

Autor: Pablo Vallejo – Escuela de Psicoanálisis de Tucumán

Título: La question de la responsabilité

Dispositivo: Mesas Simultáneas de Trabajos Libres

---

*Responsibility* is a term which use is growing in Social Problems studies in Argentina. It is also increasing in the Psychoanalytic group which has given it a great importance in its practice in relation to the patient's responsibility. I have begun an exploration about the ways in which that responsibility is understood by Psychoanalysis. In this paper, I am going to refer to one of them, which I discovered by working with mental health residents, especially by the practice given by the first interviews. If it has its own shades given by the beginning of its formation and by the institutional framework, it coincides with a conception that it is present beyond that residence field.

The responsibility is questioned, considering *whether the Subject is responsible or not*. This analysis criterion is presented in terms of being. In that way, it is privileged over any other criterion; in case any of those was supported just like that of establishing transference. It is inferred that it has no possibility for Psychoanalysis if he is not responsible. The analyst tries to *make* him feel responsible; to commit, involve him as the central issue in the interviews. In that way, what can be thought is endangered with what Lacan suggested in *Eighth Seminary*: "The image the analyst has of his own function" and I also add the patient's one. In this standard way, the first one's function seems to be that of treating the responsibility, to result in a *technical way*, that transcribes a moral appeal for it is suggested to be a value.

What the analyst definitely expects, is the patient to be responsible of his own will. Having proposed himself the term of *Subject*, he not only incurs in his confusions about himself, but he also leaves what he actually must think about as something obvious. Two consequences: 1- The processes and operations in which the *speaking being* takes part and of which the position of the one who asks is the result, are not considered. This means what do responsibility or irresponsibility answer for, in terms of a Topic and an Economic. 2- The time and circumstances in which an analysis takes place are not distinguished. The conditions in which the patient can make him

responsible and why he feels that are ignored. *Responsible Subject* refers, in that version, to one who fulfils the “treaty” of setting that subsumes the subject who is responsible of the Unconscious. A way of depicting this would be: he does not complain, he is involved in what is happening to him, making himself responsible of everything that happens to him like an intention. If this was obtained; because this is what is expected from him, as an answer for his existence and that can be satisfied in his Ego; there is still the question about what is the relation between that and the Psychoanalysis Discourse; since the fact, that during the analysis it can be forgotten that one tries to establish through the fundamental rule of discourse. *Talking* is different from *stating* “I say what I have just stated” (Lacan “*From one to the Other*”, p.19). It seems that for an idea of what the analyst’s ethic is, the conscience role is privileged, without an experience of divided subject has appeared.

Before this conception, we should think whether it is constituted as an attempt for solving a reef in practice, or an incidence of this age, introduced in Psychoanalysis, a kind of jurisdiction.

I have tried to find in which texts or fragments of Freud’s and Lacan’s works this conception is justified; since it not only gives the patient’s responsibility a central role, but there are also few written communications about in which way this happened.

I briefly stop here, in what has been spread as a version related to the “Beautiful Soul”. From this perspective, as an entity, it encloses now, every position in which the Subject does not include himself as an active part of his deeds, apparently, not being necessary to distinguish if this belongs to positions of hysteria, or to the ones of irresponsibility or problems during childhood times. The clinic revenue of simplification and qualification should be revised and I say qualification because we usually value the “beautiful soul” contemptuously.

When Lacan refers to it in “*Intervention about the Transference*”, as something governed by heart’s law; he reads in Dora’s Case History by Freud. The latter makes a first inversion by saying: “Take a look at your part in the disorder you complain about”. I consider this phrase the one that supported the idea of making the Subject responsible, by involving him in what is happening to himself, as a kind of technique,

that of repeating this statement to the patients. Something I read in a colleague's work, who quoting Lacan wrote "which part have *you* got?" There it appears *you*. If we revise Dora's Case History, the fragments in which Lacan refers to that and points the number of its page; we discover that Freud does not tell Dora so as a statement. That "take a look..." is from my point of view, the way in which Freud works to obtain that part, that *knowing it*, belongs to her and concerns her. It is the result of the work done. Lacan states that the concept of exposition in the case history is identical to that of the Subject's progress, in other words, the reality of healing.

Freud remarks that he proceeds to that inversion when he is in that typical situation, at the beginning of the analysis, when the patient leaves the analyst perplexed by saying that the facts he is complaining about are the way he clearly believes.

When Lacan quotes Freud, he modifies that fragment by claiming that the patient says: "facts arise from reality not from me". We can understand: the part that Dora did not see, that part that did not belong to her yet, the one where there was not "me" present. This means that responsibility is what can be the result, the effect in case there is first an experience of answering unconsciously. There the responsibility for the Supposedly Known Subject. The analyst, in his perplexity, can make his function coincide with that of the governess who wanted Dora to understand what happened (and that is what happened). This is, the responsible way in which the analyst answers and leads the absence of an answer's rubric, to what it is next to the patient; this is what Safouan once observed, called Counter Transference. Therefore, we find a new way of seeing the Beautiful Soul from the analyst's perspective.

To conclude, the introduction of this proposal in Psychoanalysis may proceed from what is very frequent in history: the promotion of Ego, under the denomination of Subject, asserted now in the ideal's consistence of being responsible.

It is possible that this conception of Subject's Responsibility, which fundaments and consequences deserved to be studied, is related to what it is verified in culture as the Promotion of the "Subject". This absolutely ignores what determines and at the same

time, not being interested in what arises from the facts and if they are not coming from him; results a social predator.