

**Symptoms in the age of disconnection Workshop of the Lacan  
Circle of Melbourne with Jean-Pierre Klotz Melbourne**

**17-19 April 2009**

**Public Lecture: “Why psychoanalysis today?”**

At a public lecture preceding the workshop Jean-Pierre Klotz discussed the historical demand for and success of psychoanalysis in France, noting that this demand is, however, coordinated with a more recent public criticism of psychoanalysis and a sense of its failure. This is a feature of psychoanalysis' own ironic/iconic split. In his lecture he addressed the uniqueness of psychoanalytic experience.

Many of the signifiers common in psychoanalysis-“failure”, “impossible encounter”-when encountered at the level of the *one by one*, acknowledge the singularity of each subject. The “impossible encounter”, for instance, is transformed into an enigma by psychoanalytic experience. Nor is psychoanalysis about the eradication of suffering but rather about each subject's singular way of connecting the “bad” with the “good”. It is important that the contradictory meaning found in suffering not be eradicated and that one attain the point of impossibility in understanding.

As Lacan used to say, the subject already has the answers, and what needs to be found are the questions. These arise in the transference, the “resolution” of which ends the fundamental deception. One can only speak about the-impossible-to-say, the real, in a more or less closed way and one can learn more or less to “work with” it, *faire avec*.

The real, while most intimate, is also strange and exterior. The only limit to jouissance is a lack in the form of castration. The analysand's appeal to “cure me of my symptom” would be to get rid of castration. But a symptom, the result of interpretation, is the purpose and frame of the psychoanalytic experience. It may also be a cure, meaning there are therapeutic ways of regarding a symptom. A symptom is a tool; to be able to move around inside it, not to eradicate it, as many ‘psy’ practices attempt to do, is a way not to suffer from it any more.

**Saturday 18 April Workshop I**

Jean-Pierre Klotz began the day, on the theme of new symptoms, with some general remarks of the notion of a subject for psychoanalysis. A subject is not an *in-divid-ual*, but is divid-ed. Because of language, subjects are taken in their singularity, but not their un-dividedness.

Words are the *fundaments* of the psychoanalytic experience, and, as a subject is a speaking-being, the place of new signifiers in the contemporary clinic was another of the major themes for Saturday's discussion.

In the past thirty years modes of jouissance and how bodies react to discourse have changed. In contrast with Freud's day, jouissance is now not only not forbidden, it is compulsory and must be put on display. "Sadness" has come to be imbued with the quality of a moral fault, whereas a diagnosis of "depression" is a way of being in-serted into society. One no longer "suffers from" something, one *has* "depression", "psychosis", etc. This places the individual outside of subjectivity and within the master's discourse.

Depression, in a paradoxical reflection of its etymology, can also be seen as a surfeit: "I have too much to sustain". Today too much jouissance assumes a particular prominence in symptoms and their social and political correlates. Klotz thus argued that the clinical field has more to do with a relationship to the Other of jouissance than to the Other of the signifier and that an analyst's task was to mediate a shift to the latter and to look for each subject's impossible-to-say. The difference between psychosis and neurosis is the immutability of signifiers in psychosis. There is a problem here with a lack of any enigma, an enigma which can become a "solution" in neurosis.

Ordinary psychosis corresponds well to these new forms of symptom. Noting that the "Father orientation" of Lacanian analysis is not about an omnipotent father but a dead father, and that the Name-of-the-Father is merely a suppletion, Klotz described Lacan's shift from a full-blown "Schreberian" to an untriggered "Joycean" view of psychosis, whereby the Name-of-the-Father becomes the Names-of-the-Father, thus becoming a function rather than a signifier.

Klotz stressed that psychoanalysis doesn't promote a cure, since the latter is merely a side-effect that cannot be achieved by being aimed at it directly.

In *Unbehagung* a question was raised concerning suicide, which, like a cure, can also be a side-effect of an analysis; one has to be aware of this so as to avoid it. We know that for a psychotic subject suicide can be a way of creating a hole, an absence that is otherwise missing. The automatic response of many *psy* therapies is to prevent a breakdown in psychosis but psychoanalysis aims not to prevent it, but to support it.

Finally, concerning the end of analysis, Klotz commented that the analysand, the producer of knowledge, is ultimately the one who

decides when their analysis ends. Truth, as the objective of psychoanalysis, is never reached and even the end is the beginning of a new relationship to psychoanalysis.

### **Sunday, 19 April Workshop II**

The workshop continued with a discussion of the Centres for Psychoanalytic Consultation and Treatment (CPCTs) in France and other European countries. The forum provided an opportunity for LCM members to learn of the successes and challenges that the development of the CPCTs has met with in France, Spain and Italy. Lively discussion emerged on the challenge of developing psychoanalytic interventions that maintain independence of the psychoanalytic act while negotiating with governments over such things as funding. In addition the parallel development of CPCTs in relation to the field of ordinary psychoses highlighted the importance of staying in contact with the social field across the full range of socio-economic groups. Although Klotz indicated that it was too early to know what impact the CPCTs may have upon the Lacanian clinic, rapid diagnosis, rapid therapeutic effect, and the continued development of the field of ordinary psychoses, were all ear-marked as important elements of the clinic that have been amplified through the CPCT. Finally, the unforeseen enthusiasm for the CPCT – the mania of both government officials and of Lacanian practitioners for the CPCT and their exponential growth across Europe - was discussed in light of cautionary remarks made by Jacques-Alain Miller in a recent interview on the success of CPCTs. The issue that provoked lively discussion from Miller's comments concerned the nature of the analyst's desire and the need to connect with the Other. This topic touched upon the dangers of the CPCTs' success in relation to the Lacanian clinic: namely, the perils of engaging with the discourse of the master while attempting to broaden the impact of the psychoanalytic act within the social field, *one-by-one*.

Report by Clodagh Norwood and Jonathan Redmond