

## Convergencia International Colloquium 2024

### “LOVE, HATE, IGNORANCE. Challenges in the direction of cure”

#### The epoch and the social bond

##### Does everything that happens between humans involve social bonding?

Moustapha Safouan in his book “Word or death, how is a human society possible?” says: “There is nothing particularly pacifying about the symbolic order, but without that order we would have instead of war, generalized genocide. It looks like we’re going towards him”.<sup>1</sup>

An uneasiness remains open that does not cease to summon us to go round and round about this real. The human condition produces inexhaustible bleeding on the human, on the non-human. Ferocity, destruction, racism, rejection of the living over the living. It creates its own filth and writes history after the heat of a war after the war of war. Thus the field of drive holds an inexorable path. With its constant thrust, with its structural dissatisfaction, its peremptoriness.

But “without drive there is no social bond. Anchored in the body and marked by the signifier, it is our instrument for the bond with the other. It is the instrument that bordering our bodily holes constitutes the erogenous zones and as a result of that circuit we will have a “body”.<sup>2</sup>

The drive nests and encourages the social bond, every time we speak its grammar comes into play.

Now, if the Other and the other are fundamental, what does the epoch propose when it invites the subject to the belief that it is possible to walk untied from the other (from the other) in the post of a promise of *jouissance*? It is a time that calls for the promotion of freedom and a widespread and irrepressible *jouissance* that surrounds the subject to the condition of consumer deceived by an impossible promise, tarnishing life in which some judge condemns him or some executioner punishes him. If he departs from the law, he will also depart from castration and desire, from the cause of desire. In this exacerbation we are facing the coordinates of hypermodernity.

Lacan in 1969 wrote his 4 discourses, these determine the structure in which the social

---

<sup>1</sup> Mostapha Safouan: “La palabra o la muerte, ¿cómo es posible una sociedad humana”, pág 76. Ed De la Flor.

<sup>2</sup> Osvaldo Arribas y otros: “La pulsión en el lazo social”, pág. 11. 1ra edición. Buenos Aires. Ed Kliné.

bond is organized<sup>3</sup>, each of them presents a point of impossibility and a point of impotence, each discourse respects an order among its elements and in the mode of rotation of the quarter turn. The point of impossibility corresponds to the three Freudian impossibilities: impossible to govern, impossible to analyze, impossible to educate and adds a fourth Lacan, that of hysteria impossible to make desire. What does this impossible mean, that there is the not-all, an impossible is linked to the real. To the four possible combinations of the discourse and starting from one of them, the discourse of the Master that formalizes the relationship of the master of modernity, the one that demands that everything work, Lacan proposes the irruption of a new one, which he calls the pseudo-loop and denominates the Capitalist, this one that is proper to our epoch, to the point that leads us to question the survival and modalities of those previous ties. This places us in a debate, what is heard in the contemporary subject (that is: the subjectivity of the epoch)? since it produces collective phenomena and possible meanings for the subject. In what way do subject, the significant order (meaning master and know) and object come into relationship, where the subject rejects castration and there seems to be no symbolic interval between him and *jouissance*?

The totalizing vocation of the (pseudo) capitalist discourse is not free of paradoxes. As the time's imperative of *jouissance* becomes more fierce, dissatisfaction is on the rise. The era that promises unrestricted access to *jouissance* is characterized by the inability to *jouir*. The apparent liberation of all forms of sexual *jouissance* and the terrain of cyberspace as the gateway to unrestricted *jouissance* have only made the social bond sound more and more hampered.

What real rules this age? The object a as zenith in its plus dimension of *jouissance* leads the subject from the noses, via the rules of consumerism, as consumer-consumed.

What does this mean then? The question that I ask myself and share in a state of research is the following: can we think that we are dealing with a discourse that does not make a social bond? How could we sustain this?, for if we did, we would not fail to see the social effects on the subjectivity of the time, narratives of hatred, violence, wars, is this not a social bond? Is the lives screened by the “technologicalization” of the current consumer society under the aegis of a consumer imperative an outside of the social bond?

That is, is the error that capitalism promotes regarding the bond in relation to the most extreme face of the University Discourse, which would imply that we are within the social bond, or is it the rupture that impacts from liberal capitalism? How do I think this? Can the modern master (not the old master of the master speech) in his all-knowing deception take this position to the extreme? Would we be faced with the

---

<sup>3</sup> Lacan says that he prefers to speak of a speech without words, that is, words spoken in one speech acquire a meaning, but the same words spoken in another take on a different meaning. The word can be inscribed one value or another depending on the speech they are uttered.

submission of the fulfillment of knowledge to the extreme, the bureaucratization of knowledge says Lacan and then this position would be what holds the scaffolding of a libertarian or a fascist?

In this seminar “The Reverse of Psychoanalysis”<sup>4</sup> Lacan is fruitfully dedicated to working the University Discourse, he says then that the modern master of the University Discourse, is a master perverted through the tyranny of knowledge. Because it's going to situate that as long as the S2 is in the agent's place it determines a position of knowing and from there it goes to the other, place occupied by the a. Someone located in the place of knowledge addresses the other to produce their division, depriving them of the possibility of their knowledge. That is to say, as a form of organization of the social bond, the University Discourse produces both the possibility of the knowledge of academia and that of science in the position of all-knowledge, ways in which the strategy of capitalism on the social bond is produced. Therefore, to grasp the effects of capitalism on culture and on the subject, it is necessary to hold the question referred to what happens when knowledge, in its way of becoming an expert and reproducing the extension to exercise its dominance, establishes meanings through utterances without enunciation that are introduced into the proposal of a society organized according to the corporate form. So the social bond effect of the University Discourse establishes the symbolic conditions for the advent of a capitalist mode of constitution of subjectivity: subjects disposed as human capital.

The investment in the Master's Discourse that the capitalist's pseudo-discourse brings with it is not possible without the symbolic operations introduced by the totalizing discourse of the sciences and expressed in the set of changes that led to the articulation of appropriated knowledge as a commodity. When the Master Discourse was modernized in its form of University Discourse, the hegemony of Knowledge —S2 commanding the Discourse— established the symbolic coordinates that made possible the advance in the erasure of the boundaries that distinguished the spaces of culture, in this way culture is oriented to be structured as a company<sup>5</sup>. The University Discourse then functions as a symbolic framework that legitimizes the contemporary advance of the capitalist pseudo-discourse on culture, subject and subjectivity.

From where does he impose his tyranny? The tyranny of knowledge and the tyranny of *jouissance* are linked to the very fact of the rise of the a ascent to the zenith, the circularizing upheaval that sustains the government of the imperative of *jouissance*.

---

<sup>4</sup> Jacques Lacan, Seminario 17 “El reverso del Psicoanálisis”, clase del 17 de diciembre de 1969. ED Paidós.

<sup>5</sup> This idea is based on the fact that the social bond has the function of dominating the *jouissance* that generates it, while for the subject there is no reality that is not of discourse, that is the cost of entry to the social bond due to the effect of castration, castration as a loss of an *jouissance* by structure, *jouissance* first that never existed.

This pseudo-discourse in breaking the structure rotates so fast that in addition to its dangerousness it could explode, says Lacan. But will you be able to avoid encountering the real? No, but in the face of that encounter he reinvents himself, that's his cunning. The encounter with the real is a fact of structure, it is impossible not to go to the crossroads ever, opportunity to hinder or stop, at least for a moment. For, however much the epoch opaque its signs, the real as called will happen. To conclude, "castration means that it is necessary that *jouissance* must be rejected in order to be achieved on the inverted scale of the law of desire"<sup>6</sup>, this lacanian aphorism is a kick for thinking what the subversion of the discourse of the psychoanalyst supported in the a as agent, as cause of desire, implies, since the law of desire is not the same as the promotion of *jouissance*. The discourse of psychoanalysis will not be able to dispose of its orphanhood, as practitioners of psychoanalysis we hear and promote in the clinic the effects of writing castration, which it can say in its symbolic framework, while castration regulates desire. The analyst as guarantor of the hole and in its orientation to the real will wait patiently (or impatiently) for the next call. Inserted in this age perhaps we should not succumb to great despair, nor should we believe that the discourse of psychoanalysis will finally bring about the great plague. Is it not possible that being up to the times can also be up to the times so that the times do not disintegrate us? If we hold the unconscious, the lack and the symptom as our horizons through the experience of analysis, we may be able to get rid of the lights of this dark age more quickly. It is not a question of holding on to some illusion, but of believing in what one by one the experience of an analysis, the training in psychoanalysis both in the intention and in the extent, can rewrite in relation to not-everything, that's a sufficient horizon. We will not mass ourselves, which would also mean going against our praxis. Yes, perhaps it is possible to sustain the bet and the enthusiasm there where the one to one is gestated and opens up to three and some others. It is a legacy of Freud to remember that psychoanalysis is not a praxis of the individual, but of the singular and affects social bond. Impotence cannot be a destiny, we can still orient ourselves with the call for the real.

Celia Caminos

---

<sup>6</sup> Jacques Lacan, Escritos 2, "Subversión del sujeto y la dialéctica del deseo en el Inconsciente freudiano", pág. 786. Editores Siglo Veintiuno.