when we refer to fundamental concepts, does not imply expulsion or incorporation, it

¹ Text presented at the International Convergence Colloquium: Lacanian Movement for Freudian Psychoanalysis "Love, hatred, ignorance". Buenos Aires 2024.

² Psychoanalyst, Member of Maiêutica Florianópolis-Psychoanalytic Institution.

implies recognizing that we are inside because the matter that constitutes analytical knowledge is made of the same clay, the same *motes*, the same *matter*.

Love, hatred and ignorance allow us to work on certain avatars and developments that we would like to consider from the Maieutic in order to think about the limits of intrusion and the consequences of entering discourses other than psychoanalysis: sociological or philosophical discourses, political discourses, at the price of abandoning psychoanalysis.

When I talk about intrusion, I am not pointing to what cannot be done, I am pointing to trying to rename. It is not an aseptic idea, brought over from Nazism, of separating to the point of exterminating what is different. It is about being able to think, to signify, to give names and to be able to tie the knot again, that is, to be able to call psychoanalysis into question. To question is to say that there is an object and a target. Between one and the other it is impossible to articulate them:

"This is the effect that casts a shadow over the practice of psychoanalysis - the end, the object, the very target of which become inarticulable after at least half a century of continuous experience." (Lacan, 1968, p. 6 [our own translation]) This relationship implies a beneficial tension in order to continue producing. Analytic praxis will fail, although it may seem a pessimistic view at first glance, it implies that it will always be able to cause itself again because there is always a remainder.

I stopped myself so that I could once again review, talk about and discuss what we are talking about when we put forward the signifiers that have been praised since the pandemic: organizations, movements, actions, activism that promote ways in which psychoanalysis can reach the most socially vulnerable groups.

Psychoanalysis is not outside the world, it is in the filth of relationships with peers too.

"What works is the world. The real thing is what does not work. The world goes round and round in circles, that's its function as a world. To realize that there is no world, that is, that there are things that only imbeciles believe in the world, it is enough to observe that there are things that make the world filthy, if I may put it that way. That's what analysts are concerned with, so that, contrary to popular belief, they are much more confronted with reality than scientists themselves. (Lacan, The Triumph of Religion, p. 63 [our own translation])

This is also where an institution is set up, but not with an aseptic and exclusionary bias, I am referring to the limits of psychoanalysis in its transmission function. The

limits are put to the test, that is, to be able to know if we are within a psychoanalytic discourse, we have to ask ourselves this question. Putting it into question seems to me to mean taking a risk and being able to "read" the points of tension and stop the exacerbation of affections in order to try to redo what causes psychoanalysis in the supposedly analytical institution.

Institutional crossroads, this is a bet to tangent and witness failure. The failure of mismatch, the failure of malaise, the failure that we need to identify. The emergence of movements with a militant character where affections are manifested in a way that does little to promote psychoanalytic discourse and praxis. That militancy happens in a university setting is to be expected, but in a setting where analytical practice is worked on is another matter. What can we say about an institution that claims to be analytical, declaring itself partisan and not allowing room for differences? Is there not a risk of losing psychoanalysis? Psychoanalysis is a practice that meets the real, and it is essential to sustain it. When there is a prevalence of imaginary salvationist ideas about the world, psychoanalysis itself is put in check. If we were to take this approach, we would be giving greater importance to the symbolic and imaginary registers, not considering the real as proposed by the last Lacan when he refers to the IHR, the heresy, the emphasis on the Real.

To sustain the discourse of the unconscious in the institution is to provide support for the analyst's training. To be able to tie the knot, to make something exist that cuts through what insists from hate-love. To work from the Real, where it is ordered and knotted, is to keep the flame alive in order to continue working.

Being talked about badly is worth it, the Jews have always been talked about badly, because they are not nice (Lacan, 1975), putting things back in their place implies doing justice to the incest ban, a hole in the symbolic that is structural. Moreover, "the incest ban spreads. It spreads to the side of castration" (Lacan 1974/1975, p.64 [our own translation]). In other words, the structural effects that psychoanalysis works with imply that there is no sexual relationship as a point where there is no connection. This notion must be preserved and sustained because it is what will give consistency to the other registers. Relying on the idea that psychoanalysis is no different from other practices is synonymous with bypassing the interdiction. I say this because it's as if it is a question of making a continuum with the models that are supposed to buffer the lack, equipped with imaginary subterfuges such as those of assistance,

which thus offer what is lacking to the other; we can incur in entering the blurring of the difference that is for nothing, without consequences. The consequences of what we do involve relaunching and naming, giving names, because at first, we do not know; on the other hand, we maintain something of fundamental importance, which is not to mix supposed knowledge with something that is imagined to be reparative. Maintaining the tension, the conflict of the remains as an operation to relaunch again.

In the seminar "The non - fools wander" (Lacan, 1973-1974), he says that we must stop at making the braid, which is not three, but that the thirdness, the Real is what ties the other two together, [... it is not three, but it makes the braid] (p. 95). You must make mistakes to make the knot and know what we are talking about when we have an analytical praxis. The invitation to make the braid is that we can go on making the necessary combinations until we make the knot, at first, we do not know what letter each strand has, in other words, when we ask ourselves about "current" signifiers, which strand of the braid are we on?

Quoting Harari (2009, p. 27 [our own translation]) who points out that "...the Other is epochal, we can understand not only the invariance of the structure, but also the variability within the structure. In other words, the structure can change its combinations, but not its combinatorics."

Psychoanalysis is not about doing good; it is about saying good. Exchanging one with the other, while a mistake for the naive or those who are far from it, was a destiny with the argument of reaching the subjectivity of its time.

To focus on the guiding or fundamental principles is to speak and think together with other peers. An institution is a space among others. Authorization takes place among some of these others. To be able to authorize oneself to innovate, and to be able to create acts, but directed within the analytical community, if you can call it that.

Questions arise as to how psychoanalysis will respond to the new times. As unfinished knowledge, psychoanalysis needs to position itself to distinguish fields. Fields are not territories. The field is language, as Lacan points out in "Function and Field of Speech and Language" (1953 [our own translation]).

Territory³ is an imaginary place where the marginalized population is located. There have been attempts to get psychoanalysis into these spaces. This does not mean that we can't create ways of making psychoanalytic care demanded, the point is that if we work with contours defined by psychosocial categories, we escape the field of psychoanalysis. We're in a sociological field or, as is often the case, a philosophical one.

Furthermore, making attributions that the greatest suffering comes from certain social strata or classes, trying to get psychoanalysis to reach certain spaces, can lead psychoanalysts to invert the demand and make inferences that distance themselves from the ethics of psychoanalysis.

The disconnected affections, love, hatred, and ignorance in the psychoanalytic institution, exacerbated by the upsurge in social injustices during and after the pandemic, from those who were on the margins, became even more distant. There have been responses to confront this situation of vulnerability, with actions that denounce it, proposing actions. In this sense, the psychoanalytic institution runs the risk of taking on the face of an entity and becoming sensitized to those affected.

Taking care of a flaw, that is, recognizing that psychoanalysis is not enough for everyone and creating devices where we take care of what we produce, is different from dressing up the institution as a social vigilante. Obscure signifiers have emerged that leave the analytical field out, including the signifier "territories".

Assuming that those who suffer the most are the ones who enjoy it the most, and that psychoanalysis must therefore go to them to settle a debt, seems like a terrible mistake from the outset. Delimiting territories is one thing, leaving the analytical field is another. Betting on maintaining the tension necessary for the field to continue to be the cause, the linguistic cause.

3 It refers to circumscribing people who have the same identity.

Bibliografia

Harari, R. Constelações do Pai. In: Revista Clinamen. Revista de Psicanálise. Publicação de Maiêutica Florianópolis – Instituição Psicanalítica – Vol. 4. Gráfica: Nova Letra. 2009.

Lacan, J. (1953) Função e Campo da fala e da linguagem. *In* Escritos. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 1998.

Lacan, J. (1975-1975) O Seminário.22 R. S. I. *In* facebook.com/lacanempdf.

Lacan, J. (1901 - 1981) O Triunfo da Religião precedido de Discurso aos Católicos. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar Editor. 2005

Lacan, J. (1973-1974). Os não-tolos vagueiam. Publicação não comercial. Salvador, Bahia. Espaço Moebius. 2016.

Lacan, J. (1967) Proposição de 9 de Outubro sobre o psicanalista da École. *In* Traço Freudiano Veredas Lacanianas Escola de Psicanálise. Edição Bilingue, Recife: 2001.