

Autor: Domingo Villarrubia Norri – Escuela de Psicoanálisis de Tucumán

Título: L'Expérience de la Psychanalyse Et convergence

Dispositivo: Mesas Simultáneas de Trabajos Libres

The experience of Psychoanalysis and Convergence

This paper develops from an inner question generated after working in convergence in the Liaison Commission in Tucuman (Comisión de Enlace de Tucumán). During those two years of work, we were wondering how the idea of convergence is transmitted, how a greater participation is achieved and how the experience of psychoanalysis is brought into play, core of the congress where we are participating today. More specifically, I wonder how convergence is transmitted to young analysts (young people concerned with the discourse of psychoanalysis).

I will endeavour to search for some elements in order to ponder on the questions.

Among the objectives in the Convergence founding act of 1998, we find increasing and encouraging bonds between analysts and also promoting an interchange and a discussion between them; different from its last objective: the creation of a hierarchical bond.

The above-mentioned act states that: "convergence will sanction in act the principle of plurality of heterogeneous bonds between analysts"

In that sense, we could think of the analysts who have a wider experience, those who took part in the founding of convergence and who have been involved in this movement longer, as the ones in charge of forging those bonds in a non-hierarchical manner. That is to say, to transmit the idea of convergence to the young analysts.

But when we talk about more experienced analysts, what are we talking about? What kind of experience? Let us think about different meanings of the term.

When we talk about experience, we usually think about the profession or trade expert. The worker whose years of labour have left a mark on his hands; we think about the knowledge he has of his work. He is the one that will have to pass his knowledge on his apprentices, based on the sum of positive results.

Karl Popper recounts an experience he went through with Adler, and he says: I informed him about a case which did not seem particularly adlerian, but he did not encounter any difficulty in analysing it in terms of his inferiority feelings theory, even though he had not even seen the boy. I was taken aback by his answer and I asked him how he could be so positive. "Because of my experience based on a thousand cases", he answered. I could not help replying: "and with this new case, I guess your experience is now based on one thousand and one cases" – Karl Popper.

We find ourselves with the issue of the experience of analysis. The problem we face is that of characterizing it as experience, in the sense of life experience as an event that can be told, because this experience is not instructor style, whose experience helps to position himself in a trade.

"...I think about all the patients who, over the last forty years, have lain on the divan. None of them look alike; none of them have the same phobias, the same anguishes, the same way of telling, and the same fear of not understanding." (Jacques Lacan-Writings II)

The reason for this difficulty is based on this paradoxical praxis which poses a logical impossibility to describe analysts as experienced, due to the fact that in every cure, the psychoanalysis is reinvented; it is always a new saying for which the analyst is never forewarned...how can we account for it in the transmission?

Practice is not transmissible from the theoretical knowledge. Even though practice does not exist without previous concepts, it is not the application of a theory either. Theory advances over the experience of analysis itself. Practice and theory are not separated since there is an "analizante". It could be said that this experience is not transmitted only by the clinical account; it is also legible in the way in which the clinic of a text is carried out. Experience cannot be appointed constituent of a skill.

Moreover, the good theoretician cannot be assumed to have an everyday practical knowhow. It can only be thoroughly recounted by the analyst or the “analizante” as the experience of a lack (says Eva Lerner)

An impossible transmission without experience remains due to the limits of the language to name the emergence of the subject and due to the immeasurable extent of the analytical act. The experience of interpreting (lectura) the words (letra), renewed every time it fractures because there it leaves an imprint (hace escritura). The real which does not cease to be written.

Nasio will state that on the path that both, analyst and “analizante”, go along, there are moments of rupture, radical moments we call experience.

There are two fundamental acts: the act of accepting to analyse the patient and the act of enunciating the fundamental rule. By means of these, the analyst transmits his own symbolic relationship with psychoanalysis; that is to say, with the history of psychoanalysis, with the writings, the ideals, and even with the analysts’ community, especially, it could be said, with the bonds established with the analysts’ community.

Here we can think of a particular imprint natural to convergence.

But, above all, the experience that the analyst has had in his own analysis is conveyed by means of these two acts.

Every analyst is disposed to something, a singular experience: that of knowing how to perceive outside himself – in an unconscious way – the unconsciousness in the analysis.

Possible conclusion

Let us come back to the founding act (1998) which states:

“...We acknowledge as act the fact that the transference through a text has become nowadays a predominant style in the diffusion of the teaching of Lacan. We are warned, though, about the fact that the transference of the texts can only take place in psychoanalysis as long as its discourse is supported by a enunciation and,

consequently, as long as the knowledge is questioned by the didactic effect of psychoanalysis of each individual".

We could consider transmission as the way through which an individual thinks. The forging of bonds has to do with the discourse of psychoanalysis (in extension); being able to say what you think, favouring the transmission, creating the conditions necessary for this to become true, which is different from being tempted to ensure it, tempted into a master's discourse. Transmission's privileged place is the analysis (in intention).

Why should we, young analysts, wait for experienced analysts to move us into having a greater participation in Convergence?

Some young colleagues found it difficult to present some lines of thought in this congress. It is just that, if among the objectives of convergence we find "convergence will sanction in act the principle of plurality of heterogeneous bonds between analysts..." in a non-hierarchical fashion, then, maybe they should not be labeled as young analysts; analysts (analizantes). The fact that today these questions can be made in Convergence provides an evidence of non-hierarchical bonds.

"Analysts' training and designation remain as a competence of each Convergence Association. Our movement will favour the handling of this paradox" (Founding Act 1998)

Domingo P. Villarrubia Norri