

Social bonding and facticity

According to the questions raised for this colloquium, I would like to take a few points to consider.

The current discourses propose particular modalities/methods for the social bond. What is in this point its incidence in the subjectivity? Why would the advances of science linked to the capitalist discourse take us so much as to be detrimental to the singularity of each subject?

Taking this into consideration, I ask myself about what place remains for subjectivity in this context, in relation to the necessary deployment for the constitution of the same and the bonds making. The proposal is to think about how we bond today and why the so-called scientific and technological progress would collaborate or not, in order to silence the subjective.

One of the lines that I understand from these discourses is that they appear at the point of the ideal as "facilitators" of our life and, at these points brought in as questions, they could rather be "obturators".

Mateo arrives at the consultation brought by his parents because in the beginning of his 1^o grade he presents difficulties in the school bond. Specifically, he cannot be left alone at any time, he cannot go to the bathroom alone and he must always have the company of an adult or ... of a screen. This situation, already present in his house and his daily life, had not represented for his parents too much of an obstacle, since it was solved with the company of the television or the cell phone. A screen that looks at him. This worked as a "facilitator" in the family life, to obviate the difficulties of this child, in the process of separation with the signifiers provided by the relationship with his mother. The ghost of the mother, that she could not take her eyes off him and therefore could not remain alone, was articulated with the idea that if she was not present, something bad would happen to him and this was linked to an unresolved duel of his own family history. Thus, this difficulty in Mateo, this sort of impasse in his subjective constitution process, became "covered" or veiled by these devices.

A couple of parents make a consultation for a little girl who, in her kindergarten, performs obscenities, posing problems to the school institution. In the interviews with the mother, the ghost of the "obscene" emerges in the arrival to the world of this girl. It was conceived through in vitro fertilization, considered by the mother, a treatment of manipulation and forcing of the scientific that violated or went against her religious precepts and what she considered the natural, the sacred and the desired in conception. Fertilization treatment did not contemplate this position of the mother on what motherhood was possible for her or that it implied taking this advance of science in her desire for a child.

In what points, these technological proposals would facilitate something for the life of these subjects, what do they really attend?

In Mateo's case, the screen appears to be less problematic for him than other parents, than a peer, than having to deal with other bodies, and with his difficulties and differences in that possible encounter. If he appears in that position, as the object of his mother's enjoyment, what place of Other would the screen occupy?

In this mother who performs an assisted fertilization treatment, what does this treatment assist, what transgressor desire for motherhood that violates her own religious beliefs?

I understand in these clinical situations, which are different from each other, that the scientific-technological proposals appear ideally as a "facilitation", but they are at the service of avoiding self-confrontation, with something unresolved, not processed from subjectivity, which is framed in the different times that each subject has in order to be able to carry out some movements.

Therefore, the supposed facilitators are transformed into obturators. Obturators in the possibilities where a position could emerge and be articulated to a fault, to a division that takes into account the singular desiring way in that bond.

How can we put to work these signifiers that appear static on the plane of naturalization and social idealization? And how to do it, so that these proposals of our times are not presented to us as an exteriority that we must fight, since they are part of our reality.

Lacan says in relation to the effects of the discursive of science and capitalism, that there are effects of foreclosure of the castration into the logic of bonds. According to this, the subject would not turn to the Other in search of knowledge, generated by an enigma, a question, but would find in the discursive, proposals or closed answers, immediate and coagulated in themselves. The subject would find his objects and goods in the market, which would offer him models of universal satisfaction of jouissance, of canned goods.

If these proposals are jouissance facilitators, to what kind of jouissance do they summon us, and to what dimension of the Other do they address?

One of the problems is the appeal and fascination with which these proposals are presented, determined by the spectacular advances in science and by the supposed universal accessibility offered by capitalist consumerism. I wonder how we can make a hole, to hole a possible place for these presentations that the clinic offers us without demonizing these realities.

We know from the malaise in culture that as speaking beings and subject to castration, we have a tendency to naturalize, to consider the discourse as a fact with the consequence of considering it fixed and immutable. This movement is inherent and proper to our structure as subjects, as subjects of social bond, and I understand it is a condition that does not change with the time, only changes its form and its particular incidence. Therefore, we are always going to encounter this considering as a fact and its undesirable effects.

Facticity is the movement that underlies these factual scenes, that beats and is there, eventually showing us - even if we have trouble taking it - the disruptive, the discordant, and the hiatus.

Lacan takes a series of denials from Kant and transforms them into affirmations to explain his concept of facticity.

Kant speaks of a world where there is continuity, rational explanation, and logic, a community of senses, without coincidences, without breaks and without cuts. A homogeneous and predictable world.

Lacan says that, turning these categorizations around, there is unpredictability, there are determinations - unconscious, there are differences, there are breaks, ruptures, tears, oppositions, lack of concordance, jumps, disruptions, disjunctions.

Facticities, then, are configured as what would remain outside and below, so to speak, of the factual, of the evident, the apparent, and of, we could say, the Kantian. They would be the latencies that leave effects that are sustained and that bring consequences. Latencies that leave traces, signs. "This was always so or this can only be so", would be configured as the reverse of facticity, would be the factual.

This concept of facticity, I believe, helps us to understand the bases on which the capitalist discourse and its link with the discourse of science is sustained by itself and by us.

Perhaps in the reading of the differences between the two, between factuality and facticity, one can observe the alternation in what is presented as facilitator and what can an obturator in this discursive link-, as contraposition to what opens to the singularity of the subject and its possibilities of being put into play as such. It is there a possible place to be able to sustain something of what the social bond with others represents, with their differences, their time, and their impossibilities. In its defect, the "obturator facilitator" would be feeding, in its homogenizing logic -once more- effects and mass phenomena, with its inevitable effects of segregation.

The reading of these imbalances, where on the one hand we have the moment and the conjuncture with which each subject can take something from these proposals and on the other hand what they promise and manage to cover or can up, how can it help us think about this type of presentations?

It is not a matter of questioning the use and relationship with the scientific-technological but of locating what is at stake, in this case in Mateo and in this mother, in that particular assistance, which we only see a posteriori in its undesired effects.

Could the reading of these cracks and the bet to set in motion the static factualities that promote these discourses generate other effects in these factual realities?

I thus understand that the dialogue from psychoanalysis with other discourses and with the epoch is essential and that at this point, unavoidable and somewhat complex and challenging.

How can we say and talk about, for example, fertilization treatments, with the possibility and hope that they generate and sustain in relation to something so precious and socially valued as the desires of maternity and paternity?

How can we say and talk about the use of technology in children, without it becoming a mandate of the superego for parents to "protect" them from digital exposure?

We know that understanding ourselves only among a few contributes to the factual and isolates us in our narcissistic bubble. Excessive formalization and the pretense of rigid conceptual purity in this sense would bring us closer to the dominant logic.

A dominant logic of the discourse of science that in its link with the capitalist discourse offers us homogenization and globalization, at the cost of foreclosures, in what happens to us as barred and desiring subjects. From there as a starting point, the challenge of how to open the game to others in the bonding, and to other discourses and disciplines, without losing the episteme and singularity that defines the discourse and praxis of psychoanalysis.

How can we think of a dialogue, a possible bond to others that are different, from a non-segregated and non-homogenizing logic that is therefore not very inviting? And in this diverse bond, how can we think of a desiring and hole-making saying that can be taken from psychoanalysis in extension?

Ana Luisa Perl

Trieb, Institución Psicoanalítica