

PSYCHOANALYTIC CLINIC IMPLICATED: CONNECTIONS WITH CULTURE, SOCIETY AND POLITICS

Miriam Debieux Rosa¹
Ivan Ramos Estêvão
Ana Paula Musatti Braga
Universidade de São Paulo (USP), São Paulo-SP, Brazil

ABSTRACT. This article addresses the dilemmas of the advancement of psychoanalysis when taking into account certain problems, such as social exclusion, racism and others. These issues emerge when the psychoanalyst offers his or her listening in the *pólis*: in health care, assistance or education institutions, in communities. Such clinical-political psychoanalytic practices find the limits of its field and encourage the necessary dialogue with other fields of knowledge. On the other hand, they encourage the deepening of concepts and the creation of clinical devices compatible with the sociopolitical dimension of suffering. In the first part of the article, we discuss present the way that Freud articulates clinical practice, theory and social issues. Since then, however, the theoretical advance of psychoanalysis in its interface with culture has privileged artistic and religious facts, at the expense of the political, economic and social dimension. In the second part, we present our conception of clinical-political psychoanalytic or implicated psychoanalysis.

Keywords: Psychoanalysis and politics; culture; suffering.

CLÍNICA PSICANALÍTICA IMPLICADA: CONEXÕES COM A CULTURA, A SOCIEDADE E A POLÍTICA

RESUMO. Este artigo aborda os dilemas do avanço da psicanálise quando leva em conta certas problemáticas, tais como exclusão social, racismos e situações outras desse gênero. Essas questões emergem quando o psicanalista oferece sua escuta na *pólis*: em instituições de saúde, de assistência ou de educação, em comunidades. Tais práticas psicanalíticas que denominamos aqui de clínico-políticas se dão nos limites do campo psicanalítico e incitam ao diálogo necessário com outros campos de conhecimento. Também convocam ao aprofundamento dos conceitos e à criação de dispositivos clínicos condizentes com a dimensão sociopolítica do sofrimento. Na primeira parte do artigo, abordamos o avanço teórico da psicanálise em relação à teoria da cultura. Na construção da psicanálise, Freud articula clínica, teoria e questões sociais. A partir dele, no entanto, o avanço teórico da psicanálise na sua interface com a cultura aparentemente privilegiou os fatos artísticos e religiosos, em detrimento da dimensão política, econômica e social. Na segunda parte, apresentamos nossa concepção de psicanálise clínico-política ou a de psicanálise implicada.

Palavras-chave: Psicanálise e política; cultura; sofrimento.

CLÍNICA PSICOANALÍTICA IMPLICADA: CONEXIONES CON LA CULTURA, LA SOCIEDAD Y LA POLÍTICA

RESUMEN. En este artículo se analiza los dilemas del avance del psicoanálisis que, se tiene en cuenta ciertas cuestiones como la exclusión social, el racismo entre otras. Estas preguntas surgen cuando el psicoanalista ofrece su escucha en la ciudad: en las instituciones de salud, educación o asistencia, en las comunidades. Tales prácticas psicoanalíticas clínico políticas encuentran los límites de su campo y fomentan el diálogo necesario con otros campos del conocimiento. Instan, por el contrario, a la profundización de los conceptos y a la creación de dispositivos compatibles con la dimensión sociopolítica del sufrimiento. En la primera parte del artículo se discute el avance de la teoría del psicoanálisis en su interrelación con la cultura. En la construcción del psicoanálisis, Freud articula clínica, teoría y problemas sociales. A partir de ella, sin embargo, el avance teórico del psicoanálisis en su interfaz con las

¹ E-mail: debieux@terra.com.br

manifestaciones artísticas de la cultura y la dimensión religiosa son privilegiadas más que las dimensiones políticas, económicas y sociales. En la segunda parte presentamos nuestra concepción del psicoanálisis clínico político o el psicoanálisis implicado.

Palabras-clave: Psychoanalysis and politics; cultura; sufrimiento.

Part 1: Contextualization of the articulation between Psychanalysis and Society

This article has the objective to approach the dilemmas of advancement of the psychanalysis according with the problems which the present incites. The complexity of such problems stimulates the necessary dialogue with other fields of knowledge in light of the limits of each theoretical field to approach them isolatedly. Psychoanalysis also encounters certain problems which do not arrive at the private offices, but which are frequent in institutions or other places of the city where the psychanalyst offers his listening. At these new spaces the sociopolitical dimension of suffering appears with bigger distinctness and it becomes necessary to inspect the psychoanalytical concepts and its extensions, to create clinical devices consistent with questions of the subject involved with the institutional, social and political ones.

In a first approach of problem, we approach the theoretical advancement of the psychoanalysis in relation to the construction of a theory of the culture, but constantly apart from the political dimension. In the second part of the article, we deal with our conception of political clinic and implicated psychoanalysis.

The articulation of the psychoanalytical theory with other fields such as sociology, economy, anthropology and history is well-known. In fact, we admit that psychoanalysis does not sustain itself as a field of knowledge if that intersection does not exist. Thus, since the beginning, psychoanalysis is open to this dialogue of borders, being possible to say that, at the same time in which it sustains itself according to that (but not only), it also offers fundamental elements in the point where other fields oscillate.

We can mention the appropriation that the critical theory makes of psychoanalysis, for instance, present in Claude Lévi-Strauss's constant debate with Freudian psychoanalysis; in the case of Marcuse, Adorno, Habermas and Honneth; in the present readings which Zizek and Badiou make of the social field wide utilization of psychoanalysis; in the influence of psychoanalysis on surrealist art; in the use of psychoanalysis by educators, among other exchanges. Not to make the references too wide, we recommend the interesting collection of articles titled *A Invenção Da Vida (The Invention of Life)* (Souza, Tessler, & Slavutzky, 2001) which gives the right measure of that interconnection by presenting various art and psychoanalysis essays written by authors who are not psychoanalysts, but photographers, art critics, historians, educators, plastic artists, literary critics and poets.

Freud

The border between psychanalysis and sociology is tenuous, although delimited. The incursion of the first one in relation to the second one occurs by requirement of the psychoanalytic practice in the moment in which Freud realizes that the neurotic problematic which leads to the symptom includes a component which cannot be called another thing but moral. If we consider the Dora case, for example, we will see that the sexual desires (homosexual, oedipal, masturbatory, among others) which conflict with her image of "good girl", which is constituted as an attempt to adequate to the social parameters (and, therefore, based upon certain moral precepts) are at stake in her neurosis (Freud, 1905/1998, p. 20). Many other cases are also based on this premise. The moral problematic becomes so fundamental in the Freudian theory and clinic that initially he regards the drive theory according to that (sexual drives in conflict with the drives of the self), and later he will postulate a psychic instance for the moral function, the Superego.

Presently, when Freud chances upon the desire at stake in the neurotic processes and, therefore, in the clinic, advancing from the seduction theory to the fantasy theory, he also sees himself having to deal with this moral component which opposes itself to the desire in each clinical case. That conduces

him to a whole elaboration which makes him think: a) a theory of culture; b) a sociability theory and; c) conceptual tools of social analysis.

As Estevão (to be published) teaches us, there is, thus, a dual direction: at the same time that psychoanalysis applies cultural phenomena to endorse its discoveries and conceptualizations, it also becomes a valuable instrument to understand social and cultural phenomena. This is revealed in Freud's well-known social texts, but the fact is that it propagates to several other writings, always in a triple movement of conjunction between clinic/metapsychology/culture and society.

The idea of Oedipus complex was approached by Freud in many ways and the one which interests us the most here is the one which appears in *The Interpretation of Dreams* (1900/2005). The passage is the following: how to give theoretical consistency to the thesis that dreams are hallucinated executions of desires in the face of the common dream of death of a loved and close one? For that, Freud turns to the myth of Oedipus and its perpetuation; that is, why does a story which was thought about in another culture and in a distant time still today have dramatic effects on us? There Freud promotes the idea of a universal complex of representations interconnected to affections (not yet called Oedipus), where the child is taken by loving and hostile desires in relation to its parents. *Oedipus Rex*, as a play of the culture (and also *Hamlet*), is summoned to account for the universality of the Oedipus complex in a motion which goes from the clinic to the metapsychology and which becomes universal in the culture (Freud, 1900/2005). Thirteen years later, in *Totem and Taboo*, Freud (1913/1997) locates Oedipus and the taboo of incest as the starting point of culture and society themselves.

This makes clear, in our view, the importance of the points of intersection between psychoanalysis and other sciences, which goes far beyond intellectual appropriation or even exercises of erudition common to a time. These points become ways to base the psychoanalytic theory and clinic.

In this sense, Freud treated the problematics which related the subject to a social or political phenomenon as "applications" of psychanalysis to other fields of knowledge. This exercise has been practiced since the Wednesday Psychological Society, created in 1902, at which discussions about the articulation of psychoanalysis not only with art, but also with literature, mythology and history wandered. The same occurred as of 1908, at the Vienna Psychoanalytical Society and at many of its studies. Such proposals allow us to understand that Freud always advanced the theory implying the social questions and marking his constant refusal to oppose individual and society, i.e., reaffirming the inseparable relationship between them both. This position is stated in an emphatic way in the well-known quote from *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego*: "The individual psychology has also been, since the beginning, social psychology" (Freud, 1921/2001, p. 67).

Psychanalysis, Society and Capitalism

Concerning the political problematic in Freud, four texts become central, namely, *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego* (1921/2001), *The Future of an Illusion* (1927/2004d), *The Uneasiness in Culture* (1929/2004c) and *Why War?* (1933/2004b). In the first one, Freud offers a panorama of the libidinal point of view, of how the social ties and the relationships of groups and masses with the leaders are organized, according with the concept of ideal of the Ego, libido, identification and narcissism. There the bases of a political conception are built, which is later amplified in the second text. In *The Future of an Illusion*, what matters to us is the Freudian conception that the psychic constitution is marked by a relationship of power, such as it appears in the religious experience. The religious replaces the loss of the child's safety supposed in the father, in Oedipus, transferring this same safety to another kind of father, deified. The problem is that this safety holds a price: the submission to the demands made by the other one, supposedly a protector. Rules are followed and the other offers them guarantee and protection (Freud, 1927/2004d). This is a theory of submission of the psychic and unconscious point of view which will resume in the text of *The Uneasiness*.

The Uneasiness in the Culture is Freud's main text about his theory of Culture and the ways of sociability according with the psychoanalytic conceptualization. There a series of fundamental theses of the sociological point of view is present, as wells as the elements which will be crucial as operators of social analyses come forth. He even outlines a prognostic of the Russian Revolution in the light of the

theory of the death drive. What matters to us the most here is that in this text a conception of power and helplessness comes into being.

Freud's somber prognostics about the Russian Revolution refers to the fact that he dealt little with capitalism, although he would discuss the theme at times, as in his text about the *Weltanschauung* (Freud, 1933/2004a). But the Freudian contributions to reflect about the sociability articulated to the problematics of the capitalism did not go unnoticed by his followers, such as the group of the so-called Freudomarxists, Bernfeld, Fenichel, Reich e Fromm, marked, including, by the denouement of World War II and its consequences. The theorizing where the psychoanalysts seek to build tools which serve as operators to think not only the society and culture become frequent, but the capitalist mode of production. The political dimension many times silenced in psychoanalysis comes forth. Debates about the relevance of this discussion - not without controversy - take place in the psychoanalytical field itself. Excluding the presence of politics in the clinic, in the social analysis or in the analysis of institutions, including the psychoanalytical institutions, had consequences to psychoanalysis. The arguments for this exclusion are that psychoanalysis has no theoretical resources for such analysis, what we have already contested above, or that the comprehensiveness of the term culture is exclusive to the field of arts, what we have started to discuss.

In *The Future of an Illusion*, Freud (1927/2004d) expresses his refusal to distinguish *Kultur* (culture) from *Zivilisation* (civilization). Such refusal indicates one of the creator of psychoanalysis's fundamental positioning, whose sense is clarified by Mezan(1997):

Traditionally the terms culture and civilization oppose each other, this one designating the material dimension of social life (production of goods essential to the group's survival) and that one the spiritual dimension, which manifests in religion, in art, in science, in philosophy, just as in other big cultural formation. By refusing to ratify this artificial division, Freud understands how to situate himself in a perspective in which they articulate each other, for together they constitute the index which differentiates man from animals (p. 482-3).

Descriptively, 'both aspects' of civilization, the social organization and the universe of collective representations, appear as different, but, in reality, are intimately related. That is, the way in which man organizes their social life, the manner in which they produce goods to live, all that is articulated to the form in which they represent themselves and others.

It will be in overcoming the dichotomy between social and psychic and in the refusal to pathologize certain psychic processes that Freud advances in the proposition of construction of a new field of knowledge. An example of how such conceptions articulate with each other in a very particular way is when the author risk to talk about the war without limiting himself to relate the matter "to the impulses" of one only subject, like Einstein's invitation suggests in *Why War?* He debates the theme as a matter which reflects both every man's drives, and the politics of a State (Freud, 1933/2004b, pp.187-198).

We highlight these moments, among other ones of Freud's work, to demonstrate that the articulation between subject and society is part of the theoretical and clinical web of psychanalysis. We consider, with Plon (1999), that, despite Freud's oscillations as to the relevance of these analyses, he aimed, on the one hand, to develop obscure points in his theory and, on the other hand, to witness his knowledge of epistemological irreducibility of Psychoanalysis to other sciences, as also, to avoid restrict its scope.

Lacan

All denotes that these same positions are supported by the post-Freudian theorists, and especially by Lacan. Roudinesco (1994) highlights three devices used by Lacan in his review of society, distributed in the records of the symbolic, imaginary and real: the oedipal myth, as the founder of modern societies; the function of identification, as present in *Group Psychology*, for an analysis of the formation of the groups, institutions and societies; ultimately, in this century, the advent of the *subject of science*, fundamental phenomenon, according to Lacan, whose irruption was evidenced in the Nazism.

Succinctly, we can understand that Lacan advances in this sense when he indicates to us that the subject is the effect of the signifier and of the symbolic field. In a sense, he places us before the care

not to alienate ourselves, as psychoanalysts, in what is inserted in the social-historic context. In *The Function and field of speech and language in Psychoanalysis*, Lacan (1953/1998) tells us: "How could your being make the axis of so many lives, who knew nothing of the dialectic which compromises them with these lives in a symbolic movement?" (p.322). It is therefore necessary to attend the subjectivity of your time or that "one knows well the spiral to which your era drags them to in Babel's continuous work, and that one knows their function of interpreter in the discord of languages"(p. 322). To him, "the unconscious is the part of the concrete discourse, as transindividual, which misses at the subject's disposition to reestablish the continuity of their conscious discourse" (p. 260). Thus, there is an extrapolation of the concept of discourse beyond speech, something which would come not only from the subject, but also from the social. In this text, the idea of *discourse* is treated as something which influences both the subject's psychic economy (his fantasy, his desire and the formations of his unconscious), and the relationship with the other subjects.

In *Proposition of 9 October 1967*, he names psychoanalysis in extension "everything which summarizes the function of our School as presenter of the psychoanalysis in the world" (Lacan, 1967/2003a, p.251) and of psychoanalysis in intension" the didactic, as not doing more than preparing operators for it". In 1971, in *The Founding Act*, Lacan(1971/2003b) highlights the importance necessary to articulate psychoanalysis and related sciences. He emphasizes the possibility of exchanges between the fields of knowledge, both with regard to some sciences serving to the clarification of psychoanalysis, and in what psychoanalysis can serve as a complementary inspiration to these same sciences.

Therefore, the discourse can be considered correspondent to what enables the social tie and what takes place in the field of language. After all, the unconscious being structured as a language, just as Lacan conceptualizes in 1953, we can say that the consequence is that the social tie would also be. Thus, the logic of the signifier orders both the subject and the relationship between subjects, i.e., the social.

In the seminar *Psychoanalysis Inside Out*, Lacan (1970/1996a) starts prioritizing the definition of discourses as apparatuses of language which structure the field of enjoyment. The social ties are discursive ties which concern the subject's relationship with his peers, with the Other one and with his enjoyment. That is, it is about including what escapes from the specularization, what escapes from the intersubjectivity in the relationship between subjects. These modalities of discursive tie articulate to the three impossibilities already pointed out before by Freud: to govern, to educate and to psychoanalyze. To them, Lacan adds a fourth one: an impossible complementarity in the sexual relations between men and women, evidenced by the hysterics.

The intended position of subversion of psychoanalysis is not something intrinsic to his theory or to his clinic and thereupon it requires constant reflection about its social and political implications. Psychoanalysis was a transgressor science by listening as suffering, and not as madness, the hysterical symptoms of the women who at the time encountered their final destination at the madhouses. It had, for that, to confront its discourse with the moral and scientific discourses predominant at the time. We understand that continuing to confront the current discourses is essential. Nevertheless, this path will only be legitimate if we make use of the resources of psychoanalysis and, to read these discourses critically, we start from the listening and interpellation of those who we find in health, assistance or justice institutions, in the streets and in marginalized communities. From these margins, we think it is possible to continue advancing in psychoanalysis.

Parte 2- The sociopolitical suffering and the psychoanalytical clinic

In the first part, we highlighted briefly Freud's and Lacan's orientations on the articulation of psychoanalysis with the sociopolitical dimension and mapped some conceptions of what is meant by social dimension in psychoanalysis. In this part we will point out the unfolding of these conceptions in the psychoanalytical clinic.

The political-clinic

Working on the matters concerning psychoanalytical interventions resulting from such elaborations, although it seems fundamental to us, is not always consummated. We think it is indispensable to situate the acknowledgement of the clinic in its political aspect, acknowledging the politics where the clinic takes place.

As Caterina Koltai (2012) reminds us, the Lacanian conception that *the unconscious is social* would have permitted to explicit even more what already was in the Freudian text; that is, that the subject is, by definition, marked by History, and cannot be thought about only according to the relationship with his parents. The author defends that psychoanalysis is not only some therapeutics of the subject, but a theorization of his relationship with the world, what makes the social transformations interest both psychoanalytical theory and its practice (Koltai, 2012).

Since Freud it has been known that psychoanalysis deals with the tense relationship between individual and society. It is about rescuing the radicality of the psychoanalytical proposal and highlighting the ethical and political character of this listening, bringing contributions to the clinic and elucidating aspects concerning the subject under social and discursive helplessness (Rosa, 2002). Under this perspectiva it is necessary to think, on the one hand, about the forms of alienation of the subject which is situated on the edges of the social operation and, on the other hand, in the psychoanalyst's ethical-political impasse in this scene, that is, how he positions himself in the political scene which produces the social inequality (Alencar, 2011).

We locate here the crux of the psychoanalyst's resistance to the listening of the subject. This listening bumps into the horror of the confrontation with the stranger [*Unheimlich*], such as thematized by Freud (1919/2006), like the encounter with something strangely familiar to and known by the subject himself, who have alienated himself for the repression. The effect of estrangement is provoked when the repressed one returns and his presence makes itself aware by the affection of anguish [*Angst*]. Confronted with his own ghostly structure and with the impasses against suffering of sociopolitical origin, he survives the analyst's resistance, just as pointed out by Rosa (2002):

Taking this other one as a subject of desire, crossed by the unconscious and confronted with situations of extreme helplessness, pain and humiliation, situations generated by the social order which the psychoanalyst enjoys – raising the repression is what promotes the social distance and allows us to get along, joyful, deaf, indifferent or paranoid, with the other miserable one.... In these situations, the listening supposes to break the pact of silence of the social group which we belong to and which we benefit from; benefit which supposes the innocence, the ignorance about the determinations of the other one's misery and the reflection about the equality among men, when, in fact, what we do is to exclude them (p. 44).

This interweaving of the psychic and the social, as well as the analyst's position, propitiates the condition of listening of these people. We understand that it is political-clinic, for it approaches two faces: the subject's face in the sociopolitical context and the one of the questioning of the ethics of this context which does not only generate a symptom, but also the subjective deterrent disarticulation of the construction of the symptom.

It can be said that the psychoanalyst listens to the subject when he does not confuse him with the manner, many times degraded, in which he is presented in the social tie. Tie, in this case, marked by prejudices of class, race, gender and culture. Such prejudices take to suffering beyond the pain of existing, or the neurotic or psychotic ailments. Still, these prejudices cast the subject to the discursive helplessness, as we will see next.

Sociopolitical suffering and discursive helplessness: the wiles of power and the structural alienation to the discourse of the Other

The psychoanalytical interventions developed with subjects submitted to violence in its several forms (social exclusion, poverty, racism, indifference, humiliation, forced immigration, exile) refer to the social, political and cultural setting in which the subjects are constituted and from which they suffer the

incidences. Incidences present both in the constitution of the subject and in the political strategies of destitution of the subject. In this scenario, not all pay the same price for the civilization.

In the psychoanalytic perspective, the social ties have their foundation in the language which inaugurates the man's entrance into the culture and refers to the man's and the civilization's constitutive condition. From this point on they are discursive ties (Lacan, 1964/1996b), that is, they materialize in the ways of relationship in a given time and place. Ties which insert the subject simultaneously in the relational, affective, libidinal game and also in the political game, ruling the construction of each one's history, inserted in the discursive field of his time. The speeches which propagate in a given time indicate the possible ways of belonging to each subject, assigning, to each one, values, places and positions in the tie.

The thesis developed by Rosa (2016) is that these speeches seek to parallel the symbolic field of culture and language, naturalizing these attributions and avoiding giving visibility to the social and political feuds present in its base. The invisibility of the conflicts generated in and by the social tie reflects on the subject, individualizing his impasses, pathologizing or criminalizing his outings.

The alienating effects are based on the sustention of a misconception in the social relationship, in the relationship with the other, who authorizes the veracity and relevance of what is said about the subject. We refer here to the power which instances like the legal, religious or political power have to legitimize or to negate the experience and each one's testimony. As Cerrutti&Rosa(2008) clarify, the legal field establishes defined positions – many times defining victims and guilty ones *a priori* – in a speech which operates in the grammar of the record of the imaginary, in which the words are treated as image and thereby fixed in an absolute certainty. By supposing that it holds the necessary tools for the subject to achieve his well-being, the legal discourse ends up excluding the enigmatic character of the desire. And this for its conduct to be in the corollary of an ideal ego, i.e., corollary of this other imaginary.

This social discourse is presented as an emissary of an unhistorical and apolitical truth and value. Notwithstanding it is loaded with political and economic interests, based on the maintenance of specific social order which it represents. The predominant social discourse in the present days is the one regarding the market law, governed by an obscene voracity and interested in the sociopolitical maintenance, and converted in social practices and in public policy.

Well, the alienating misconception which provokes is to introduce oneself as if it were *the discourse of the Other*. This discourse, composed in the field of language by the set of the signifiers, could host several significations, interpretations of reality, versions of society, values and include its desire and singularity in the subject (Rosa, 2016). The social discourse intends, to increase its efficiency, to overlay the *real*, introducing itself to the subject as Another consistent/not-castrated one, without space for the enigma, for the singularity, for the polysemy of the word. With the potency acquired by passing itself off as *the discourse of the Other* and by its pretentious symbolic dimension, the social discourse captures the subject in its mesh, whether in the subjective constitution, or in the circumstances which promote the subjective destitution.

Presented as *the discourse of the Other*, a hegemonic and universalized discourse dislodges the subject from his personal, sociocultural and political history, removing him from his discursive place, the place from which he speaks. We verify the deletion of the discursive strength of those who are submitted to the social hegemonic discourse. Along with social helplessness we encounter the *discursive helplessness* to which those who occupy a place of waste in the social field are cast and upon whom alienating and identity discourses which criminalize and pathologize them fall.

Helplessness [*Hilflosigkeit*], in Freud, gains centrality in the second theory of anguish, in the *Conference XXXII, Anguish and Drive Life* (1933/2004a), where it articulates with anguish and with the dimension of the traumatic. The concept deals with the subjects structuring experience, related to the absence or lack of support, concerning primarily to the beginnings of human existence. The baby - for its organic and psychic immaturity - is entirely dependent on the care of others and incapable of surviving alone, what causes the subject's entrance in the language by way of the desire of the Other. In his constitution, the subject weaves edges around the real, woven from the desire of the Other and of the transmission of the culture by means of the language. Edges which protect from the anguish and from the trauma. But the mark of the helplessness is always present referring to the tragic dimension of

existence, to the structural emptiness which inhabits the subject, to the real of his lack of being and it becomes evident when the symbolic coordinates which sustain the subject are removed. The traumatic dimension refers to that experienced one as an excess of tension coming from the exterior, along with the subject's lack of resource to respond to such excess.

Besides this dimension of the subject's constitution, the political and social violence and exclusion characterize situations of precariousness and sociopolitical unprotectedness. Mário Pujó (2000) names *de* the embrittlement of discursive structures which give support to the social ties *discursive helplessness*; ties which rule the circulation of values, ideals and traditions of a culture, guarding the subject from the real. The concept of discursive helplessness is resumed by Miriam Debieux Rosa (2002) to articulate the subject to modalities of social and political discourse which promote his helplessness. When there is disqualification of his discourse, the discursive helplessness is added to the subject's social helplessness, that is, he is entirely blamed for his social-pluri-determined condition. Without possible addressing to the Other, the subject silences himself and is cast to the non-sense and the difficulty to acknowledge himself his suffering, his truth, his place in the social ties and in the discourse. This condition disarticulates the subject from his ghostly fiction, affects his narcissism and refers him to the anguish when facing the helplessness which perpetuates the traumatic condition.

The deletion of the discursive strength incurs upon the subject. His suffering is politically, discursively managed, as presented, with repercussion on the narcissism, the identifications, the mourning and such affection as love, hate, ignorance and fault.

A silencing is produced, many times issuing from the narcissistic commotion which the subject casts upon the anguish, to the emptiness and to the constitutive hole which inhabits him. The loss of the identification ties with the equal and the disarticulation of his ghostly fiction are processed. Without place in the discourse, bereft of the polysemic function of the language, the subject sees himself prevented from giving a symbolic outline to the hole, to the *trou* which inhabits him, without being able to build the symptom and a demand (Rosa, 2016).

It is in this sense in which we can talk about a psychoanalytic clinic advised of the incidence of the political discourses which establish relationship of power and of governance over the excluded ones especially devastating. In these circumstances, the clinic encounters one first direction: to separate the subject's structural alienation to the Other's discourse from the alienation to the social and ideological discourse.

This alienation and entanglement can be elucidated by means of historicization of the social ties in certain social groups, what comes about through the retrieval of the memory in and through the shared experience. In this retrieval, psychoanalysis has much to contribute, building or highlighting clinical tactics which address both the subject's desired position and the modalities of resistance to such processes of alienation.

Therefore, it becomes imperative to pay special attention to the processes of production of oblivion and deletion of the memory which, many times, the psychoanalytic community agrees with. In this sense, the silence and the scarcity of psychoanalytic researches about negritude and racism is an emblematic case. Both for the nearly inexistence of research about a theme related to the lives of over 70 million Brazilians with African ascendancy (Munanga, 2004), and for the various modalities of deletion of the few writings about the subjectivity articulated to the racial inequality (Musatti-Braga, 2015).

The psychoanalytic listening and the sociopolitical dimension of suffering

The concern about building a clinic with the helpless subjects from the discursive point of view, to use Pujó's (2000) or de Rosa's (2002) words, proves indispensable, particularly in a country ruled by social and racial inequality as ours is. Although such concern is very far from having constituted itself as predominant in Brazilian psychoanalysis, it has been supported by some groups of psychoanalysts. But its advancement has been leveraged by the institutional psychology according with the reflections of the psychiatric reform which presented the clinical-political modality which advanced in the direction of the subject's circulation in the city, at his singular manner.

One of the important debates in psychoanalysis in this field was promoted by the group *Sexto Lobo (Sixth Wolf)*, about what it called *clinic of the social*, which aimed to create conditions for those who intended to intervene discursively in the social symptom, in keeping with the ethics of psychoanalysis. In 1989, the group held its first meeting at the clinic of psychological care at the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul (Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul) and presented this consign, resulting in an issue of paramount importance in which the possibility of a *clinical intervention* which would be compatible with the ethics of psychoanalysis in the approach of the *social symptom* was defended.

In this issue the group *Sexto Lobo* presents to us the conception of *social symptom* in which it is anchored: "There is no psychoanalysis of the individual and another one 'applied' to the social symptom. For the symptom is always social (...) what we call individual, the singularity, is always the effect of a discursive network, which is the same network as the one of the collective". (Calligaris, 1991, p. 12).

For Souza(1991), the social symptom, as well as the subject's symptom, is supported by a fantasy. Important debates arose about the difficulties of work in this dimension. Although the group has dissolved, the debate has born fruits.

Psychoanalysis has expanded its field of intervention and entered mental health and even general health institutions, managed by the State or by NGOs, and occupied spaces different from private offices, like SUS, SUAS, CAPS and day-hospitals. Differences which are related both with the connection of these institutions to the discourse of public policies of Health, and for caring for another segment of the population. In Brazil, differently from other countries where the use of these services takes place in a wide manner, the public service is associated to impoverished portion of the population who has no access to private services, considered of better quality.

Besides the experiences of psychoanalytical care articulated to the health area, other fields have been opened. The science of psychology is summoned to be articulated with the legal discourse to solve impasses of various sorts, such as the assistance to the families in situations of litigation or violence or other issues like adoption and assistance to institutionalized children. It is also called to intervene with adolescents in conflict with the law and to the educational and criminal impasses in this field. The educational institutions require the psychologist's or the psychoanalyst's knowledge – like educating, teaching, disciplining... Besides, he is required in situations of violence, in natural accidents or the ones generated by public neglect, or, currently in Brazil, in the matter da immigration and asylum. Many experiments of intervention with the communities have been designed in which the governing body is absent – there where the subject's suffering is visible, there the psychologists – many of them psychoanalysts – are.

It has been necessary to advance in the proposition to dare to build a particular manner to make a clinic considering these issues and the patients who presented themselves. Advancing in the theoretical proposition and in the strategic techniques. And the advancement would not be possible without overcoming, as we have already proposed, a dichotomy and a repression: the issue of politics in psychoanalysis.

The cases which are presented to the psychoanalysts in the clinic-politics are different, in several aspects, from those of patients found in the offices. Distinctive, particularly, as to the sociopolitical face of suffering and, at times, as to the lack of a demand of psychoanalytical or even psychological intervention, replaced by apparent objective demands aimed at material scarcity.

In these circumstances, we consider importante to highlight what we understand as *psychoanalysis implicated*: the one which listens to the subject there where only the ways of alienation in which he is captured and entangled by the machinery of power appear initially. The perspective which we present is the one which we maintain in the sphere of the clinic, not being either applied psychoanalysis, or clinic of the social, or psychoanalysis in extension, but a clinic of the subject in the social ties, a clinical-political psychoanalytical practice (Rosa, 2016).

Final considerations

We understand that the psychoanalytical listening of the subjects who occupy place of waste in the social field either by economical exclusion, by ethnic group, by gender, by religion, etc., must consider the effects of the social discourses and the manner in which they operate in the relationships of power

and of governance upon these “excluded ones”. In these circumstances, the direction of the listening will be to separate the subject's structural alienation from the Other's discourse, from alienation to the social and ideological discourse. Thus, it builds or highlights clinical tactics which refer both to the desiring position and to the modalities of resistance to such processes of alienation. Among the effects of these discourses is the discursive helplessness and the loss of the identification ties with the equal and the disarticulation of his ghostly fiction are processed.

The clinical-political practice encounters the issue of anguish and of mourning in its political face (Alencar, 2011). The anguish in these cases presents itself not as a symptomatic manifestation (case of the neurotic anguish in Freud), neither as an escape, but as a time in which the subject refuses to locate himself and that, for this reason, is linked to the feeling of the uncanny, the Freudian *Unheimlich* (Rosa, 2016). The anguish appears exactly when there is no distance between the unconscious demand and the Other's response. The psychoanalyst operates in the production of this estrangement and in barring the joy of the discourse without holes, even and especially in the cases in which the subject has not built a metaphorical response, a symptom through which he can talk about his suffering and address a demand (Rosa, 2016). The silence, the pain and the lack of a demand are the psychoanalyst's vicissitudes in this clinic.

The possible direction of treatment, its ethics and politics in these circumstances are based on restoring a minimal field of signifiers. This way the subject can locate himself and make sense of his experience of pain, articulating an appeal which withdraws him from the silencing. It is based also on transforming the *traumatic choking* into *shared experience* and on making the construction of the position of witness, transmitter of the culture, of the history of his land possible (Benjamin, 1996; Hassoun, 1996). On the other hand, the direction of the treatment aims to bar the joy contained in the violent and identification discourse, which is presented as symbolical, and to mark the suppression of any participation in this joy.

The clinic summons the analyst to stress, with his foreign presence, the space between statement and enunciation, opening space to the lack and the speech. Notwithstanding, this is a goal and not a starting point. A goal which can be constituted by interventions according to the way in which this subject is inserted in the social ties, in the relationship with the other; according with his discursive position, with the modality of anguish which he presents. Depending on this, sometimes we speak with him, other times we accompany him in the trajectories through the city, other times we look with him for his peers and affective supports, other times we listen to him on the couch.

These are a few among many strategies which aim to cause the rupture of the alienation and enable the subject to redraw a fiction of himself and of the other, in the production of a discursive place which promotes a position of speech. Such strategies of intervention are ways of enlacing a lost word, adrift, for the recomposition of a fictional plot which protects from the difficult presence of the *real*. From this angle, there are situations in which the public space, either on the street or in the institutions, is the privileged place of an analytical work where one can authenticate another position for the subject. The clinical-political psychoanalytical practice requires unconventional interventions and a position of invention of the psychoanalyst in the direction of polysemy of the word.

Concluding, although the symptom is considered social, not always the clinic is political. For it to be that, in our perspective, it is necessary to listen to the subject and to enquire the modality of social ties which entangle him (Martins, 2015).

The issue which is presented to the psychoanalyst refers to being able to sustain the loss of illusion and of the joy of enjoying uncritically the culture received, convinced that it guarantees the protection of all, negating the daily presence of violence. The psychoanalyst of his time is properly prevented about the policies of happiness and about the tricks of joy in intruding uncritically history and the social ties.

References

Alencar, S. L. S. (2011) *A experiência do luto em situação de violência: entre duas mortes* Tese de Doutorado, Faculdade de Psicologia. Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo.

Benjamim, W. (1996). *Magia e técnica, arte e política* (S. P. Rouanet, trad.). São Paulo: Brasiliense.

Calligaris, C. (1991). Liminar. In L. T. Aragão, C. Calligaris, J. F. Costa, & O. Souza. *Clínica do social: ensaios* (pp.9-15). São Paulo: Escuta.

Cerrutti, M. Q., Rosa, M. D. (2008). Em busca de novas abordagens para a violência de gênero: a desconstrução da vítima. *Revista Mal-Estar e Subjetividade*, 8, 1047-1076.

Estevão, I. R. (no prelo). *Sobre a universalidade na psicanálise: um estudo da teoria freudiana do complexo de Édipo*. São Paulo: Ed. Escuta (previsto 2017).

Freud, S. (1997). Tótem y tabu. In *Obras completas* (Vol.13). Buenos Aires: Amorrortu. (Trabalho original publicado em 1913).

Freud, S. (1998). Fragmentos de análisis de un caso de histeria (Dora). In *Obras completas* (Vol. 7). Buenos Aires: Amorrortu. (Trabalho original publicado em 1905).

Freud, S. (2001). Psicología de las masas y análisis del yo. In *Obras completas* (Vol. 18). Buenos Aires: Amorrortu. (Trabalho original publicado em 1921).

Freud, S. (2004a). Nuevas conferencias de introducción al psicoanálisis. In *Obras completas* (Vol. 22). Amorrortu: Buenos Aires. (Trabalho original publicado em 1933).

Freud, S. (2004b). Por qué la guerra? In *Obras completas* (Vol.22). Buenos Aires: Amorrortu. (Trabalho original publicado em 1933).

Freud, S. (2004c). El malestar en la cultura. In *Obras completas* (Vol. 21). Buenos Aires: Amorrortu. (Trabalho original publicado em 1930).

Freud, S. (2004d). El porvenir de una ilusión. In *Obras completas* (Vol. 21). Buenos Aires: Amorrortu. (Trabalho original publicado em 1927).

Freud, S. (2005). La interpretación de los sueños. In *Obras completas* (Vol.4). Buenos Aires: Amorrortu. Trabalho original publicado em 1900).

Freud, S. (2006). Lo Ominoso. In *Obras completas* (Vol.17). Buenos Aires: Amorrortu. Trabalho original publicado em 1919).

Hassoun, J. (1996). *Los contrabandistas de la memoria*. Buenos Aires: Ediciones De La Flor.

Koltai, C. (2012). O inconsciente seria politicamente incorreto? *Reverso*, 34(63), 33-43. Recuperado em 12 de abril, 2016, de http://pepsic.bvsalud.org/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0102-73952012000200004&lng=pt&tlang=pt.

Lacan, J. (1996a). *O seminário 17. O avesso da psicanálise* (A. Roitman, trad.). Rio de Janeiro: Zahar. (Trabalho original publicado em 1970).

Lacan, J. (1996b). *O seminário 11. Os quatro conceitos fundamentais da psicanálise* (M.D. Magno, trad.). Rio de Janeiro: Zahar. (Trabalho original publicado em 1964).

Lacan, J. (1998). Função e campo da fala e da linguagem em psicanálise. In *Escritos*. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Ed.(Trabalho original publicado em 1953).

Lacan, J. (2003a). Proposição de 9 de outubro de 1967. In *Outros Escritos* (V. Ribeiro, trad.). Rio de Janeiro: Zahar. (Trabalho original publicado em 1967).

Lacan, J. (2003b). Ato de fundação. In *Outros escritos* (V. Ribeiro, trad.). Rio de Janeiro: Zahar. (Trabalho original publicado em 1971).

Martins, A. S. (2015). Clínica sem política. *Correio da APPA*. Recuperado de http://www.appa.com.br/correio/edicao/246/clinica_s_em_politica/214. Recuperado em 12 de abril de 2016

Mezan, R. (1997). *Freud, pensador da cultura*. São Paulo: Brasiliense.

Munanga, K. (2004). Psicología e racismo: uma autocrítica necessária. In M. V. Silva (Org.), *Psicología e Direitos Humanos: subjetividade e exclusão* (pp. 89-94). São Paulo: Casa do Psicólogo/Brasília: Conselho Federal de Psicologia.

Musatti-Braga, A. P. (2015). *Os muitos nomes de Silvana: contribuições clínico-políticas da psicanálise sobre mulheres negras*. Tese de Doutorado, Instituto de Psicologia, Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo.

Plon, M. (1999). A face oculta da análise leiga. *Revista Ágora*, 2(1), 91-108.

Pujó, M. (2000). Trauma y desamparo. *Revista Psicoanálisis y el hospital*, 17, 20-29.

Rosa, M. D. (2002). Uma escuta psicanalítica das vidas secas. *Revista Textura*, 2(2), 42-47.

Rosa, M. D. (2016). *Psicanálise, política e cultura: a clínica em face da dimensão sócio-política do sofrimento*. São Paulo: Ed. Escuta/Fapesp.

Roudinesco, E. (1994). *Jacques Lacan: esboço de uma vida, história de um sistema de pensamento* (P. Neves, trad.). São Paulo: Companhia das Letras.

Souza, E. L. A., Tessler, E., & Slavutzky, A. (Eds.) (2001). *A invenção da vida*. Porto Alegre: Artes e Ofícios

Souza, O. (1991). Reflexões sobre a extensão dos conceitos e da prática psicanalítica. In L. T. Aragão, C. Calligaris, J. F. Costa, & O. Souza. *Clínica do social: ensaios* (pp. 75-92). São Paulo: Escuta.

Received: Feb. 10, 2017

Approved: Jul. 03, 2017

Miriam Debieux Rosa: Full Professor of the Institute of Psychology of the Universidade de São Paulo and acts in the Postgraduate Course in Clinical Psychology. Full Professor of the Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo (PUC-SP) at the Postgraduate Course of Social Psychology.

Ivan Ramos Estevão: PhD Professor of the School of Arts, Sciences and Humanities and of the Postgraduate Course in Clinical Psychology in the Universidade de São Paulo. Member of the Lacanian Forum. de Art, in Clinical Psychology at the Universidade de São Paulo, Member of the Laboratory Psychanalysis and Society of the IPUSP.

Ana Paula Musatti Braga: Graduate degree in Psychology at the IPUSP in 1990, Master in Clinical Psychology at the IPUSP in 2001, PhD in Clinical Psychology at the IPUSP in 2016, Member of the Laboratory Psychanalysis and Society of the IPUSP since 2004.