



Original artwork: Gláucia Nagem – “Falatório 2” / Poster design and artwork: Maurício Simões / Web designer: Ilana Chaia Finger

Prelude 8

A Formation Measured by Ethics

At the end of the text “Allocution on the Psychoses of the Child” [Allocution sur les psychoses de l'enfant]”, when addressing the urgencies of our time and the question of segregation, Lacan speaks about the importance of *Freud “reintroducing our measure into ethics through jouissance.”*¹ This is an ethical orientation, and it is on this point that I would like to offer some considerations in this prelude.

This text seems fundamental for the debates we will have at our upcoming International Meeting precisely because it is one of the texts in which Lacan situates the notion of segregation articulated with the progress of science and raises the question of how we psychoanalysts will respond to this problem of our time². Not only that, it is a communication that takes place shortly after he presented his “Proposition of 9 October 1967 on the Psychoanalyst of the School [Proposition du 9 octobre 1967 sur le psychanalyste

¹ LACAN, J. *Autres écrits*. Editions du Seuil, 2001, pp. 361-371.

² Sidi Askofaré, in his text “Aspects of Segregation [Aspectos da segregação.]”, highlights two strands of segregation: one understood as structural, as a principle of all discourse, and another that deals with segregative practices and their current phenomena — which seems quite important for thinking about the issue of segregation in the intension and extension of psychoanalysis.

Askofaré, S. (2009). Aspectos da segregação. *A Peste*, 1(2), 345–354. <http://revistas.pucsp.br/index.php/apeste/article/view/6287/4621>

de l'École]”³, in which he proposes the device of the Pass in his School, speaks about the formation of analysts, and also returns to this question of segregation, recalling that he himself had been expelled from the IPA. In other words, these indications lead me to think that this *measure* reintroduced by Freud into ethics imposes itself both in relation to prevailing discourses and to the formation of analysts.

In “Television: A Challenge to the Psychoanalytic Establishment [Télévision]”⁴, Lacan states that Ethics is relative to discourse. We know that discourses are what order *jouissance* and regulate the civilizing bonds that produce what Freud so clearly reveals in *Civilization and Its Discontents*. In other words, what makes us human is the very same thing that produces the darkest side of this same humanity. All phallic, speaking, and castrated—this is the universal that makes us subjects, but for this we pay the price of what does not become inscribed: a *jouissance* that lies outside the bond, that resists the norm, produced by this very bond. Thus, segregation is inherent to every discourse that seeks to eliminate what does not become inscribed within it—the different, what resists universalization.

Still in the Allocation text, Lacan remarks that we ran the risk of forgetting that there is an ethics at the base of the field of our function and that our main torment concerned a formation capable of being qualified as human. Why would this be our main torment? Among other reasons, because this formation, although it humanizes us by virtue of language, produces malaise by segregating singular modes of *jouissance*. Indeed, what resists the norm of prevailing discourses if not the very *jouissance* proper to each subject?

How, then, can we confront segregation and take responsibility for a mode of *jouissance* that does not comply with the traps of a universalizing *jouissance* present in the discourse of science, nor with the seduction offered to subjects by the capitalist discourse, which establishes the recovery of an impossible *jouissance* through the objects offered by the market? What can psychoanalysts do in the face of this?

It seems to me that one of Lacan's wagers for dealing with this question was the formation of analysts. Indeed, if we remained bound only to the *jouissance* of the One of the universal of all speaking beings who enjoy meaning, we would have no way of finding another know-how with *jouissance*. Psychoanalysis has to offer this other *measure* that does not serve everyone: the *measure* of each one's singular *jouissance*, always one by one, not universalizable. For this, we must be radically ethical in relation to analytic formation and in the conduction of analyses.

Lacan hoped to be able to verify the passage to analyst at the end of analyses; hence his proposal of the device of the Pass. It does not seem accidental to me that we still maintain the device of the Pass in our School today. We have no guarantee that an analyst will know how to confront the segregation promoted

³ LACAN, J. *Autres écrits*. Editions du Seuil, 2001, pp. 243-260.

⁴ LACAN, J. *Autres écrits*. Editions du Seuil, 2001, pp. 509-546.

by the discourse of the One, but an analysis that reaches its end may be one of the few chances we have to deal with its consequences.

Only then, I believe, can we speak of an analytic formation *measured by* the ethics of psychoanalysis.

Beatriz Oliveira

April 14, 2026