

Individual presentation.

Robson de Freitas Pereira

"We only institute the new within functioning - desire and contingency".

Instituting in the functioning is Lacan's phrase enunciated in the *Proposition of October 9/67 - about the psychoanalyst of the school*, when he sought to reorganize the Freudian School of Paris. I quote: "We do not institute the new except in functioning". Perhaps it will help us elaborate the *inter-institutional* experience by recognizing its limits and potentialities with the logic of indestructible desire and contingency.

Indestructible desire. Lacan in 11/13/73 formulates the question whether sustaining the presence of the discovery of the unconscious in culture would not be our reading of the indestructible desire itself as proposed by Freud in the last lines of the *Interpretation of dreams*- as long as we accepted being fools of the unconscious, not fighting against this structure that determines us, trying to be non-foolish, over smart. Because if, hegemonically, we are seeking not to recognize this lack in the language that articulates the desire, we may be headed for the worst.

We have a series of difficulties in the encounter with the others, the different ones. The differences in languages - how far do they promote resistance? Languages have phallic value. To recognize this, and to recognize the differences beyond the phallic value, would be an advance; for we would have a chance to overcome the semblance in favor of the psychoanalyst's discourse effects.

To do this, we would have to face our impulses to transform discourse into jargon and transference into stereotypes. Any institution runs this risk, any movement does too. Questions of how to live together (remembering Roland Barthes) in certain communities. To be up to his time, without giving up the fundamentals; another challenge for Lacan, who is in accordance with Freud when he did not want to give up the value of dreams- nor of sexuality- as he had been advised on his trip to the USA.

The encounter with the other is always a failed, incomplete encounter. It is consistent with the symbolic language that organizes us. It causes fear, anguish, rejection, but also curiosity and the possibility of the emergence of something new.

Here we can point out the dialogue with several strands of knowledge which differs from ours, but that resonate in our listening. A fine example: the ethnography of Yanomami's dreams, made by Hanna Limulja in her book *The desire of others*. The author uses the idea of the Moebius strip to show how the dream, the body and the environment are articulated by native peoples. In another moment (working group) we talked about recursivity: a term used more generally to describe the process of problem solving through fragmentation and repetition of an object. Recursivity as a process of repetition for psychoanalysts implies the recognition of an encounter with the real, and this recognition has its possibility to be effective as a well-saying (*bien-dire*) when it is established from its contingency. Because there is another *jouissance* beyond the phallic. This enables the praxis of an ethics and points to the limits of our knowledge when we fall into isolation. In Seminar XX, (08/05/73), Lacan makes the following statement, "The economy of *jouissance*, here is what is not yet near our fingertips...What we can see about it, from the analytic discourse, is that we may have a small chance of finding something about it by essentially contingent ways."

We achieve something new by contingent means. A function has a space of emptiness that makes possible something that *ceases to be not written* (uninscribed). Hence, instituting in function articulates these dimensions that point to a functioning in the operative sense and, simultaneously, enables the constitution of a space where there is no obligation to quickly establish a sense, or even the recognition of the impossibility of closing the organization in a single sense. That would be ignoring good logic. Finally, if we don't accept being fools of the unconscious, if we want to have control (be non-dupes) and keep resisting to accept this structure that determines us, we will always attempting the madness of total control, or seeking an Other that controls us, be it a scientific, religious, or even totalitarian knowledge. In individual and collective history, examples are countless.

One of them, pointed out by Ailton Krenak in his book *Ideas to postpone the end of the world*: "Our time is expert in creating absences: of the meaning of living in society, of the very meaning of the experience of life. This generates a very great intolerance towards those who are still able to experience the pleasure of being alive, of dancing, of singing. And it's full of little

constellations of people scattered around the world who sing, dance, make it rain." Facing thus, the kind of impulse that summons one not to tolerate so much pleasure, so much fruition of life. "So they preach the end of the world as a possibility to make us give up on our own dreams. And my provocation about postponing the end of the world is exactly to be able to tell one more story. If we can do that, we are postponing the end." This is said by an indigenous leader, of the Crenaque nation who reminds us that 500 years ago the extermination of their nations began.

They do not lose their enthusiasm, despite everything. They are not afraid of the fall; after all, the divided subject appears in the interval, in the fall between signifiers. They invent colorful parachutes. For as the cheers of that English team sing:

"when you walk with hope in your heart/
You'll never walk alone./ walk on, walk on

<https://open.spotify.com/track/7AaIBKBoLDR4UmRYRJpdbj?si=36ee78f6e0a64620>

(4'50")