

Corona and the difference between standards and principles

Elisabeth Müllner¹

Corona can create very different effects. In my case, Corona led me to grasp or make out a difference that is not always accessible to me, namely the difference between a standard and a principle.

At the beginning of the second week of March this year, I learned that due to Corona-related travel restrictions, my analysis sessions scheduled for the weekend in Austria could not take place – at least not with physical presence. Three days later I was informed that my trip to see my analyst, which was planned for the following week, was not possible for the same reasons. My analysis – in the sense of “two bodies sharing the same space for a certain time”² – was suspended. In my analysis there had long been the experience of telephone sessions, since traveling from one continent to another was not possible every week, even in times of unlimited travel possibilities, and so analysis sessions with simultaneous physical presence alternated with telephone sessions.

Especially now in this uncanny early period of Corona, in which – for me until then – unimaginable and monstrous things happened, the telephone sessions were an important holding point. Cartels, seminars and similar forms of work were quickly transferred to the digital network.

As far as analytical sessions are concerned, the reaction was – in my perception – very reserved. Here the way must be found carefully, not without being aware of the loss of the speaking body. Can one even speak of analysis if the body with which the analysant speaks and the analyst’s body, in which what is said resonates, are not present at the same time? From the numerous articles that appeared at that time on this subject, certain sentences jumped at me – following my *phantasm*. Such as in the article by Esth la Solano-Suarez, who prefers to be a heretic and opposes the “cybernetic frenzy”³ she has diagnosed. She writes that this is a decision “not to expel the body to body of the analytical session, to oppose the depletion of its *mot rielle* substance to limit the transformation of flesh and blood bodies into glorious bodies”⁴. Absurd, but through this article, I had the feeling of being robbed of my analysis, at least that my analysis would be damaged and degraded. With the possibility of long-term travel restrictions or with only short windows of opportunity to travel and - since some of us here in Austria do our analyses abroad – I felt that the whole development of analytical work in Austria was in danger.

In the Cartel, my consternation and pessimism were not shared. We talked about the difference between standards and principles. In his article *Rappeler la psychanalyse*⁵, Gil Caroz writes that tele. or digital media have their place in analysis, may even be a necessity at the moment. The presence of the body of the analysant and the analyst at the analytical session can be considered as a principle. But if you insist on a principle,

1. Initiative Vienna.

2. J.-A. Miller : « La s ance analytique », *L’hebdo-blog* N° 198.

3. E. Solano-Suarez : « T l -s ance » ?, *L’hebdo-blog* N° 198.

4. *Ibid.*

5. G. Caroz : « Rappeler la psychanalyse », *L’hebdo-blog* N° 198.



it is pressed into a standard⁶. I realized that I had made a technocratic standard out of Solano-Suarez sentences. In the negative wording for me it said: A session via digital or telephone is not an analytical session! In the said Cartel meeting, our plus one mentioned that if he takes Lacan's last teaching with *parlêtre* and body event seriously, there is – in his opinion – no work at the end of an analysis without the simultaneous presence of the bodies of the analysant and the analyst. The end of an analysis, expressed in the *passe*, cannot happen in physical absence, so to speak.

Because everyone hears as he hears, I heard that in the course of an analysis there may be passages in which the simultaneous physical presence can be suspended, but this is not possible for the end of an analysis. And quickly I was back in the fairway again, to make a standard out of it. But regarding the end of analysis, the testimonies of the Analysts of the School (AS) show a large variety of modality of ending one's analysis. No previously fixed standard. Each one follows its proper conditions.

It may happen to me again to make a fixed standard out of a principle that describes an attitude, to which I subject myself and others. Hopefully, talking to colleagues will help to uncover this process quickly.

6. *Ibid.*