

“If castration touches the structure as real, there are effects on malaise and alterity”

Iaci Torres Pádua
Práxis Lacaniana/Formação em Escola

I would like to express my gratitude to my colleagues, who undertook the task of organizing this gathering around the questions that summon us and move us. The vast labor necessary to bring forth an International Colloquium of Convergence is worthwhile—worthwhile, for instance, when we have access to an argument such as this year’s, Paris 2025, which propels us toward the work and the force required to produce.

Psychoanalysis persists. On Saturday, April 26th of this year, at the Colloquium of the Lacanian Field Foundation, I heard Norberto Ferreyra articulate something that propelled me back into the work I had been preparing to bring forth in this moment.

The colleagues of the Foundation were engaged with the question: “What destiny is possible for psychoanalysis?” In this debate concerning psychoanalysis’ future, I was struck by Norberto’s firm declaration: *the future is today, now*.

The argument of this Colloquium, Paris 2025, also calls upon me, by affirming the “now”, by maintaining psychoanalysis within its interrogative axis regarding its very existence: “Is there psychoanalysis?” which immediately brings forth another fundamental question: “Is there subject?”

The process of failure within the practice of structure, where the subject is nothing but an effect, sustains the practice of this structure, propelled by the being of thought in its effort to reconcile thought with itself, which leads us, as Lacan indicates, to a greater prudence in the face of the challenge formulated by truth before the real.

Such matters are well situated, precisely there, as Lacan himself posits. There is no harmony. “There is no union between man and woman without castration determining, as a phantasm, the reality of the partner where such union is impossible, and without castration entering into play within that mode of reception which establishes it as truth in the partner.” (Page 12, Seminar “*From One to the Other*”).

At this point, why does Lacan insist on the necessity of walking alongside the subject of the discourse of modern science? Because it is precisely this subject that concerns us, with its knowledge that is neither devoid of value nor efficacy.

This subject we can situate it in proximity to *il pleut*, as our grammar demonstrates, a subject that does not exist. It constitutes significations. Significations that render it more at ease. It is rain as meteorology. The signifiers that operate, and this *il*, this *hilo*, this *thread*, this subject carries its moment of detention – certainties rather than truths – within the dependence of the discourse that supports and positions it.

The movements Lacan presents at the outset of Seminar 16 insist upon the essence of psychoanalytic discourse, that is, the function of discourse. At this point, I apprehend this essence as castration in relation to structure.

The argument of the Colloquium Paris 2025 touches directly upon this point, it touches the real, the real of structure. What do we mean by castration? What do we mean by alterity? How do these elements affect the unease we experience today?

This concerns psychoanalysis and the fact that it can only address unease insofar as it situates itself as a symptom of our time, as Lacan states in this Seminar.

As the argument articulates: Just as an infant expects its mother to relieve it from the pulses that agitate it, children expect love and recognition from their parents so they may channel their drives; adolescents and young adults expect those of the other sex to enable them to sustain their sexual identifications and share in sublimations; adults expect recognition at work and within the family. We are always waiting for others to relieve us from the irreducible dissatisfaction of our desire.

When does this Other-other cease to hold the consistency that sustains the subject? Consistency that the subject misrecognizes within desire, failing to grasp it as the very lack that produces it. How do we confront such ambiguity?

It is through repetition, through the pathway of the subject-supposed-to-know, that one may articulate lack with loss, as a part detached from oneself. There is a logical necessity to the fall of the subject-supposed-to-know. Subject-supposed-to-know necessarily logic constituted at analysis.

Whose fall, within the required time, may emerge through some contingency that presents the subject between the act of saying and the said.

Through the footsteps of Freud and Lacan, the pathway through which these expectations may find their breath – a new mode of linkage in the face of the irreducible dissatisfaction of desire – lies in the dependence upon another desire: the desire at the level of the analyst's desire.

This is sustained through the discourse of the analyst, which upholds this desire—this radically new desire.

To achieve this, it is necessary to articulate the renunciation of *jouissance*, which renders explicit the function of *plus-de-jouir*—which Lacan seizes as the essence of interrogating the cause of desire.

A function that has its departure point in the discourse structured within analysis through the fundamental rule that Freud establishes: speak whatever comes to mind, without judgment.

That which surprises as well.

With this rule, the subject is suspended from speech – a speech that must be articulated, and which is not poetry – which leads the subject into the discourse of the unconscious.

In this Seminar, Lacan takes Marx from his political economy. Marx is a subject of his time, and through the symptom that surprises him by the real of his historical moment, he grasps something that coincides with the way Freud apprehends the symptom in psychoanalysis.

As Lacan says, Marx is a being of thought within the moment that determines the predominance of the labor market that causes it; and in seeking the cause of his discourse, he designates a function – an effect of capitalist discourse, an effect within the subject – the function he names *surplus value*, which Lacan also identifies as object *a*.

Marx, too, is affected by the real that encircles him.

How do we traverse, within analysis, these different articulations of renunciation of jouissance?

How do we reduce *plus-de-jouir* within these distinct relationships of desire and jouissance – such that this petit *a*, this Lacanian invention, may present itself as the term of the phantasm in the subjectivation of the subject?

2025 is the year we inhabit, and it is staggering that – as Lacan remarks – even now, surplus value operates within an abusive linkage, not taken seriously, yet detected as early as 1867.

It is logically necessary that psychoanalysis, with the radical force of Freud and Lacan's rigorous resumption, hold its place as the symptom of our times.