Juan Felipe Arango, AP, MS, DEA Psychoanalysis, Paris 8, is a member of the WAP, NLS, NEL, and LC. He is a member of the council of the LC and its current president. He is also a member of the Board and Faculty of the Center for Research and Development of Psychoanalysis in Florida as well as LOCUS. He has held various positions, such as Treasurer of the Executive Committee and Member of the Council of the NEL and was also Director of the NEL-Miami site. He is the author of various articles and works as a psychoanalyst in his private practice in Miami.

Ignorance: Lack of Knowledge of a Hidden Cause

Ignorance is the most fundamental passion of the three Lacanian passions. Since its beginnings, psychoanalysis has been a practice that goes against the *not wanting to know*. Since Freud, *ignorance* has been a passion to fight against. *Ignorance* is the lack of knowledge of the hidden cause that lies behind each formation of the unconscious. For Freud, the first name for what was ignored was repression. Therefore, the purpose of psychoanalysis since the beginning has been to go in the opposite direction of ignorance.

In Freud, there is a clear opposition between affect and representation. Lacan proposes something different: a knotting relationship. Lacan used the term *passion* to show that there is no representation without the presence of an affect. That's why an analysis is not a simple intellectual adventure of advancing self-knowledge. At the heart of the psychoanalytic experience, there is a knowledge with consequences on the body, an affectation of the living being by working on representations. We are far away from proposing a phlegmatic experience. Hence, to any manifestation of the unconscious, there corresponds a production of a trace, a remainder, a residue, the so-called object *a*. Thus, it's about a saying that has consequences on

the body; it is a work that goes in the opposite direction to the passion of ignorance. Affections are ephemeral, passions are long-lasting.

It is to be expected then that the passions are present in the transference as well. From the installation of the *subject supposed to know* as the support of transference, the germ of ignorance is installed. So, what is a driving force for analytic work is at the same time its deception. It funds the relationship to the analyst, who operates in opposition to what sustains him. One loves or hates the analyst in order to sustain one's own *not wanting to know*, to remain in the realm of ignorance.
For Lacan, *passions* are referred to the passions of being and, therefore, related to the Other. Where the "lack of being" is a suffering due to the operation of the signifier, the belay that remains is the lack of knowledge of that lack through the fiction of the Other. That is why this subtracted object is incessantly attributed to the big Other. Thus, the neurotic suffers from the lack of being.

What is it that the neurotic does not want to know? When Freud describes unconscious processes, he establishes that judgments of value (attribution) precede the judgments of existence, which means that whatever is threatening to the self or is not pleasurable to it, it's then denied. The tendency of the psychic apparatus is to ignore what it does not like.
Recently Marie-Hélène Brousse located love between the imaginary and the symbolic as the ignorance about the desire of the object and, therefore, the fuel of transference. She placed hatred between the imaginary and the real hence real hatred is the hatred of the symbolic since it ignores the castration of the Other. And finally, she placed ignorance between the symbolic and the real.

This implies a certain aversion to the power of the symbolic, that is, a certain rejection of the consequences of being speaking beings. The split subject does not want to know about the opposition between the symbolic and the real. The neurotic doesn't want to pay the price of a choice that led him to consent to the symbolic. So, the neurotic always presents himself as suffering from a contradiction between the subject and his jouissance.
It seems to me that all the passions are forms of ignorance about the real at stake. Love and hate are passions that serve as a resource for not wanting to know about the real of the sexual non rapport, or in a positivizing way, is a way of ignoring the subject's most intimate jouissance.
We can say that the analytic discourse goes against the passion of ignorance because it allows the subject to accede to the separation of the master signifiers that determined him and specify the jouissance that the subject is unaware of.

At the end of analysis, it is no longer about making bonds from the unsatisfactory unawareness of ignorance as a passion. It is about moving forward over our own *not wanting to know* and, also, the not wanting to know of psychoanalysis as a discourse, which invites us to make a careful reading of each era.

In this sense I ask myself: how can we sustain the awakening to which the analytic discourse invites us? What is this new love that Lacan proposes, the one that does not invite us to sleep but to wake up?