

Escuela Freudiana de Buenos Aires

“The Subject to Be Safeguarded”

In 1936 in Mariánské Lezen/ Marienbad, Lacan poses- as a key to the revolution of the method that Freud creates- his submission to the real. Freud, when encountering the impossible, not only does he not surrender but he conceptualizes the unconscious by taking it to the limit.

Now then, debtors of his legacy, of his know-how when the real undertakes its mark, each analyst is forced -as Lacan liked to say- to reinvent psychoanalysis, to extract from it a theorization that makes it transmissible in the extension of psychoanalysis.

It is in this excerpt that I will stop to share with you some insights.

If early in his teaching Lacan needs to let the constituent alterity be posed, which crowns the invention of the object “a”, it is because the subject, in this place, is sheltered when the structure puts into action the relationship to the Other and the others.

Established as an original matrix of a collective logic, it is articulated that way what the bond verifies: there is always something “inadequate” in the relationship of One to the Other because it is about a ternary articulation. Between two, there is always one and the “a” and in no case it can be taken for “a One”¹.

It is there where the root of the ungraspable of the being that inhabits us lies.

It is impossible to disregard what Freud had already anticipated in 1920: the collective is nothing without the subject of the individual². This is what the maxim anticipatory of the writing says, in which all discourse is suspended, by formalising what is governed for the social bond.

In the last years of his prolific work Freud writes “Civilization and its discontents”³ (1930), where he poses fundamental questions about psychoanalysis and the collective, the ones which Lacan will later take up in his Seminar⁴. There he mentions a central thesis around which its whole development revolves, the one of suffering that threatens us in three highly sensitive places for human life: the body itself and its decay, the outer world with its omnipotent and destructive force and the relationships with the other human beings. Because, once the death drive was introduced in 1920, nothing, neither religion nor narcosis will be able to avoid the encounter with what the afterlife brings due to the unavoidable instance of the

¹ Lacan, J: Seminar XX. Fragment of the class on 1-16-73. Transl. Carlos Ruiz. RRPonte Library. EFBA

² Lacan, J: “Logical time and the assertion of anticipated certainty”. Writings I-Siglo XXI Publishers.

³ Freud, S: “Civilization and its discontents”. Volume III- Biblioteca Nueva Publisher. Madrid.

⁴ Lacan, J: Seminar VII: “The Ethics of Psychoanalysis”. Paidós Publisher.

automatism of repetition. Facing the impossibility of full satisfaction, man will keep encountering insufficiency that any resource presents.

Freud approaches the feeling of guilt and its unconscious relationship in the culture progress with the cultural super ego, which derives discontent. Ethics, which derives from it, is summarized in the ideals that, erected as norms, rise as demands at the most vulnerable point of any culture. Among its consequences, the commandment “thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself” stands out as unachievable, although religion, inciting its pursuits, abounds in promises and benefits, thus fertilizing the future of an illusion.

At the end, Freud sows a certain scepticism about whether in the future of cultural development will be able to cope with the unleashed disturbances of aggression and self-destruction instinct, since he denounces that extermination could reach such a point that would end with the last man, leaving for Eros the enigma of the resolution of such an outcome.

When Lacan takes up again in his Seminar⁵ fundamental questions of the Freudian text, he produces a decisive turn.

The indelible relationship of love to the father and fraternal rivalry, which derives in the commandment of love for one’s neighbour, places at the centre of the scene what the little other carries in its intimate reality: “the *nebenmensch*”, an astonishing rebout that makes arise the marginal and the similar, the separation and the identity. From there, the recreation of imaginary trap that the specular will place in the encounter with the similar until it touches the “*das Ding*”, a foreign element which is presented, in its intimacy, as the absolute Other of the subject. It is about a primordial emergence regarding the stranger, in which the paranoid does not believe, and which carries the imminence of joy.

Lacan reads in “Civilization and its discontent” that *jouissance* is an evil and it is so because it entails the evil of the neighbor; as it also entails the beyond of the pleasure principle, the death drive introduces the *jouissance* inherent to the bond itself.

Thus, the neighbor’s *jouissance* poses us the real problem of love.

Finally, we come to the question for psychoanalysis and the analyst’s place. Following the trail that Freud traced, leaving the way out to Eros, Lacan knew how to indicate the paradox of evil in the *jouissance* that every relationship to the other entails.

I therefore argue that the position of the analyst in which his/her function is sustained, is decisive. If the analytic discourse is the social bond that transference

⁵ Lacan, J: “The Ethics of psychoanalysis”. Paidós Publisher.

establishes in each analysis, its effectiveness in the resolution of the problematic of joy is crucial.

Although not guaranteed, it calls for ethical responsibility in its guiding. It is about a way out that occurs one by one because, as it is not collectivized there is not one for everyone. On the contrary, it would be a return to the worst to enthrone the ideal.

Moreover, to make from psychoanalysis a “weltanschauung”, is to pervert its field and lead it to an ideologization that betrays its grounds. On the contrary, referring it to the analytical function leaves the way open to be able to place another fate of jouissance, once the symptom that the phantom put on scene has been reduced.

So, it is in the transference itself where the game, in which jouissance is questioned, is played. Meanwhile, the analyst is made to be the phantasmatic object that governed the subject’s life by the semblant he/she occupies. A crucial turning point in which, after his/her fall, he/she drags the de-supposition of the knowledge where the whole experience was sustained.

Once the rejected truth of jouissance was received, the analyst performs the figure of the saint, as Lacan points out, whereas he/she embodies the ejection of jouissance. Moreover, the analyst is waste of a singular joy⁶, which, having moved on the side of the Other writes his/her non-existence.

So, what remains on the analyzing side?

I leave it posed.

If the neighbor has come to a good place, re-creating the lack⁷, elaboration that concerns the transferential bond and if he/she counts with the remedial resource of the sinthome, something that does not always happen, to know how to do with what is hopeless, if he/she has been able to channel the jouissance through a sublimatory path that makes the bond to the other a creative and non-predatory instance, perhaps psychoanalysis can make a life-giving contribution to the collective life.

Alejandra Rodrigo

Escuela Freudiana de Buenos Aires

Mayo, 2025- Buenos Aires, Argentina

⁶ Lacan, J: “Television”. “Other Writings”. Pg 546 Paidós Publisher.

⁷ Vegh, I: “The neighbour: links and denouements of jouissance”. Lugar Publisher.