

What is the Transferential Situation in Psychoanalysis Today?

Escola Lacaniana de Psicanálise do Rio de Janeiro

Lacanian School of Psychoanalysis of Rio de Janeiro

*"It is not true that people stop pursuing dreams because they grow old, they grow old
because they stop pursuing dreams"*

Gabriel Garcia Marquez

"I'll pay the shrink's bill so that I'll never have to know who I am again."

Cazuza.

Could it be that psychoanalysis is aging? Gabriel Garcia Marquez, in 1967, tells us in his book *One Hundred Years of Solitude* about a peculiar event in a fantastic society, where its inhabitants stop sleeping. At first, the event is perceived with optimism, because this non-sleeping allows for that people to fulfill a desire to be more productive, to never stop; nonetheless, they did not imagine that, without sleeping, they were betraying themselves by ceasing [all] their oneiric activities - they stopped dreaming.¹

Thus, that community from the book mentioned in the first paragraph, which also tells the story of the "Buendías," start to forget everything, to the point of indicating a cow with signs that read "cow" and milk with signs that read "milk", on the threshold between the thing and the significant that kills it.

I bring the example of a psychotic subject who did not register his sleep; [sleeping] was not perceived by him. At times, he would ask for nighttime shelter at the CAPS (Psychosocial Care Center, a substitute model for the asylum model for the treatment of madness) so that he could sleep, since he recognized his increased irritability when not sleeping, and thus, he would spend the night there, take his medications, and be observed by the on-call night staff to see if he was awake or not. They reported deep sleep, and even intense snoring.

So it happened that after a night of sleep perceived by others, when asked how it had been [for him], we received the response: "I didn't sleep at all, it's hell, everyone keeps watching me all the time when I'm showering, all the Brazilians, I'm going to blow up the senate, nobody does anything, I can't keep being seen in the bathroom all the time, everything I do there, everyone sees it." In him, this non-registration of sleeping prevented him from distinguishing

between a dream experience and a waking experience, that is, a cut between a psychic reality and an external reality, between one and the other. Is that what it means to be with the unconscious in the open?

In other clinical situations, in cases of dementia, caused both by neurodegenerative dementia syndromes and by dementia due to alcohol toxicomania, it is common to hear confabulations from these subjects, that is, they unconsciously fill amnesic gaps in a narrative with events that occurred in the past, which is observed more frequently when they are heard close to their waking time, before the forgetfulness of the dream operates.

In both situations, these people follow the golden rule of an analytical process: they speak freely to another, regularly, every week. They do not go to an analytical “setting,” but they place [the other] in a position to listen to them; they demand this. Until the pandemic, [I saw] the choice for the couch as the main device to characterize [entrance in] analysis in analytical praxis, or even more specifically, the analysand's passage from the armchair to the couch as the moment of truly entering analysis, in the second time an analysis, of the moment of understanding, between the instant of seeing and [the one of] concluding.

Many case reports that did not follow the ritual described above already questioned the essential feature of the Divan. Such experiences remain indecisive as to whether a psychoanalytic path of the subject could be named along these lines. Then came the pandemic with its irreversible cut to the rite, causing the need to sustain ongoing analytical processes and also to welcome the new demands for [analysis] to be framed by the desire of analysts, who found themselves, once again, in a place of dissection between structure and function, as was the cut made by Lacan when elaborating that the masculine and feminine parents do not necessarily correspond to the paternal and maternal functions respectively.

When researching the first epigraph by Gabriel Garcia Marquez, in order to know when and where he uttered those words, I did not succeed, but found a similar phrase by Karl Groos, dated 1904: “We do not stop playing because we grow old; we grow old because we stop playing.” Attributed to other English writers after him, it reaches us through Gabriel Garcia Marquez, replacing playing with dreaming; both of which can be true without one excluding the other. Moreover, [it demonstrates] how playing and dreaming are intrinsically related to each other and to the satisfaction of unconscious desires; after all, “all play has a background of truth.”

The same way that these two construed sentences - one with playing, the other with dreaming, - can carry veracity without excluding each other, the cut that the pandemic caused in our *praxis* teaches us, in retrospect, that the transferential situations experienced outside the psychoanalytic setting were already guiding us in relation to the core of an analytical process that

prioritizes the dynamics of the drive objects gaze and voice in a specific occasion that is frequently established in order to allow for free speech.

And [it is by] assuming the term *praxis* in its broadest use, as Lacan does in Seminar XI - to "*designate an action performed by man, whatever it maybe, which places him in a condition to deal with the real by means of the symbolic,*" - that I articulate the object of this work, [the] psychoanalytic transference situation, listening to the name of our Colloquium as a triptych, because I think that, essentially, transference occurs from an actualization of castration with its effects of *malaise* and of otherness. And, therefore, the transference occurs on a given occasion and at a given time: it is the topology of the unconscious that is revealed there.

"The analyst's desire is not pure desire. It is a desire to obtain the absolute difference, the one which intervenes when, confronted with the primordial signifier, the subject comes, for the first time, to the position of subjecting oneself to it. Only then can the signification of a limitless love arise, because [it is] outside the limits of the law, only where it can live."

(Lacan, "In you more than you," 06/24/1964)

I brought the literary work from 1967 as a representation of what we have been experiencing today in another way. What have we been doing with our memory? Régis Michel, in a lecture entitled "Trauma," given in 2002 at the II Circle of Psychoanalysis and Art of the Lacanian School of Psychoanalysis of Rio de Janeiro, presents the cloud as the antithesis of form, ready to give materiality to our imagining. Today, the cloud has also become the destination of our images, documents, records, a virtual destination where everything is stored, betraying us in the task of memorizing. It's all in there.

The website www.infomoney.com reports that there are approximately 14.3 trillion photos stored globally in the clouds. People prefer to delete applications rather than delete photos, and the main reason for buying more storage space on Apple is to store more photos. This article also brings the thought of sociologist Nathan Jurgenson on the presence-absence of photography – it serves to prove that we were there, but never to revisit them. The sociologist also points us to an observation of this hypertrophy of photography: "we have never been so visual and seen so little." Erasing is losing, deleting is recognizing that the moment was not as important as it seemed.⁴

Are we dreaming less, playing less, and becoming less creative as a result? Or is this new dynamic simply generating a new economy in dreaming, playing, and in the creative, inventive process? Freud feared that the malaise in the modern world would erase the uncanny-familiar that

inhabits us, making the theater inaudible and invisible if, for example, nothing about us is strange, or if there are inhuman things that will never be familiar to us.⁵In contrast, Lacan says:

“From a certain point of view, the public must always have been at the same level. ‘Sub specie aeternitatis,’ everything is equivalent, everything is always there – simply, not in the same place”

(Lacan, 1959-1960: 295)

Erik Porge, in his text “Summary of the Real in Lacan,” brings this dimension of the Real in its double affirmation, articulating it precisely at the point where the more one tries to forget something, the more one knows of it due to its incessant inscription.⁶ The lyrics of our second epigraph come as an effect of the capillarity and function of psychoanalysis in its social bond; 74 years distant from the first text on psychoanalysis published in Brazil (“Psychoanalysis – sexuality in neuroses,” Gerência de Souza Pinto, 1914), the lyrics (of the song) testify to how transference enables the actualization of repression through the always partial return of what was repressed.

Phillipe Julien, in his book *Psychoses, a Study on Common Paranoia*, reminds us of Lacan's importance in justifying Freud by situating castration and the Oedipus complex in its second constitutive time of the subject, by means of what he named the Imaginary Father, situated between the first time, Symbolic [Father]; and the third time, Real Father. Thus, he tells us that “Lacan is the difference between the Symbolic and the Imaginary. But the Real, what is it?” Julien tells us that the Real of the Father is what takes effect in the asymmetry between one generation and another, because in that time, the empty place to be occupied is given by a man who will fulfill it in his own way.⁷

The author in question evokes in his book *Noah's Ark, Essay on Fatherhood* a supposed saying of the Real Father: “*your room is your room and mine is mine. My jouissance has nothing to do with you; my jouissance turns to a woman, a woman of my generation, the cause of my desire.*”⁸ Now, isn't this where he semi-declares to his son that he must occupy himself of his room, of a woman of his generation, of his cause of desire? And therefore founding a place to be occupied in his own way too? Well, there it is, a radical otherness; this turn towards a “woman of his generation” (*pere-versement*) makes the Real of the Father appear between generations, because, about the jouissance of each subject in their epoch, only a semi-declaring is possible. What does one generation invent for itself about its jouissance, based on what was semi-declared and, therefore, forbidden by its predecessors?

“A father has no right to respect, but only to love, unless this said love, this said respect are perversely [pere-versement] cut.”

Lacan, Seminar R.S.I, session01/21/75.

It is worth noting here that, when speaking of the Real of the Father, what we witness is a perversion in discourse, not the constitution of perverse subjects. Pointing out this difference is necessary given the stigma that is perceived when speaking of the perverse structure, even among psychoanalysts. Overturning stigmas was a task of Lacan, when saving his Aimée from the stigma of perversion, situating her in a psychotic structure, for example. Moreover, just like art, [he] points to injury as another way of manifesting the Real. Many indices so that we can be attentive and not warned of the Real; it is impossible to be warned of the Real.

Thus, in a contemporary world that distances structure and function, with each step towards the future, a whirlwind of discursive questions resurface in this opening, among them: what is a man? a woman? a father? a mother? an artist? a psychoanalyst? the human? When the founding discourses of many ideologies are revealed, no longer generating identification or social ties, but rather an adherence to these discourses? And how can we prevent this from happening among psychoanalysts? As we change our presence-absence, our memorization, our dreams and our repression, our identifications regarding gender and sexuality, what will become of the transference situation today in the world and in Psychoanalysis? Has psychoanalysis left a void for contemporary subjects to engage with psychoanalytic discourse in their own way, thus providing a listening space for their analysands to occupy in their own way?

Bibliographic References:

1. GARCÍA MÁRQUEZ, Gabriel. (1967). Cem anos de solidão (Trad. Eric Nepomuceno). Record. Rio de Janeiro.
2. RIBEIRO, SIDARTA. O oráculo da noite: a história e a ciência do sonho. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2019.
3. LACAN, J. (1964). O Seminário, livro 11: Os Quatro Conceitos Fundamentais da Psicanálise. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Ed.2008.
4. DOLCI, RENATO. A foto perdeu valor, mas ninguém tem coragem de apagar. <https://www.infomoney.com.br/colunistas/convidados/a-foto-perdeu-o-valor-mas-ninguem-tem-coragem-de-apagar/>. Último acesso: 28/04/2015.

5. REGNAULT, FRANÇOIS. Em Torno do Vazio: a arte á luz da psicanálise. (Tradução: Vera Avellar Ribeiro. Rio de Janeiro: Contra Capa Livraria, 2001.p. 143.
6. PORGE, ERIK. Resumo Sobre o Real em Lacan (Trad. Celso Pereira de Almeida. Revista Dizer. Ed. 10. Escola Lacaniana de Psicanálise. Rio de Janeiro.
7. JULIEN, PHILIPPE. As psicoses: um estudo sobre a paranóia comum. Rio de Janeiro: Companhia de Freud, 1999.
8. JULIEN, PHILIPPE. O Manto de Noé: Ensaio sobre a Paternidade. (Tradução de Francisco de Farias). Rio de Janeiro: Revinter, 1997.