

Autor: Felisa Josefina Puszkin – Escuela de Psicoanálisis de Tucumán

Título: The Experience of Psychoanalysis

Dispositivo: Plenario

I want to begin by thanking the Committee organization group of this fourth Conference, for their arduous and fruitful work, the one that let us gather here in Bs. As. to work on the different moments, spaces and topics related to the Psychoanalysis Discourse. I also want to thank my partners from the School of Psychoanalysis of Tucumán for choosing me to represent them in this plenary, another instance for discussion and exchange of Psychoanalysis experience.

I think about this question: how can Psychoanalysis add “The” experience? Because this is what all is about, not THE experience of Psychoanalysis but the existence of any. We even know there are many ones in the sense they are countable, they have variations and they naturally have repetitions to this “one” among “others”. They result from the adding operation, how we write it; consider it and make it exist and also how we say it, because that is how it fulfils its duty of being uttered, which is precisely its function, being one or other and being able to be uttered. It is also about adding, actually even more than that; I mean limit, soothe, the experience by taking out that impression of global vision or Great Sum of all the Experience. Also about being The Best, The Only One or The Worst of all, but finding it from another point of view, considering it a function. In other words, taking part of a discursive logic becomes a first step.

The second step is tackling the possibility of this experience, taking part of psychoanalysis itself, that is to say, to be affected by the dimension of the Unconscious. This is a typical condition of Psychoanalysis, and to see if we can get close to its answer, I quote Freud in the opening paragraph of “*The Schism of Self*” in the process of defense in 1938. He says: “ For a moment I find myself in the interesting situation of not knowing if what I am going to communicate, may be either appreciated as something known and evident or as something completely new and surprising; yet I tend to believe it is the latter”.

Well, I consider that paragraph to be the one which establishes the dimension of the Unconscious of the Subject, so much that is about the experience of a schism - repeating the meaning of its own title- and that doubling it in an act, in that moment he says “**he says I do not know**”, he inscribes on terms we could call “*The Discourse Privileged Experience*”.

I say it in this way because it is not only about a simple writing, but about one from which we can make the experience of transmission of a reading experience of the Unconscious.

We can read several things there and we can read them and their lyrics because they are exactly said and written. On the one hand, the surprise, which is a crucial matter regarding the manifestation of the Unconscious, as well as when in therapy, we mention the surprise produced by an interpretation.

On the other hand, we also find repetition. Regarding that question, there are two aspects we could mention: in the choice between what it is known and what it is new, we find the “not known” one.

Finally, a matter of ethic in the analyst's position-function will be present, not for a chance for lore but for the action of a belief and the decision in HIS wish and so he believes that this is not about something evident and known, but new, surprising. He wants to say this and he does so, that is to say he writes so...again.

As regards the repetition and the transmission of that experience, we could think that what we do, is a search for a letter, a different sign and once we have found that phrase, letter or trace it is ordered in a different way, it may proceed by means of equivocation and we reach another reason, not the same one, there remained differentiated by reading and it resounds differently.

Lacan usually says that he talks and repeats himself, but he also says he always says the same things; but that *repeating is different from saying the same thing*. The incidence of repetition in Psychoanalysis experience is something to be taken into

account, as well as the repetition in the construction of that transmission. I will go back to the repetition topic later on.

In Psychoanalysis Institutions, as well as in this Conference, we are saying some things about the experience of Psychoanalysis, namely the transmission of an experience. That experience's bindings, together with the analyst's function, is not something evident but something to be built in the same way institutions are built for reasons, modalities, practices and more devices with Psychoanalysis Discourse.

I want to refer now to what Lacan states in the first meeting at the 20th Seminary, Encore, for it will permit us introduce something to be considered, about Psychoanalysis experience. Lacan seems to have realized that his way was something of the order of "I do not want to know anything about that. This, together with time, is what brings me here 'again' and bring you there; this is still amazing for me!"

Then he says regarding his audience, that they cannot be anywhere else but in the position of the analyzer of his "not wanting to know about" matter.

This allows us to consider that in Psychoanalysis experience, the analyst's wish grows through the Unconscious and that as a consequence of the discourse, that wish is in the intersection between "the unknown" and the resistance of the "not wanting to know about". The question is that it *is* about and at the same time, it is *not* about a general discourse, but as an analyzer of *his* "not wanting to know" and everyone goes through this in his analysis.

In that same paragraph, Lacan states that when somebody considers to have had enough of his analysis of "not wanting to know about that" and when he is one of his analysts, he can detach himself from his analysis.

There is insistence in what I wrote, many "his" in these phrases, thus it is about that *real* everyone can find and that concerns everybody. Yet, in the introduction of the Seminary, there are other affairs that let us say that Lacan is there because some

part of his experience continues in the Seminary...again. Again, Encore is the translation chosen by Rodriguez Ponte.

I am going to refer now to a brief piece of writing by Clarice Lispector, this belongs to a book which is a compilation of some writings for a *Brazilian* diary, and this one I "chose" is called: "*To the Linotypist*".

"Excuse me if I am so mistaken in the typewriter. In the first place, it is because my right hand got burnt. Secondly, I do not know why."

"Now a requirement: do not correct me. Punctuation is phrase's breathing and my phrase breaths like this and if I look strange to you, respect me though. I even obliged myself to do so. Writing is a malediction".

The reason for including these fragments is because there is so much force and estrangement in her words that language can make something sound differently. Not less important is the fact that this was written for a diary, which means something small that has that expiration note and on the other hand it is like the air we differently breathe, every day. Lacan is the one who advises us about the poetic writing, he says it can help the analyst to have the dimension of what might be the analytic interpretation. And even though the recommendation is for the Chinese poetic writing, I believe that Clarice Lispector perfectly insists in and with her writing, something of that is real and that is what I mean when I say "saying, transmitting and making the experience of Psychoanalysis".

In the same intimate and peculiar way, Walter Benjamin wrote some book reviews to be published in a newspaper -coded news that when we say Roberto Calasso they seem to come from a store of old and used stuff- Benjamin says in this book review of *Toy Story*: "Every deep experienced wants it insatiably, it wants the experience and the return of everything to the end, the restoration of an originating situation from where it arose... the game is not only the way to own the terrible experiences originated through mitigation, evil evocation and parody, but it is for tasting the larger intensity as something always new, triumphs and victories... transforming the habit of the most exciting experience: that is the essence of the game".

What Benjamin presents in that paragraph, seems to be hidden somewhere in Freud's "*Beyond the Pleasure Principle*"; repetition is precisely one of the most important issues when something about the experience is said.

So, how should we say, write, transmit, the experience from the analyst's perspective, analyzer and from the practice in Institutions? Are there impasses among any of these places? Lacan answers no, but I think that it is not about falling in the same answer, because the hurry would not let us realize that the response is not the same. Of course that implies a promise of a journey, and this announces a future, one we would better not deny.

Because what it is real is what comes back always to the same place, I think the experience of Psychoanalysis plays the role of a symptom and prefers words like Lacan's in *The Third*, warning us that the sense of that symptom depends on the future of what is real. I said he warns us, about the proliferation of the sense, that sense that join reality and symptom, as something that does not work so well as Clarice's mistaken writings which the linotypist wanted to erase. The truth is that they do not function or they are not functional and "we must get rid of them!" "Oh!" "Get rid of evil!" "Oh!" it sounds like a prayer and so it is, and it is also a prayer from the efficient discourse of Science and Capitalism. Are we warned enough? Each case I have mentioned is not similar to the other one and we may discuss the policy we are going to take about these warnings.

In that way, I think this is about the experience from a work about the discourse, the experience of Psychoanalysis can be formulated as a logic operation about that joining between language and the-speech and that place where we *set our body* so much, but not so much...again