

THE ABSOLUTE DIFFERENCE OF THE DREAM

ABOUT THE REAL UNCONSCIOUS

ANGELINA HARARI



PRÉCIS

The two papers, "The Absolute Difference of the Dream" and "About the Real Unconscious," were written and presented by Angelina Harari for the Clinical Studies Days in New York City held in February 2020. These texts are related to the contemporary Lacanian clinic and its connection to the later Lacan. Harari elucidates that the use of the dream has changed since Freud and the earlier Lacan. She mentions the use of the dream and its attachment to the real unconscious. The dream is taken as an 'interpreter' pointing towards a hole, as opposed to being deciphered by the analyst. Here, the use of the dream is decentered from the Other's discourse, and oriented to the concept of the speaking body and *sinthome*. Harari proposes in the end of the second text that the analyst must renounce the solipsism of the analytic practice, taking into account the trans-individual unconscious and its connections to the real unconscious.

Renata Teixeira

Angelina Harari is a Brazilian psychoanalyst working in São Paulo, Brazil. She is the current president of the World Association of Psychoanalysis (WAP), Analyst Member of the School (AME) of the Escola Brasileira de Psicoanálise and member of the WAP of São Paulo, Brazil. Harari has written numerous articles touching the subject of the contemporary issues of the Lacanian clinic and its practice.

THE ABSOLUTE DIFFERENCE OF THE DREAM

*“I have every right, like Freud, to share my dreams with you. Unlike Freud’s dreams, they are not inspired by the desire to sleep, it’s rather the desire to wake up that stirs me. But, in the end, it is something personal.”*¹

This statement from Lacan serves as the epigraph for the 12th Congress of the WAP and I will use it as a starting point to introduce its theme: “Dream. Its interpretation and use in Lacanian treatment.”² We will start here, with the interpretation of dreams according to the Lacanian orientation.

The desire to sleep and the desire to wake up are two important axes of this work. Is this a return to Freud? Yes! But not because psychoanalysis has once again deviated from its path – such as when Lacan wrote his “Founding Act,” revisiting Freud and sharpening his blade. Yes, I too am returning to Freud, but in order to better guide us to a truly Lacanian viewpoint, from a Lacanian orientation.

Dreams can be interpreted – this was the extraordinary Freudian discovery, the founding step taken by Freud towards the unconscious; it is surprising enough when one thinks about it. Today, our return to the origins of psychoanalysis is, above all, an attempt to shed light on what is specific to current Lacanian treatment regarding dreams. By choosing dreams for its theme, our Congress goes directly to the core of our practice.

In “The Moment to Conclude” Lacan points out that “we spend our time dreaming, we do not only dream when we are asleep.”³ Therefore, we must differentiate waking dreams from *spending our time daydreaming*, as well as from *it being nothing but a Freudian dream* – which is basically the dream as a protection against waking up. Lacan concludes that “everybody is mad; that is to say, everybody is delusional.”⁴ He also said that the unconscious is “precisely the hypothesis that we do not dream only when we are asleep.”⁵ Therefore, there is not only the desire to wake up, in contrast the dream preserves the desire to continue to sleep. [Portanto, não se trata apenas de destacar o desejo de despertar em detrimento do sonho guardião do desejo de dormir.]

Retroactively to the “Freudian Field, Year Zero” which was launched by Jacques-Alain Miller, the subsequent WAP Congress chose as its main theme the Lacanian treatment of the dream from a singular point of view, “The Dream.” Interpretation is a safe way to look at the dream. Instead, ‘*The dream as interpreter*’ prevails over the ‘*Dream interpreted by the analyst*’ during a Lacanian treatment.⁶ Therefore, we are particularly interested in looking closely at the use of the dream in a Lacanian treatment.

Whether it is the dream as interpreter, the interpreted dream, or the navel of the dream, what is at stake is the impossible domain of being. According to Freud, “the core of our being is at the level

1 Lacan, J. “The Third”, *The Lacanian Review*, n° 7, May 2017, p. 99.

2 12th WAP Congress « Dream. Its interpretation and use in Lacanian treatment », Buenos Aires, April 13-17, 2020, information and subscriptions here: <https://congresoamp2020.com/pt/>

3 Lacan, J. « Une pratique de bavardage », *Ornicar ?*, n° 19, 1979, p. 5.

4 Lacan, J. « Journal d’Ornicar ? », *Ornicar ?*, n° 17/18, 1979, p. 278.

5 Lacan, J. « Une pratique de bavardage », op. cit.

6 Brousse, M.-H. Presented at the event « Une soirée de rêve. Vers le XIIe congrès de l’AMP », organized by WAP at ECF, in Paris, January 28th, 2019. Unpublished.

of unconscious desire, and this desire can never be mastered or annulled, but only directed. This is what Lacan was aiming at when describing his practice with the title ‘The Direction of the Treatment...’.⁷ What guides our practice regarding dreams in the treatments that we conduct?

We are interested in the use of dreams, in drawing out another way to confront the dream that would be in line with the direction of the psychoanalytic cure. This would be a way that would be less centered on the Other’s discourse, “untangled from the *slags* inherited from the discourse of the Other.”⁸ Ours is a study about the dream that is not about deciphering but rather leads us towards the hole extracted by Lacan in his last teachings. Jacques-Alain Miller highlights that it is the renunciation of ontology that led Lacan from the *lack of being* to the hole; Lacan went beyond this ontology by announcing his *There is the One [Y’a’d’lun]*, which pertains neither to the order of the *lack of being* nor to being.

This path seems essential. Otherwise, how are dreams in the end of analysis to be understood? Analysands going through the process of the Pass, often describe a concluding dream,⁹ which creates a rupture in relation to the previous material. This has been observed in dreams told by Analysts of the School (AS). The pass is not about one speaking to everybody. “The truth of the pass gives us the key to the deflation of desire, because desire has always been the desire of the Other.”¹⁰ Therefore, dreams of the AS will also play an important role in our next Congress.

In *Seminar 23*, Lacan highlights the term *use*.¹¹ This *use*, that is, the dream’s use value, prompts us to rethink our practice based on what is absolute in the *sinthome* of the One. This orientation is based on the absolute difference of the One. Here we should distance ourselves slightly from Lacan’s teaching in

Seminar 11, where he describes the *absolute difference* in reference to the analyst’s desire.¹²

The later way of using the dream shows how psychoanalysis could be defined as an access to the absolutely singular consistency of the *sinthome*, a *savoir y faire* (a know-how-to-do) with one’s *sinthome*, where, according to Lacan “lies the end of analysis.”¹³ J.-A. Miller highlights two terms in Lacan’s *Seminar 24* about how to work with the *sinthome*: “to know how to untangle it, [to know] how to manipulate it,” in which the expression “to know how to manipulate it” indicates that “the body is a part of the deal.” On this level, it is not a matter of speaking or deciphering, because the *sinthome*, which is considered the most singular thing we have, is “undecipherable.”¹⁴

Based on the absolute difference of the One on our horizon, our biggest challenge is to show, through current Lacanian practice, how we intervene in the dream.

Thus, I wish to say this practice will be an essential part of the next Congress, and a crucial vector for the formation of analysts within the WAP.

Translation: Teresinha N. Meirelles do Prado and Isolda Alvarez
Reviewed edition: Liliana Kruszel and Renata Teixeira
Final edition: Elizabeth Rogers, An Bulkens and Neil Gorman



7 Miller, J.-A. Lacanian Orientation: “The One all alone”, course of May 11th, 2011. Unpublished.

8 Miller, J.-A. « En deçà de l’inconscient », *La Cause du désir*, n° 91, November 2015, p. 103.

9 Cf. Report about Na ECF pass cartel: « Conclusive Report about the A9 Cartel », written by Cottet, S. *Lacanian Option*, n° 60, September 2011, p.74. This issue is about pass procedures at WAP Schools, the accounts of the « passers » and the appointment of the AS.

10 Miller, J.-A. Lacanian Orientation Course: “The One all alone”, op. cit.

11 Lacan, J. *Seminar XXIII The Sinthome*. Edited by Jacques-Alain Miller. Translated by A. R. Price. Ed. Polity, 2016, p. 3. Cf. first chapter, which J.-A. Miller named “The Logical Use of Sinthome”

12 Lacan, J. *Seminar XI The four fundamental concepts of psychoanalysis*. Edited by Jacques-Alain Miller. Translated by Alan Sheridan. Ed. Norton, 1998, p. 276.

13 Lacan, J. « Séminaire XXIV ». *Ornicar?*, n° 12/13, 1977, p. 6.

14 Miller, J.-A., « En deçà de l’inconscient », op. cit., p. 103

ABOUT THE REAL UNCONSCIOUS

In the second portion of my lecture I will return to reading some clues about the real unconscious, based on the theme of the Conferences of the Lacanian Orientation School (EOL is its Spanish abbreviation) held in November 2019. The theme of the real unconscious is also aligned with the theme of the WAP Congress: “Let’s talk about the unconscious - still?,” which introduced an approach in line with the use of the dream.

Talking about the unconscious is a response to a provocation made by Jacques-Alain Miller during his lecture “Habeas Corpus,” in which he claimed that there is a slip of tongue, a Freudian slip, a *lapsus*, in the composite formula “the unconscious and the speaking body”:¹ “...we only occupy ourselves with the speaking body, and have left the unconscious aside. As if the real in the analytical experience stands side-by-side with the notion of a speaking body, yet we must speak about the real unconscious.”

The unconscious also evokes Lacan’s political stance in 1964, year zero of the foundation of the EFP School, during his battle to reestablish the “cutting effect of the Freudian truth”² in view of the deviations adopted by Freud’s followers, whom he called the post-Freudians. The real in his last teaching was Lacan’s response to the traumatism of the Freudian discovery.

Thus, today we can talk about the unconscious in its three dimensions (R-S-I) taking into account

the different moments of Lacan’s teachings, as described by Juan Felipe Arango in the argument of the CSD13. We are also interested in the way in which *jouissance* approaches the unconscious from the viewpoint of the real, which is what J.-A. Miller recovered from Lacan’s text:

“It should be noted that psychoanalysis has changed, since it has ex-sisted. Invented by a solitary incontestable theoretician of the unconscious, which is not what one imagines it to be. The unconscious, I would say, is real, it is now practiced in pairs.”³

The teachings of Lacan and the various events in the WAP community, including Pipol 9, “The Brain and the Unconscious: Nothing in Common,” have offered us an interpretation of the unconscious in relation to a possible, or not possible, intersection with the brain. From a psychoanalytical perspective, the subject of the unconscious in its real status imposed itself in several lectures during that event, in line with Lacan’s insistence on showing that by being devoid of any laws, the unconscious does not respond to the law of scientific regularity.⁴

The establishment of a distinction between the trans-ferential unconscious and the real unconscious has led to questions about the unconscious in analytical practice. This trajectory goes from the unconscious as a combinatory network to the unconscious as an evanescent emergence.

1 Remarks by J.-A. Miller at the closing of the 10th World Association of Psychoanalysis: The speaking body. On the unconscious in the 21st Century, Rio de Janeiro, April 25-28, 2016. Cf. Miller, J.-A. (August 2016). “Habeas corpus”. *Lacanian Option*, (73): 31. (An English translation can be found in *The Lacanian Review*, Issue 03/Spring, p. 94)

2 Lacan, J. (2003). “Foundation Act” (1964). In *Other writings. Ibidem*, p.235. (English version could be found at <http://www.amp-nls.org/page/gb/59/fouding-act>)

3 Lacan, J. (1998). Seminar XI The four fundamental concepts of psychoanalysis. *Edited by Jacques-Alain Miller. Translated by Alan Sheridan. Ed. Norton*, 1998, p. vii

4 Cf. Guéguen, P-G “L’inconscient réel ou neuroscience: un choix crucial in : *Mental* número 40.

We can also use a reference from *Seminar 11*. Even though this should be read retroactively from the fundamentals of psychoanalysis, it should also be considered in regard to the pass as based on a proposition made by Lacan to the members in 1967. This was Miller's proposal in "The Life of Lacan"⁵ when he underlined the idea that the function of discourse is attached to the function of *jouissance*. Thus, in retrospect, with the "Proposition of 1967," which is combined with the "Italian Note," we can identify in *Seminar 11* the mention of *jouissance* as beyond the Freudian concept of the drive. The "Proposition of 1967" makes it clear that Lacan intended to go beyond the Freudian concept of the unconscious.

The same occurs with the concept of the Subject Supposed to Know, in the matheme of transference, which assigns a new status to the concept of the unconscious. In his essay "The Misunderstanding of the Subject Supposed to Know" Lacan states that the unconscious is not tied to the Freudian notion of the term. He insists on the Subject Supposed to Know as a definition for the unconscious itself to which he remains faithful until the very end of his teaching and which allows us to understand the real status of the unconscious.

Thanks to J.-A. Miller's proposals about Lacan's last teachings in his Lacanian Orientation Course, we can openly talk about the real unconscious by showing that the status of the unconscious can only be real, insofar as it is lawless. Since 2001 Jacques-Alain Miller has been promoting what he calls "the famous real without a law," which is not only a real outside meaning but also a real outside knowledge. Miller highlights this in "The Purloined Letter," where one finds an absence of regularity between one action and another. Then, Lacan finds the topology of the knots when he states, "when we take the separation between knowledge and the real to its extreme, not even the unconscious comes out unscathed."⁶

Prior to "the famous real without law," in 1988, while making his defense against the real, J.-A. Miller points out, "Understanding the unconscious in relation to the real is different from understanding it in relation to the Other's discourse. In its relationship to the real, the unconscious is pure soliloquy, as in talking to oneself, a semblant, in order to defend oneself against the real. We have defined the analysand as one who agrees to receive from a psychoanalyst something that will shake his defense. This soliloquy, defense, has to admit and consent to something that will disrupt it." ("The experience of the real in the analytical treatment," Class of November 25th, 1988.) Jacques-Alain Miller's orientation provides two crucial positions in relation to the real: madness and mental debility. According to the Lacanian orientation, dismantling the defense, disarranging the defense against the real is what the analytical treatment is based on.

In "My Teaching," Lacan proposes that "the language apparatus is there somewhere in the brain like a spider. It has a hold."⁷ Lacan does not discard language nor the semantic resonances that it introduces in the body. The spider metaphor shows that language is neither apprehensible nor apprehended, it functions as a parasite in human beings: "The relationship between the language organ and the speaking being is a metaphor. There is also the *stabilitat* implying that the speaking being is parasitized, inhabited, presumably affected by a hit of the real."⁸

THE UNCONSCIOUS AFTER THE SIGNIFIER

The signifier "year zero," as a quilting point, offered an interpretation for the subjectivity of the time of the year 2017 by designating its coherence. An interpretation is a signifier that percusses and makes waves by touching the fundamentals of the analytical discourse taken as a social bond.⁹

5 Miller, J.-A. [12/06/2010]. "The Life of Lacan", lesson 13th

6 Miller, J.-A. "The place and the ties" (lesson January 24, 2001, from the Lacanian Orientation Course). *Lacanian Option*, (34): 13.

7 Lacan, J. (2006). *Meu ensino* (1967). Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, p.42. (English version available Lacan, J. (2009) *My Teaching*. Translated by David Macey, Preface by Jacques-Alain Miller, Ed. Verso)

8 Lacan, J. (2003). "O Aturdido" (1972). *In Outros escritos*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, p.477 [FR: 476]

9 Miller, J.-A. ("Quilting Point" in: Lacanian Option 79 course, of June 24th, 2017, p.23).

The subjectivity of a time can be designated according to Lacan, because subjectivity is trans-individual. “Its field refers to a concrete discourse, the field of the subject’s trans-individual reality.”¹⁰

In her guidelines for the WAP Congress website, Christiane Alberti describes the concrete nature of the dream that appears when we experience, in a paradoxical manner, a limit to interpretation. Rather than dreams that act out the fundamental fantasy, Alberti is referring to those dreams that appear from *nowhere and anywhere*.¹¹

Concrete discourse is on the one hand trans-individual subjectivity. On the other hand, as in the latter case (“dreams that appear from *nowhere and anywhere*”) it is exemplified by J.-A. Miller with the sophism of the three prisoners: Three individuals who by being connected and tied to each other create a ‘prisoner-subjectivity’ in addition to being prisoners of their own time in order to exit the imprisonment. Based on this sophism, Jacques-Alain Miller points out that the School itself can become a subject, as it constitutes a common dialectic in which the individual subjects are engaged. The step taken in 2017 was qualified by the Sartrean term “engaging oneself.”

The “year zero” has engaged us with an approach that focuses on the unconscious in politics. This has led to the idea of a “trans-individual unconscious,” an unconscious that causes the analyst to exit the sphere of solipsism in order to insert the unconscious into the city. As a result we must articulate this trans-individual unconscious with the real unconscious.

Translation: Teresinha N. Meirelles do Prado and Isolda Alvarez
Reviewed translation: Liliana Kruszel and Renata Teixeira
Final edition: Elizabeth Rogers, An Bulkens and Neil Gorman



10 J.-A. Miller highlights Lacan’s phrase in *Écrits*, p.259 in “Quilting Point” quilting point”, p.34.

11 Alberti, C. « Rien de plus concret que le rêve, son usage, son interprétation » Retrieved from : https://congresoamp2020.com/en/articulos.php?sec=el-tema&sub=textos-de-orientacion&file=el-tema/textos-de-orientacion/20-02-07_rien-de-plus-concret-que-le-reve.html



The LC EXPRESS is produced and distributed by

LACANIAN COMPASS

Liliana Kruszel, *Editor*

Pierre-Gilles Guéguen, *Advisor*

Robert Buck, *Designer and Art Editor*

Image: *L'Araignée souriante (The Smiling Spider)*, Odilon Redon, 1887

The Lacanian Compass is an associated group of the New Lacanian School (NLS) dedicated to the development and promotion of the Lacanian Orientation of Psychoanalysis in the United States, psychoanalysis as first described by Sigmund Freud and further elaborated by Jacques Lacan and Jacques-Alain Miller.

To subscribe to Lacanian Compass, fill out the subscription form on the 'contact' page of lacaniancompass.com

For more information and to access the archive, visit lacaniancompass.com



LACANIAN COMPASS

