



Precariousness and social disinsertion¹

Pierre Naveau

A research collective, RIPA, was created in Paris in November 2007 through the impetus of Hugo Freda.² The orientation for this endeavour was given to us in a passage from a talk by Jacques-Alain Miller on the 1st July 2007 at the end of the congress PIPOL 3. I quote this passage: “It is now time to enter into a thematic, differential and measured study of the subjective situations of social discontact (*déprise social*)³. Social discontact has a name in the contemporary administrative language: disinsertion (*désinsertion*). This word was chosen as the title of the research project of RIPA at a European level. I see PIPOL 4 as a scansion of this research. Hence the title I propose: “Clinic and Pragmatics of Disinsertion in Psychoanalysis”.⁴

We asked ourselves a certain number of questions. With reference to the beginning and the end of a short treatment at a CPCT we were interested in the articulation between ‘dis-connection’ (*débranchement*) and ‘re-connection’ (*rebranchement*). We asked ourselves if, for example, at the beginning, the subject who is socially disinserted is also dis-connected, and if, at the end, the socially reinserted (*réinséré*) subject is necessarily re-connected. In this respect, how can we approach the distinction that must be made between ‘un-subscribed’ (*désabonné*) from the unconscious, ‘dis-connected’ (*débranché*) and ‘disinserted’ (*désinséré*)? It seems, indeed that social discontact, more often than not, implies unsubscription from the unconscious, dis-connection and exclusion, all at once.

If one must choose a literary reference, for me, one can, without a doubt, do the same operation with a reading of Samuel Beckett as Lacan did with James Joyce. For Beckett is the great writer of exclusion. He is the one who spoke of the expelled, as Deleuze highlighted.

We also questioned the consequences of the shortness of the treatment, when it became clearly apparent that it is impossible to treat all the points in 16 sessions. There is necessarily a remainder. A certain number of points are not treated. Another question was to know what route the subject really followed? The route followed has indeed something of the real. If we take it from the point of view of the Borromean clinic, is this real in the order of a point of support, a knotting, the sinthome or a hook?

² Three RIPA research groups were created, in Barcelona, Milan and Paris. They are led by Antoni Vicens, Domenico Cosenza and Pierre Naveau, respectively. The group founded in Paris is presently made up of 17 members: Paz Corona, Sandrine Corouge, Hélène Deltombe, Pascale Fari, Daniela Fernandez, Marina Frangiadaki, Beatriz Gonzales, Marina Lusa, Catherine Meut, Laure Naveau, Pierre Naveau (plus-one), Stéphanie Navas, Camilo Ramirez, Marc Schaffhauser, Gudrun Scherer, Laura Sokolowsky, Beatriz Vindret

³ (TN) see Thelma Sowley’s note to her choice of ‘discontact’ for ‘*déprise*’: “In French, the pair I translate “contact/discontact” are “prise/déprise”. Déprise, like discontact, is a neologism”

⁴ Miller, J.-A.; Towards PIPOL 4, in NLS messenger 509 : PIPOL 4/BARCELONA translated by T. Sowley. (Vers PIPOL 4, *La Lettre Mensuelle de l’École de la Cause freudienne*, n° 261, septembre-octobre 2007, p. 28)

I take an example that was the object of in depth discussions within our research group.

This man of 58 has not worked for 10 years. He receives a minimum income – a minimum income of insertion. He is in fact disinserted. He is on the way to becoming a bum (*clochardisation*). The bum, whether celestial or terrestrial, to evoke Jack Kerouac, is an important person at the CPCT. The administration asked this man to make an effort and get into contact with the CPCT. He meets our colleague Marina Lusa.

In the 1st interview, our colleague reports that she intervened twice. She asked him the question, “Can you come to our meetings without having had a drink?” And when he told her, “I have always been a dropout (*un marginal*). Now, I am a bum (*clochard*)”, she replied, “A dropout and a bum are not the same thing.” Thus, our colleague introduced a gap between ‘dropout’ and ‘bum’.⁵

In the 16th session, the patient thanked our colleague by saying, “You bet on me. I felt supported by you because I felt that you gave me confidence and that you placed your hope in me.” The patient has thus underlined that the end of a short treatment depends on the way in which the subject approaches the contingency of the encounter with the analyst.

He has found a job. He passed exams in English for executives who work in large companies. To the extent that we can speak of a reinsertion, is he, moreover, re-connected? If we rely on the difference Jacques-Alain Miller introduced between the solid dimension and the liquid dimension of psychoanalysis, what solid thing has he taken with him? To take this metaphor further, with what stone in hand did he separate from the analyst? Maybe this stone is simply the fact that he was able to part from, what has been for him, a grave accident of life. He was able to say to the analyst he saw at the CPCT – and this for the first time – that, for him, who lost his father at the age of 9, the cause of his descent towards the worst had in fact been the sudden death of his father in law.

When he was introduced to him, the father of the woman he married, asked him the same question as our colleague, “Can you hold out without drinking? Are you able to not drink and wear a neck tie?” The patient replied with a yes. Not only did the old man give him his daughter’s hand. But he also found him employment in a large company.

This father in law transmitted something to him that he was lacking, a passion for gambling (*le gain*). Because there lay his real poverty, the fact that he had no desire, he had no urge. So, this father in law ‘injected’⁶him with a surplus of enjoyment in the form of a passion for the game. He had started with saying, “I am nothing. I am waste”. In the course of the treatment he came to say, “I am a gambler”

After the death of his father in law, there was the fall. A slow fall that lead to the disinsertion. Two events contributed to it. On one side the responsibilities entrusted to him were too heavy. He could not cope. On the other side, his mistress told him that his wife had cheated on him with his best friend. He lost his ground. He was only supported by his mistress. It was her who encouraged him to find work again.

Thanks to the 16 sessions he had at the CPCT, the patient took up contact with his ex wife again (who is a lecturer at university), and with his three daughters who are in the process of finishing their studies.

⁵ The accent is not put on the sense but on the ‘signifier division’, as Hugo Freda indicated in Milan.

⁶ This is the term to be used by Fabien Grasser in the course of RIM of the 18 June 2008

The case by our colleague is paradigmatic. It shows that 'social discontact' is articulated with the dis-connection provoked by an event that was abrupt and unforeseen – the decease of an 'accomplice'⁷, with whom he shared a passion.

For the first time he was able to speak about this complicity. This is the stone with which he left. Jacques-Alain Miller said, in his text of the presentation of the argument for PIPOL 4, that there can be an 'Alpha Place' only if, by the operation of the analyst, the chattering turns out to contain a treasure. In this case, I consider that the stone in his hand is a treasure.

Translated by Natalie Wülfing

Copyright © Pierre Naveau 2015. This text from the website of the London Society of the NLS, at <http://www.londonsociety-nls.org.uk>. Permission to use material from this site must be sought from the LS-NLS. All rights reserved. Please include this portion of the text in any printed version of this paper.

⁷ As Serge Cottet said, in the same RIM of 18 June 2008, the father in law is less a father (*père*) than an accomplice (*compère*).