

## *DESIGNATIONS*

### **ON THE MEANS AND CRITERIA FOR THE DESIGNATIONS IN MAIEUTICS-PSYCHOANALYTIC INSTITUTION**

I. The psychoanalyst is authorized in its clinical practice with other analysts, with whom he/she shares an institutionalized experience. This authorization springs from a symbolic sanction, both of his-her own and shared – because it is not properly of his-her own unless also shared-, in which the three axes that make up the poetic praxis get co-involved: the analysis of the analyst, the analysis of control –which is not a random and erratic "case supervision"- and a continuous and insistent journey – processed, but not echolalic– through the foundations of theory.

Thus, the psychoanalytic institution provides a guarantee springing from testimonies, and from this the validity of a sufficient clinical education is sanctioned, corresponding to a given analyst. Likewise, the designation binds in a borromean fashion, and as a fourth link, the other three: the analysis called personal, the control analysis and theoretical formation<sup>1</sup>. Thus, the logic in the topology of the Designation that we propose is one of '3 + 1'. The Designation in Maieutics-Psychoanalytic Institution is "+ 1" that originates a novation from what is sanctioned as difference: the condition of Analyst Member. It is important to point out that this is one of the possible links of the institutional life.

With such purpose, we differentiate nomination, from designation and from namings<sup>2</sup>.

**Nomination** attempts to go beyond denomination<sup>3</sup>, the general meaning of which is to give names to referents. Nomination instead, refers to new signifiers, which fulfill their function in the invention of artifices and, from these, to the result from and in a work. Such new signifiers have a range both in a conceptual aspect and related to

---

<sup>1</sup> Translator's note: "formation" corresponds in a very specific way to the psychoanalyst formation, which is, in my understanding a broader and different meaning than the usual professional "education" or "training".

<sup>2</sup> Translator's note: "naming" corresponds to the Spanish word "nombramientos". We follow here Bruce Fink's note: "Nom ( noun) could alternatively be translated as "name" , in J. Lacan, *Écrits*, a selection, pag. 334 ,W.W.Norton & Company.

<sup>3</sup> Translator's notes: according to the Larousse Spanish-English Concise Dictionary, the English word "denomination" does not overlap with the Spanish word "denominación", in the Spanish original of this text, which is nearer to "naming". "Nombrar" in Spanish has a broader meaning than "denominar", but is also its synonym.

the foundations of psychoanalysis (which are not limited to concepts, since they entail the symbolic coverage of a real they attempt to screen. The foundations, then, drive the doctrinary advancement of a progression that attempts, at the same time, to account for its losses).

It differentiates into imaginary nomination, symbolic nomination, and real nomination, each one with its consistency, its existence, and its value to pierce through the pretensions of wholeness.

The **designation** makes place in Maieutics-Psychoanalytic Institution, for the condition of Analyst Member (AM). This constitutes a legitimate option to put into act differences, and by the validation of which, we aspire to reach and effectively influence on the powers constituted in our country, affecting the presumable future state and/or university regulation related to the alleged concerns derived from the issuing of the "enabling degree" of psychoanalyst. Moreover, we will try to extend the validity of the artifice of the Designations to all the countries the Institutions of which are members of Convergence, Lacanian Movement for Freudian Psychoanalysis. With this we try to solve, through our own means and resources, i.e. within the analytic institutions, the issues that aim at the sanction of our agreements to qualify those of us who will designate by acknowledging them as such: analysts who have provided proofs. Such proofs are always transitory and reversible, and of course, they can also be validated over and over again.

The **namings**<sup>4</sup> are the responsibility of the Sections, supported by the Directing Council to comply with the acting of the different activities conducted by the Institution.

II. We will start from the elucidation of what we understand as the **place of the analyst** in its two axes: one of pertinence, related to the form of enunciation proper of each analyst, reporting the obstacles or *impasses* in the advancement of psychoanalysis sustained on its poietic praxis; and the one of membership, linked to the place of the analyst within the Institute. This is summarized by stating that it is a subjective implication in its transference of work, which brings into play the desire of the analyst within the Institution.

In this sense, the two directions implied in the forms of intervention (significantly, those made by "verbose" ways ("palabrera")) will take their place. In

---

<sup>4</sup> Translator's notes: "namings" is an alternative to "appointments", which, in our understanding is not so near to the Spanish "Nombramientos" in the original text.

other words: the one of the enunciation proper of the analyst, and the one as a feedback from others, both considered in their display in activities performed whether on the Institution, or in the psychoanalytic community. The elucidation –to be performed by the Body of Guarantee and Designations- related to such forms of intervention will take into account its character of conductive, as long as they are pertinent and promoting openness under the mode of questions, comments, and/or associations, or on the contrary, of not conductive by their profile either causing aggression or revealing of the primacy of fantasmatics proper.

III. As to the criteria to be used, and related to the described means, the following will be taken into account:

III.1. That we prioritize the means of what is **indicial**, because it is founded on a reading modality in agreement with the poietic praxis of the analyst in the clinical practice. Indeed, there is an attempt, considering the topic in question; to obtain the greatest nearness possible to the defining variables of singularity that rules our daily life, with the analysands. Of course, the intension and extension cannot be overlapped, but their relationship should be read and worked on, with pertinence, in interior eight. By virtue of this, and without constituting into a specific return of the same categories, the one of *indicial* qualifies an inferential modality proper of our clinical practice. In it, it is not about induction or deduction: we do not go from the particular and from there to construct alleged general laws, neither we go from the stated universal law to find again the alleged compliance in particular cases. To be coherent with our estimation and with our search for the singular, of the one by one, we end up with Peirce, in the methodology commanded by the *abduction*. Therefore, starting from signs<sup>5</sup>, from indicative traces, from tracings, a critical reading is constituted, encoded in the targets, in the possible absences, in the "waste" from observation, in the possible contradictions, in lapses; in brief, where the nucleus of our being is said, distancing from the effects of infatuation and self-arrogation, typical of narcissistic "own self". This, on the occasion, would be outlined by the self-attribution of the "psychoanalyst" signifier.

We are immersed, consequently, within a modality of reading away from the one known as "literal" –or reading “to the letter”-, already criticized in all fairness by Lacan in *L'insu...*(19/4/77). Thus, we contrast this with the so-called "symptomatic" or "symptomal" one by Althusser, which is precisely, incurring into the criteria previously

---

<sup>5</sup> Translators' notes: “signs” in the sense of “clues”.

indicated. The notion by H. Bloom also coincides with such criteria, about un-reading<sup>6</sup>, since it constitutes according to him, the mode to try to withdraw from the "anguish of influences". This anguish, related to the Designations in our Institution, is what could lead us, by fantasmatic means, to ignoring the differences, placing as a failed primordial value, the one of reproduction, of making a series between alleged equals, a movement to which the way of the pre-chaotic science so leans. This, evidently, would sanction the precept of a fallacious un-differentiation.

In other words, the criticism put into act in reading - or the proposal conducive toward culturing un-reading- relates to a modality where abduction leads to inferring something different from what is observed at the level of patency, from the "raw" empirics. According to Peirce, the abducting procedure "frequently [infers] something that will be impossible for us to observe directly." With some distance from occultism and certainty, the abductive hypothesis is included, legitimately, in the field labeled by Lacan as proper of *conjecture*. Let us remember it: "For exactness must be distinguished from truth, and conjecture does not exclude rigor." (J. Lacan, *Écrits*, p. 286)<sup>7</sup>.

A conjecture starting from indicial, then, determines the letter to be read may appear as an "enigma or threat" (R. Harari, *Polifonías*, p.80), fostering the formulation of hypothetical answers, and not portended verifications. For this reason, we may state that the enigma seeks for inventive replies, while the threat does not command any other thing than hope; since it produces a permanent tension with what is stagnant, leading then to novation.

Our proposal is, in brief, included within the field in which Freud participates as one of its outstanding originators: the one of "indiciary paradigm", as the historian C. Ginzburg called it. The means is that of the indicial, the method that of abduction, the result is a conjecture.

III. 2. That we distinguish the intervention mode by means of the **word** as one of the privileged means and criteria to consider the Designations, attentive to the following issues that such procedure makes manifest. Thus, we stated in the Booklet "*Reuniones Clínicas 2001*" (Clinical Meetings 2001), a rationale for the "Conference starting from the case" that we now extend to other similar modalities of incidence (Edgardo

---

<sup>6</sup> Translator's note: "un-reading" translates "des-lectura", a neologism which in our understanding, does not correspond to "misreading".

<sup>7</sup> Translataor's note: here we follow Bruce Fink's translation. In J. Lacan, *Ecrits*, a selection, pag. 73. W.W. Norton & Company.

Feinsilber, Alberto Franco and Diana Voronovsky, *Reuniones Clínicas 2001*, Booklet on Maieutics-Psychoanalytic Institution).

Paraphrasing then the abovementioned document, we take the "Conference starting from the case" as one of the artifices categorized so that a member of our Institution may have the occasion to put enunciative postures to work. When distinguishing the way of "verbose" (*palabrero*) mentioned before, we are considering what happens on those occasions to which our experience has lead us: indeed, a participation may change the direction of a reflection with a collective character, which was in a state of disorder or theoretical mistake. When an analyst speaks before other analysts –which is not equivalent, of course, to his/her subjective posture as a possible teacher- the emergence of "the unknown that is known" occurs thanks to a lifting of censorship, and this is acted within the symptomatic, singular articulation of the analyst that speaks. For the analyst, it will constitute a *know-how-to-do-there-with*, what up to a previous moment was circulating among the audience. This is a modality of intervention that places a limit to the alleged associative freedom conveyed by the seductive principle of "everything is permitted", which often finds in verbalism a propitiatory field, triggered by the presence of the audience.

We attempt, with this talk before other analysts –in the mentioned artifice, and also in others ruled by the efficacy of the transference of the work in the Institution- "[...] to make effective, before several individuals, a saying that may stand objections without losing too much of its consistency." The "verbose" (*palabrera*) incidence, unlike what is written, is produced as something rash that does not admit delay, since the writing of the latter, with its subsequent possibility of paused reflection, correction, bibliographic search and consultation, etc., originates an attempt to formalize the poetic praxis that gets away from immediacy, from the logic of hurriedness, required by the performance of the analyst in the cures under his charge. In brief: what is written does not resemble, at all, to put into act the variables required to originate the response of the analyst in the clinical practice, and for this reason it does not constitute, the way we see it, a valid evaluating means regarding Designations.

Therefore, we focus in a mode of "work in progress" without mediation, where the invocatory drive plays in the vector of the "I make listen – I make speak," thus attempting to propitiate an exchange that is valid for the advancement of the psychoanalytic doctrine; consequently aiming at the following circumstance: the theory is "read" by means of its operatory acting.

Now, in the Seminar "*De un discurso que no sería del semblante*" (From a Discourse that Would Not Come from the *Semblant*), in the class from 1971/1/13, Lacan formulates an emphasis about the difference of having or not having an audience. In fact, it states there the fruitfully instigating feature of the presence of the latter to encourage the inventive speech of the analyst. In this emphasis, the signification of the presences that pushes, is valid then, as a group that separates from massification, constituting according to his point of view, "[...] a plus of *jouissance*<sup>8</sup> *pressé* (pressed, urged)."

III.3. What belongs to the **events**, the supernumerary aspect understood as leads of what is Real, which seizes the testimonies of what is occasional, i.e. the meeting with the thing that breaks up with the pre-existent logic. Thus, placing outside anticipation – that is proper of the Imaginary mirror - and judgment – which is proper of what is "normalizing" Symbolic-, the analyst tries to constitute as a facilitator of the passage from the incident to the event, which leads, by means of work, to a new knotting<sup>9</sup>.

For this, there is an attempt to put a new and singular posture of knowledge to work, in the facts, taken in its meaning of open to what is Real. Because in fact, what makes an event is what appears as supernumerary to the subject, namely: what each time appears as irruption of language under the form of these leads of what is Real, which enable, by forcing a break up with the unity of language, the invention of what is new in the means of the symptom.

III.4. **Persistence**, considering that we do not propitiate a characterization from isolated situations, but instead from the insistence proper of a subjective position, sustained over time and in different ways through the changing circumstances. As has to be - as it is - the circumstantial variability the analyst. We find the *posture* of the one that speaks with and among analysts, supported by what constitutes his/her poetic praxis.

In short, this is ultimately about considering how the insistence of an enunciative posture operates in each participation –predominantly, we repeat, by means of word made public-, proper of the analyst's ethics. This, it is worth remembering, is supported by the responsibility of the individual that replies, in their saying, from *well-saying* and

---

<sup>8</sup> Translator's note: we follow Bruce Fink's translation. His quotation: "I have assumed that the kind of enjoyment beyond the pleasure principle ( including orgasm) denoted by the French *jouissance* is well enough known by now to the English-reading public to require no translation". Pag. 315, *Écrits*.

<sup>9</sup> Translator's note: there is a play on words in the Spanish original "re-anudación", meaning "a new beginning" and also "another knotting", "a new knot", which is broader and does not overlap with the English word "resumption".

the *know-how-to-do-there-with*, i.e. that is not limited to thoughts –even though these are enabled in the unconscious- to achieve the accomplishment; but instead of doing within the social link.

III.5. That highlighting what is **singular** as one of the criteria for the Designations puts into act the desire of *not* dialectizing the performances of the analyst. And this, related to his/her modes of participation both verbal and written. We propitiate not to manifest a generalization that would prioritize the repetition of "the same," which constitutes an apprehension made from the recording of what is Imaginary in its link to what is Symbolic. Admitting that work of the other yields efficacies in one's own work –what this is about, in the end, in "enabling oneself by some others"- we support the value of making it public. For this reason, we commend the fact of not omitting the bibliography of references, that is to say, not only those of the founding texts of the doctrine, but also those belonging to the members of the Maieutics-Psychoanalytic Institution, in the first place, both including those owed to other colleagues, and for instance those belonging to the Institutions-Member of Convergence, Lacanian Movement by Freudian Psychoanalysis.

It is thus we understand the singularity of an intervention, whether it is verbal, or written. The mentioned intervention, then, aims at an order of interpretation –"books make books" says U. Eco- and the appearance of the dimension of the *sinthome*, whether from the analyst, from analyzing, susceptible to be offered, as a logic and valid consequence, to the psychoanalytic community.

#### *Addendum*

The Analyst Members (AM) of Maieutics-Psychoanalytic Institution to date are the following:

Edgardo Feinsilber  
Alberto Franco  
Susana Gass  
Roberto Harari  
Zulema Lagrotta  
Manuel Rubio  
Diana Voronovsky

**Maieutics-Psychoanalytic Institution, August/October, 2003**