

Neurosis Today (1) – 27th October 2018

Interview with Yves-Claude Stavy

To complement our forthcoming event, **Neuroses Today**, the following is a transcript of a recent interview with our guest speaker, **Yves-Claude Stavy**, conducted as part of the preparations for a Study Day of the CPCT in Paris earlier this year. The Paris CPCT (Centre for Psychoanalytic Consultation and Treatment) is one of the many walk-in clinics set up by the École de la Cause Freudienne, offering free treatment, within a specific time-frame, for those suffering from social exclusion in one form or another. One of the French terms for social exclusion, *précarité*, indexes, particularly well, the therapeutic stakes of such a clinic for those adrift in this field. But what is at stake for psychoanalysis itself? It is here, in a characteristically illuminating twist, that Yves-Claude Stavy reveals that what is most fundamentally at stake in this clinic, often referred to as that of applied psychoanalysis, is in fact identical to what is at stake in the field of pure psychoanalysis or psychoanalysis ‘in intension’, as Lacan called it – a field which is coextensive with, but not reducible to, the clinic of neuroses and ultimately the domain of a training analysis. The twist in question turns upon a traumatic element or mark, left over from the inscription of language on the body, that is ‘outside discourse’ *for all* and not simply for those who find themselves without the resources to inscribe themselves within the social bond without recourse to an analyst to invent a way in. It is this ‘mark’ of jouissance and its consequences at the level of experience that makes this clinic *urgent* and highlights the uses of invention, in any personal analysis, to find a way to inscribe something of one’s own traumatic and nonsensical ‘outside discourse’ within it – to make it *pass*, so to speak, at the level of the social bond without it having to first pass through the circuits of meaning where it finds itself effaced in a compromise formation. In fact, although it is not made explicit in the interview below, Yves-Claude Stavy’s responses echo many of the themes of our own upcoming Congress, and in particular – as Lacan specifies at the end of his “Preface to the English-Language edition of Seminar XI” – what it means for an analyst, as part of their own ongoing formation, to be *on a par* or to *pair* with urgent cases. How will this relate to what Yves-Claude Stavy will be speaking about at our event this coming Saturday? Well, why not join us as we take up, from a different angle and in a more accessible form, the wager that Yves-Claude Stavy offers us here? To find out more about this event, please visit our [website](#). To purchase a ticket [click here](#). P.D.

* * * * *



A Wager Relating to What is at Stake in Pure Psychoanalysis!

An Interview with Yves-Claude Stavy

Conducted in preparation for the 2018 Annual Study Day of the CPCT-Paris, taking place under the title: "A Social Bond Without Common Measure: Clinical Singularity & the Analytic Discourse"

CPCT-Paris: What do you think about the theme of the next day of the CPCT Paris: "A social bond without common measure"? How can we understand this "without common measure"?

Y.-C. Stavy: I think it's a very nice title because it raises the very current question of knowing what you are partnering in a psychoanalysis. Let's try to answer that. This leads us to have to make a small detour, but I think it is one that is essential in order to be able to grasp something. In fact, the

first question we have to ask ourselves during this next CPCT Study Day is this: from where or from what position [*d'où*] do we partner a patient who comes to us for a consultation? And the second question, with respect to the first, is: a partner, yes, but of what [*de quoi*]?

Regarding the question of this from where, let's say that it's not on the basis of a knowledge acquired in books – be they those of Freud or Lacan. This would be to inscribe ourselves within the academic discourse. This doesn't mean that we ignore the teachings of Freud, Lacan and some others, but that it is not from this place that we risk ourselves as a partner. The place in question is the result of our own analytic experience, conducted as an analysand. Unlike contemporary psychiatric discourse, to assert this does not presume to know what is at stake for everyone, but fundamentally distinguishes the variety of answers produced from what is acquired through academic discourse. On the other hand, these various forms of the place in question that emerge from one's personal experience as an analysand, are also distinct from the know-how acquired during professional practice, even when conducted as a psychoanalyst. Acquired knowledge and know-how do not answer the question of this place from which we partner, this *d'où*, that results from a personal analysis conducted as an analysand. The hypothesis of the big Other, the object little *a*, or the existence of an incurable traumatic bit of *lalangue* that gets caught up in someone's life certainly do not amount to the same thing for one to take as the basis of one's act or of one's own reading of a patient's case, despite the structure of discourse in which the object *a* is one of the articulated terms. But these three different forms of this place from which we partner at least have the merit of springing from one's own authentic experience as an analysand.

CPCT-Paris: So the third one that you mention, the incurable traumatic bit of *lalangue*, is related to the symptom?

Y.-C. Stavy: Yes, of course. That is what is at stake [*l'enjeu est là*]: to take account of a real is to bet on a symptom produced at one's own risk and at one's own expense alone [*à compte d'auteur*]. The formal envelope of the symptom – which itself is analysed on the basis of the structure of discourse – is not the real of the *sinthome* that keeps repeating itself, despite what is interpreted in the most rigorous way within the discourse. The object itself pales with regard to the existence of this mark of traumatic *jouissance*: it is only the structural correspondent of this real outside-structure. And this is testified to by the real of the symptom, which is impossible to dissolve in the discursive solution. This is what Freud observed very well. He did not call it the object *a*, but said that at the heart of the formal envelope of the symptom there is the lost object of the drive. What is extraordinary in this title framing our work for this Study Day [the CPCT Study Day: "A Social Bond without Common Measure: Clinical Singularity and the Analytic Discourse"] is that it leads to the following question: what becomes of the social bond as soon as one refers one's act and one's reading of a case to the existence a mark of *jouissance* outside-discourse? This is a crucial question concerning the initiative of the CPCT and it makes it necessary to refer to what is at stake in psychoanalysis 'in intention'. The CPCT is not 'a little bit of psychoanalysis' and 'a lot' of social. On the contrary, it leads us to pose the question of what becomes of the social link, vis-à-vis a mark of traumatic *jouissance* that has always already been encountered by the body. When all is said and done, the social bond proves to be a double-entrance door: either the social bond is itself a shady refusal of the real to which it responds, which would be the position counter to [*à l'envers de*] that of psychoanalysis in the sense of the cynical position of a *parlêtre*, so that the structure of the discourse itself becomes the way of not wanting to know anything about a real to which it responds, or, a new social bond proclaims itself to be an extension of the unprecedented symptomatic invention produced by a patient in order to take into account the bit of real, beyond-meaning, that he has to deal with. It is paradoxically the wager of the CPCT: a wager relating to what is at stake in pure psychoanalysis!

CPCT-Paris: The social bond as a "shady refusal" of a real that I personally have to deal with: would that be the social bond as a means of trying to forget one's solitude?

Y.-C. Stavy: That's exactly it. But as soon as we no longer content ourselves with the contradiction between structural interpretation and the insistence of the symptom, one's complete faith in the structure is stripped bare and revealed to have been nothing but a defence against a bit of traumatic jouissance which cannot be grasped that way.

It is a racism directed towards what in oneself is "foreign-to-oneself". What's at stake is not to transform ourselves into the moon, what's at stake is a social bond that has become itself an extension of one's own invention created to account for a jouissance which does not allow itself to be civilized, and which cannot be transposed onto anyone else. That's what's at stake in the CPCT in a nutshell. It is how to become a partner, without a clear idea of what it concerns, of a piece of real that calls upon the patient to symptomatise it, at his own risk and at his own expense. But this is also where it becomes crucial to distinguish the reading that the partner produces of his patient's case from what is at stake in the new reading that the patient produces... of his own case. It is necessary to distinguish them, but not so as to imply that the analyst's reading is secondary: it comes first. For there to be a chance for a patient at the CPCT to be touched by their own mark of jouissance, requires, all the more, that the partner has himself been touched, in his own experience of analysis, by his own mark, in other words, has acquired a taste for the real outside-discourse. At this level it is the taste for it that counts. To make it possible, within the space of four months, for there to be a chance - without the distraction of a delusional elaboration that does not need anyone - to produce a glimpse of a piece of language that has arrived at its destination: this is the wager that opens the way to "a social bond without common measure ". I think it's great to have formulated it like this: a social bond that might be secondary to one's own sinthome. That does not mean that no social bond exists anymore. On the contrary, it means that the social bond becomes an extension of one's own sinthome. As a result, it raises the question of the difference and the points in common between 'sublimation' and 'sinthome': the big difference is that the activity of sublimation does not, in and of itself, assume that something of one's own mark has, or has not, arrived at its destination and no longer contradicts the social bond to which it responds.

CPCT-Paris: "Without common measure" is this without measure?

Y.-C. Stavy: Let's go this far: the object *a* is for us the measure of discourse: the object *a* is not the master signifier, but it remains a semblance in so far as it is articulated with the other terms of discourse. The whole challenge of a "link without common measure" is to consider whether the social bond becomes the extension of my own sinthome, which is itself without any measure in common. The "without common measure" of the social bond is a little equivocal, since the social bond itself remains, of course, *with* measures. But a social bond *without* common measure suggests that the reference is no longer that of a measure that is held in common, of something transposable from one person to another. This is where the whole question of personal responsibility arises: I am not responsible for the discourse in which I am inscribed: the subject is only an effect of discourse. We do not change the discourse in which we inscribe ourselves. At this level, it is only a question of rigour, not of responsibility. On the other hand, discourse cannot account for the jouissance for which I *am* responsible. This is what is at stake of psychoanalysis.

And in this respect, I find that the CPCT, because of the short-cut nature of its undertaking, reveals especially well, in its own way, what is at stake in psychoanalysis in intention. If it is no longer certain today that traditional discourses still function; then to bet on a social bond that is secondary to the sinthomatic invention for which I *am* responsible becomes all the more crucial.

CPCT-Paris: Earlier you spoke of the social bond as something that itself has a common measure, but I was thinking rather of what we are researching into at the CPCT, and that opens onto the other

question, which is not about someone's insertion in the social bond, but rather that there is a link, without common measure, that is the CPCT itself.

Y.-C. Stavy: Yes, precisely. Of course, discourse is a treatment. And besides it is the most beautiful treatment. It is precisely civilisation. To take into account a remainder of jouissance outside-discourse is to take into account what is incurable ... despite the discursive treatment. And there, it is not simply a question of rigour ... but of taste: do I or do I not have the taste to take account of the remainder of jouissance for which I am responsible. Lacan, in his Seminar, *The Sinthome*, says that "responsibility means non-response or a response that falls wide of the mark": "non-response" since this remainder of jouissance is without Other; "a response that falls wide of the mark" since the issue becomes that of a sinthomatic discovery that resonates with the mark of jouissance that I have to deal with. It is an invention to be constantly renewed. To give a chance to a small invention that is not itself a sleazy refusal of the mark that we have taken wind of and for which we are responsible: this is the challenge and the wager of the CPCT today. The impasse that is bringing people to the CPCT is the one produced by the protocols that have been established in our society, proposed in ready-to-wear forms. The human being does not fall under the aegis of harmony, it is an incurable disharmony, between a wonderful and useful mechanism which is called the social bond (that is to say discourse), and a real peculiar to each which, with respect to this mechanism, ex-sists. What's at stake, this *enjeu*, which is always personal, is to move from a sorely felt contradiction between the real and the symbolic to the singular intranquility of a way of accommodating the real and the symbolic that is without common measure and for which you *are* responsible.

CPCT-Paris: Thank you very much, Yves-Claude Stavy.

For further information about our own Study Day on **Neuroses Today**, please visit the [programme page](#) of our website.

[Tickets are available here](#)