

Colloquium of Convergence. Paris, May 15-17, 2025

Malaise, Castration, Alterity

The Real of Our Clinic

We can consider that the theme proposed in the call: Malaise, Castration, Alterity, is a syntagm that leads us to the core of our clinical practice.

Indeed, it is from discontent that psychoanalysis and its practice emerge. Psychoanalysis responds to this symptom that we read as discontent. Symptom, inhibition, anxiety, have their anchorage in the Real and hinder the subject's progress on the path of sustaining their desire. This is what the analyst encounters, each time in their practice.

How does this discontent manifest in our time, in culture, which Freud situated at the level of structure, as limits that, as humans, make us human, the *parl'êtres*? Malaise that is "where our experience proceeds from", we read in La troisième. Both Freud and Lacan produced their interrogations from modern science. As Lacan shows well, with Galileo, on the one hand, and with Descartes who, from "I doubt, therefore I think, therefore I am", made possible the emergence of psychoanalysis as it emerges from the singularity of the subject, as subject of the unconscious.

The emergence of psychoanalysis is a symptom in relation to the science of the time. But still, is psychoanalysis a symptom? If Lacan insists on this interrogation, can we sustain it today? R.S.I will be what guides the path of analysis, knotted, being the central hole, the place of that object *a* that sustains in the lunules, the different jouissances: of the Other, phallic, of meaning, provided that castration functions, which implies these holes in each register.

The nodal articulation that Lacan advances, R.S.I situates that the subject is this knotting, and as we know, it is a knot linked according to a very precise logic: on the one hand, that the threads do not penetrate each other, and on the other hand, if a thread is cut, this knotting unravels. But he emphasizes that this is the structure of the subject, that the *parl'être* is RSI. Real, Symbolic, Imaginary, knotted.

Something in the Real - and not just anything: life itself -, structures itself with a knot, Lacan will say in *La troisième*. Subject that enjoys as a remainder of what is not possible to symbolize, and on the other hand an Imaginary, where Lacan situates the body, Imaginary that puts to sleep, but also puts a veil, so necessary to sustain this nodal equivalence RSI. These formulations have consequences on the analyst's interventions.

As we know, the one who comes to the analyst is not the only one who pays with their difficulties, with their symptoms, with their *jouissance*. The analyst also pays in the course of treatment. With words, with their interventions, producing an effect of interpretation, that is, interventions from the Symbolic; but also interventions from the Imaginary, provided that they aim at producing an act of the analyst, and from the Real, insofar as their person supports the transference, operating in the place of the Subject supposed to Know.

Let's take up again that 1930 text where Freud interrogates and poses the limits with which the *parl'être* finds itself and what remedies it has at its disposal to face them. Let's see its validity.

How do these *parl'êtres* manifest, the end and purpose of their life - Freud will say - is to achieve "happiness" according to the program of the pleasure principle, but the death drive comes to pose its limits as unattainable: that "beyond" that we call *jouissance*.

Thus, this program enters into question both in the microcosm and in the macrocosm. Hence, we can speak of the subject's discontent in culture, since our constitution limits our possibilities of happiness, Freud will say, that is, the very structure of the subject. Subject that is threatened from its own body, where pain and anxiety manifest as alarms; from the external world - we know its destructive forces - and from the bond with others, suffering that we feel as the most painful, Freud will say.

This is a Real that we face not without its necessary knotting. The Real puts itself in cross to prevent things from going well. It's the pain of existing. But accepting these limits propitiates that different paths are tried to channel them. And we already speak of the function of the cause. Let's recall that object *a* in the place of the hole bordered by RSI.

What are these possible paths and with what resources do we count to respond to these limits? Different paths, some extreme, the sought solitude, to protect oneself from others, and others better that imply being in a community: from science submitting nature to human will. The most interesting, Freud will say, are those that seek to influence the body. The chemical influence of intoxicating substances, drugs, alcohol, which determine its dangerous and harmful character, the series of addictions, in their effort to plug the holes of the Real.

Following the destinies of the drives, we also locate sublimation, art, professional work, when it is freely chosen. We cannot help but consider the validity of these paths. Taking into account the call, we can make use of discourses since it is a matter of social bond and insofar as this Real with which we find ourselves, the deviation of the Master's discourse, which is the Capitalist Discourse, as Lacan calls it.

*What does science provide us, after all? ...It provides us with something that for most people, even those present here, is reduced to gadgets.* Although Lacan continues to insist that there are four discourses: Master, University, Hysteric, and Analyst, he also reads that there is a rupture of the ordered pair S1, S2, so that S1 does not emit castration to S2 and the S under the bar, which is like an agent, is a consumer, whose product is precisely objects of consumption, gadgets. There is no desiring subject. The fantasy is disarticulated. Discourse of capitalism, which in this time is dominant. Calling it discourse is perhaps an excess.

What distinguishes this 'discourse' is the *Verwerfung*, the rejection of all fields of the symbolic, and this has as a consequence the rejection of castration. Any order that is similar to the 'discourse' of capitalism leaves aside *the things of love*. How to face the subject's discontent, in the bond with others, which implies this alterity with the Other constituting and the other similar, necessary, if love as a veil of castration is rejected?

Difficulty that we hear in our practice, trying to put into question this enjoying subject, jouissance that is accentuated with social networks, making

room, as much as possible, through the deployment of speech that the rejected enters into discourse, constitutes itself as an enigma and makes of these *gadgets* a symptom, as Lacan will say, to limit this jouissance and that something of desire can be articulated.

Susana Splendiani

Escuela de Psicoanálisis Sigmund Freud-Rosario. Argentina