

**THE INTERCONTINENTAL AND BILINGUAL CARTELS OF  
THE SCHOOL**

**FLYING PAPERS OF THE SCHOOL**

**N° 2**

An aperiodic Bulletin of the Intercontinental and Bilingual  
Cartels of the School of the CIOS



EPFCL

December 2022

# CONTENTS

Presentation	3
<b>Dyhalma N. Ávila-López</b> (Puerto Rico), What is left of the body at the end?	4
<b>Luciana Guarreschi</b> (Brazil), When we expect, we don't listen	7
<b>Philippe Madet</b> (France), The new tyranny of knowledge	9
<b>Kristèle Nonnet-Pavois</b> (France), Knowledge in the analytic discourse: a certain ignorance?	11
<b>Juan del Pozo</b> (Spain), The maelström of a psychoanalysis	14

\*\*\*\*

## PRESENTATION

This second issue of the *Flying Papers* of the Cartels of the School of the CIOS (CAOE) 2021-2022 differs from the first issue. It is lighter and results from the invitation made by our CIOS to members of five intercontinental and bilingual cartels to write short texts inspired by the work of their cartel. The Catalogue of Cartels remains available in *Flying Papers* n°1.

In this issue, the authors raise questions that produce a tension between the path taken by each cartel and the theme they have chosen. The following are thus punctuated: the knowledge of the psychoanalyst and the refuse of learned ignorance, the tyranny of knowledge and psychoanalysis in intension, the question of the uniformity of elaborations about the pass, the logical times of the body in the treatment, the passage from the symptom to the sinthome and their different uses of jouissance.

Thus, our CIOS concludes its activities with these five contributions, and remains in expectation of Number 3 coming from the next ICG, and wishing it a warm welcome and good work to come.

We wish you all an enjoyable reading and a happy holiday season.

December 10 2022

Sandra Berta

\*\*\*\*

## What is left of the body... at the end?

Dyhalma N. Ávila-López (Forum of Puerto Rico)

I enthusiastically welcome this call to give an echo of the work in progress in a cartel whose theme is *'The body at the end'*. But, before transmitting something about what the cartel and its questions contribute, I will comment on its composition, taking advantage of the contingency of two equivocations in the Spanish version of the invitation: psychoanalysis in *tension* (for in *intension*) and the translation of the French *provenant* (instead of *de*) as *'decurrent'*, a Botanical term that alludes to the *'limbo'* [blade or edge] of a leaf.

*Limbo*, in Catholic doctrine, refers to the place destined for those who die without baptism, which resonated with a moment of slight tension – evoking the other equivocate – whether the doubt could be 'baptized' as one of the *Intercontinental and Bilingual School*. The doubt, which I left in a certain limbo, was whether the intercontinental character was strictly geographical, since three members belong to Zones of the American dispositive, and one to a Forum of the Anglophone Zone, attached to the dispositive of France but located in the United States.

I usually say that I am in favor of a work of the School oriented by rigor without rigidity and, fortunately, that seems to have been the CAOÉ's [CIOS's] wager as well, by hosting this cartel whose composition pointed to less rigid borders in terms of 'both sides of the Atlantic'. Reflecting our international and multilingual community, the two dispositives of the Guarantee, three Zones,<sup>1</sup> four Forums,<sup>2</sup> three languages,<sup>3</sup> and four nationalities<sup>4</sup> are represented in the cartel.

The themes we are working on are: *(Dis)encounters between the body and the subject of enunciation* (Gabriela Costardi), *The sexual fantasy suspended in the body until puberty* (Liora

---

<sup>1</sup> LAN, LAS, Anglophone.

<sup>2</sup> Colorado, Los Angeles, Mexico, and Puerto Rico.

<sup>3</sup> Spanish, English, and Portuguese.

<sup>4</sup> Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, and Puerto Rico.

Stavchansky), *The experience of the drive after analysis* (Gabriela Zorzutti, Plus-one) and, for my part, *The body and the times of analysis*.

At the moment, we have discussed papers of the First International Meeting of the School in *Wunsch* number 8, as well as testimonies of the pass in number 21. As a result of the discussion, has emerged:

- the question of which body the subject speaks, since he usually arrives at the analysis speaking of the *body-organism* that ails and hurts, of the *body-image* of identifications, of the *fantasmatic body*; but he seems to speak of the *drive-body*, with its marks of jouissance, only if it ‘intrudes into the saying’.
- the realization that, in an analysis, the end depends on the beginning, and the experience ‘gives back a body’ to the analyzand: a drive-body which, by being *hystorized*, can be appropriated and put to a new use, starting from a new relationship with the symptom; a body no longer so much *mortified* by jouissance but *vitalized* by an *incarnated desire*, *vivified* by a new articulation between desire and jouissance.
- the question of the body in the Pass: how we listen to the body in the dispositive; why it seems that in many testimonies ‘the body is missing’; how many analyses lead to the *desire of the analyst* as a possible destination of the drive
- the observation of analytical effects in the *experience of the drive*, after the end of the analysis: what of the *knowledge-without-subject* continues to work in the body, no longer from the trans-ference but from the trans-mission in the dispositives of the School.

As for my question, it is whether there would be, in a clinic that assumes a temporality to the unconscious and sometimes to the analysis, something generalizable in terms of structure, in the analyzing work around the body; whether one could speak of *logical times of the body* in the treatment, in that re-traversal that opens the possibility of a different way of doing with the marks of jouissance that pushes to the re-petition. A transit that implies, among others, crucial movements from:

- the symptom as a *foreign body* to the *analyzing symptom*<sup>5</sup>
- the imaginary and symbolic identifications to the real of the singularity of jouissance

---

<sup>5</sup> Lombardi, G. (2010). *Wunsch* 8, p. 35.

- the division of the subject into the *parlêtre*, the speaking being with its corporeal dimension<sup>6</sup>
- the *corpo-rection* of socialized jouissances to the *corpo-difference* of dissident jouissance<sup>7</sup>
- the *beautiful indifference* to the *sinthome*<sup>8</sup>
- the object of the fantasy and the drive-object, to a ‘denuded’ object; to the *object-cause*, the *object-hole*, and the *being-object*<sup>9</sup>
- the analyzand-body to the *analyst-body*.<sup>10</sup>

Perhaps also, it occurs to me to propose a movement: from – evoking *The Third*<sup>11</sup>– a symptom *nourished* by meaning to one emptied, *de-nourished*; and – alluding to the equivocation of psychoanalysis “in tension” – from the *body-in-tension*<sup>12</sup> to the *body-in-intension*<sup>13</sup>, a body for making a School.

*Translated by Nathaly Ponce*

\*\*\*\*

---

<sup>6</sup> Soler, C. (2019). Los tiempos de los sujetos y del inconsciente. Seminario Escuela F9 Madrid.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>8</sup> Izcovich, L. (2022). El cuerpo: del deseo al goce, *El cuerpo y el tiempo en un psicoanálisis*. Grupo de trabajo Inter-Forums, p. 172.

<sup>9</sup> Soler, C. (2010). *Wunsch* 8.

<sup>10</sup> Rostagnotto, A. (2021). El saber ¿se inventa?, *Wunsch* 21, p. 14.

<sup>11</sup> Lacan, J. (1974). La tercera, *Intervenciones y textos* 2, p. 84. “The Third”, trans. Philip Dravers, *Lacanian Review*, 7, Spring, 2019.

<sup>12</sup> “Estado de un cuerpo sometido a la acción de fuerzas opuestas que lo atraen.” (RAE, *Diccionario de la Lengua Española*).

<sup>13</sup> Lacan, J. *Le séminaire de Jacques Lacan, livre XIX ... ou pire*, 1971-1972, ed. J-A Miller. Paris, Seuil, 2011.

## When we expect, we don't listen

Luciana Guarreschi (FLF Sao Paul, SPFLF-Brazil)

I entered the intercontinental cartel, 'The end of analysis based on readings from the School',<sup>1</sup> with concerns regarding our School's doxa, and how it cuts through both of our School's dispositives, the Pass and the cartel, and the bodies responsible for the functioning of these dispositives. These concerns led me to ask whether we were leaning more towards an orthodoxy or whether we practiced some heterodoxy in the exercise of various functions in our School: as analysts, members of the Secretariat of the Pass, members of the Cartel of the Pass, **what do we expect to hear?** In other words, couldn't we have become too adapted to the series of ritualized statements in our School – revealing some type of tacit consonance – that would hinder our listening, relegating it to the expectation of this same series of statements?

I am aware that there is no "zero degree" of listening, meaning we always start somewhere and, in this sense, it is good to know from where in order to avoid negligence and imprudent positions. In psychoanalysis, per my understanding of Lacanian developments, we start from a position of not knowing. Freud did not put it this way, he just said: listen to each case as if it were the first. It is not an easy task, and it is not by chance that he considers it to be impossible along with governing and educating. We share this statement, but do we practice it in the different bodies of the School? Or do we just follow a certain 'Lacan said' to justify actions we take within these very functions?

Being more specific: could our common reading operators be functioning as moorings? If yes, how? With these questions in mind, I launched myself, along with the cartel, to reading issues of *Wunsch*, an expression of what our School has developed in 20 years. Revisiting these readings, discussing them in another language, following the reasoning of colleagues, was and is fascinating.

However, in this one and a half years, I cannot deny I've noticed a certain uniformity in the texts, maybe just slightly different ways of saying the same thing. If it is true, as the Charter of

---

<sup>1</sup> Members of the cartel: Patrick Barillot, Monica Palacio, Nadine Cordova and Patricia Gavilanes.

Principles states, that we respect the local dimensions, which are moreover very different due to the several languages involved, different historical and cultural paths in psychoanalysis and even outside of it, why did it seem to me that in the issues of *Wunsch* there is a certain uniformity? Would that mean we have found a good way to communicate with each other? Where were the necessary dissonances that come from the articulation between regional psychoanalytic dialects, the singular of each analysis, and a certain international uniformity? Some impertinence must take place in our School, like the figure of the foreigner/stranger in our analyses and in the analyses we conduct.

That led me to revisit Reik, whose ideas on “not understanding too quickly” and the role of surprise in analytic listening Lacan refers to. Reik says it is necessary to have the courage not to understand for the subject of the analysis to be “suddenly confronted with his own thought as if it were a strange thing [...]. As paradoxical as it may seem, we can only know ourselves if we become strange to ourselves”.<sup>2</sup> The consonance in the issues of *Wunsch* signals that it is necessary to give room to the foreign impertinence “as paradoxical as it may seem”.

Following Reik, we don't need to fear desegregations. He tells of an episode with Freud. They are both old, the war has begun and Freud is about to depart for London: “We both knew we would never see each other again. After a handshake, I stayed at the door, incapable of uttering a single word. [...] While I shook my head without answering, he said in a soft but firm voice, as if he wanted to comfort me: “People don't need to stick to each other when walking together”. Reik also says this phrase came to his mind several times: “I repeated it when some analysts expressed the idea that I was being unfaithful to Freud in discovering that certain theories had to be modified in the light of more recent research. [...] Perhaps it would temper the self-esteem of these gentlemen who call themselves ‘Freudians’ to know what Freud said to me with a smile: ‘Moi, je ne suis pas freudiste’ [...]”.<sup>3</sup>

We don't need to always keep expecting Lacanian steps to conceal the fact that we have more things that divide us than unite us, which is not a problem. After all, we don't need to be stuck together to move on.

*Translated by Gabriela Costardi*

---

<sup>2</sup> Reik, Theodor. *Ecouter avec la troisième Oreille*, EPI S.A. Éditeur, Paris, 1976, p. 222.

<sup>3</sup> Idem, p. 467. TN: “Me, I am not Freudian”.

# The New Tyranny of Knowledge

Philippe Madet

Cartel – The new tyranny of knowledge: Cora Aguerre, Spain; David Bernard, France (Plus-One); Philippe Madet, France; Vera Pollo, Brazil; Sara Rodowicz-Sluzarczyk, Poland

Based on the reading of Seminar XVII, our cartel work within the ILPP framework articulates the question of knowledge and its new tyrannies<sup>1</sup> with that of the politics of psychoanalysis. Two subjects that concern psychoanalysis in extension but also in intension.

If it is admitted that extension is linked to intension, there is also reason to wonder about the effects of the types of jouissance, of civilization and particularly of its apprehension of knowledge about analytic discourse.

Lacan presented the analytic discourse as being part of a round of 4. As soon as the analytic discourse is in the round, it is linked to the others, with possible effects of porosity between them. The analytic discourse is not outside of the world, it came to respond to the development of science, to the growing scientific discourse at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, a period concomitant with Freud's first works and the birth of psychoanalysis.

With science, appeared a new knowledge in the real, capable of replacing religion, a heavenly knowledge, that one. Discontent. Psychoanalysis, on the other hand, has exposed the possibility of knowledge lodged in another place: the unknown [*insu*], that is to say, the unconscious.

The status of knowledge or knowledges was therefore modified at the same time by both science and psychoanalysis.

Has our relationship to knowledge changed for all that?

---

<sup>1</sup> As per Lacan's expression in *Seminar XVII, The Other Side of Psychoanalysis*, 1969-1970, trans. R. Grigg, New York and London, W.W. Norton & Company, 2007, p. 32.

Religion, science, or psychoanalysis demonstrate a structural relationship to knowledge. Seeking to know is a constant among speaking beings, even if this search is oriented towards different discourses. A major difference, however, distinguishes them: religion and the science associated with capitalism produce established knowledge to be consumed, while psychoanalysis invents knowledge as an enigma.

Thus, what has changed regardless of the discourse and the evolution of civilization, or what can change, is not our relationship to knowledge but the knowledge to which we relate.

Is the tyranny of knowledge structural? To speak of a new tyranny implies that the latest is not a new one. We can think about this concerning the unconscious: “What you do, knows (*sait*), knows what you are: *knows you!*”<sup>2</sup> The same goes for the signifier which determines the subject and marks it even inside its body.

This is also true at the collective level, religion being the paradigmatic example, with its ability to impose knowledge without worrying about that of its followers.

Capitalism is no longer a new tyranny; we have known its mainsprings for a long time now. It knows that the lack lives in us, it proves it in an even more striking way than psychoanalysis and knows how to tyrannize us with its surplus jouissance.

The new tyranny evoked by Lacan concerns the bureaucracy linked to science by its concern to put in control not the signifiers, vehicles of meaning, but the numbers or the letters of the equations, outside sense. We know, especially in the field of care, how exponential this is.

While religion keeps a part of mystery, held not by the subject but by God, bureaucracy and science try to suppress it. To the truth, they oppose the certainty of all-knowledge. Meanwhile, the subject was subjected, possibly subjugated, the all-knowing de-subjected.

What are the consequences for psychoanalysis in intension?

---

<sup>2</sup> Lacan, J. *The Non-Dupes Err*, unpublished seminar, lesson of December 11<sup>th</sup>, 1973. Translator’s note: As this is a spoken seminar, Lacan spells out the word *sait*; s, a, i, t, likely due to the homophony between ‘knows’ [*sait*] and ‘it is’ [*c’est*]. The punctuation in the quote has been changed accordingly to that of the ALI’s edition of the seminar on p. 45.

Two hypotheses:

- The first can hinder the analysis. If the resort to the analyst remains frequent, the transition to analysis seems more difficult because of the tyranny and the injunction of knowledge, and particularly given the devaluation of signifiers in favor of letters outside sense. The treatment is oriented by the real, but it passes through the signifiers, however misleading they may be. What of psychoanalysis if the equivocal is removed?
- The second, on the contrary, can be an opening. The real updated by all-knowledge could reveal a horror of this knowledge, different from that of psychoanalysis, but such that the passage to analysis could offer a preferable living space, not to disappoint on the analyst's side.

These two hypotheses question, more so, the desire of the analyst and puts it to the test.

*Translated by Diana Correa*

\*\*\*\*

## **Knowledge in the analytic discourse: A certain ignorance?**

**Kristèle Nonnet-Pavois (Paris, SPFLF France)**

Based on reading the presentations Lacan made in the chapel of Sainte-Anne Hospital between November 1971 and June 1972, entitled *The Knowledge of the Psychoanalyst*, and on the *Italian Note*, 1973.<sup>3</sup>

“Everyone knows – many ignore it.”<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> This writing brings together two intercontinental cartels: The Cartel on The Knowledge of the Psychoanalyst (with Anais Bastide, Julieta de Battista, Carole Leymarie, Dominique Touchon-Fingermann), and the Cartel on the Analyst as Product of Analysis and its Link to the School, with reference to the *Italian Note* and the commentary by Colette Soler (with Diego Mautino, Chico Paiva, Claire Parada, Lia Silveira).

<sup>4</sup> Lacan, J. *Talking to Brick Walls* (trans. A. R. Price). Cambridge, UK and Medford, MA: Polity Press, 2017, p. 37.

It is with these words that Lacan begins to speak about the importance he gives to the preliminary interviews in analysis. Yet the phrase quoted above resonates with his introduction to the parallel seminar, a series of discussions he held with psychiatry interns. Indeed, to enter into the question of knowledge [*savoir*], Lacan makes his audience go through ignorance. He begins with ignorance defined as that which is “linked to knowledge. It’s a way of establishing knowledge, of turning it into established knowledge”,<sup>5</sup> that is, a well-installed knowledge. That knowledge, a knowledge which reigns, Lacan puts aside to go towards a different knowledge, that of learned ignorance [*la docte ignorance*] defined by Cardinal Nicolas de Cues for whom knowledge – or truth – is a fixed and inaccessible place. Thus is the unrepresentable represented, the inaccessible approached, here is a knowledge infinitely perfectible for the ignorant, who will be all the more learned [*docte*] the more he knows that he is ignorant; and thus will he approach the ceaselessly elusive truth, there where an Other knows but remains unattainable.

Is this how we approach what pertains to the knowledge of the psychoanalyst?

The place of knowledge is important in the analytic experience because it is necessary to the establishment of the transference, this “love addressed to knowledge”<sup>6</sup> and its treatment. So then, what knowledge – and what ignorance – would it be? For “This in no way authorizes the psychoanalyst to be satisfied in the knowledge that he knows nothing, for what is at issue is what he has come to know ... the unknown is arranged as the framework of knowledge”.<sup>7</sup> Everyone knows established knowledge. Many ignore the unknown knowledge, this “knowledge that is articulated, structured like a language”.<sup>8</sup>

A knowledge of the unknown [*l’insu*]

In particular, to consider in the “babbling and gibbering”,<sup>9</sup> the “gullies of speech...and the gullies of discourse”<sup>10</sup> as productions of knowledge.

---

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., p. 4.

<sup>6</sup> Lacan, J. *Introduction à l’édition allemande des Ecrits, Autres écrits*. Paris: Seuil, 2001, p. 558.

<sup>7</sup> Lacan, J. *Proposition du 9 octobre 1967 sur le psychanalyste de l’École, Autres écrits*, op. cit., p. 249. See Proposition of 9 October 1967 on the Psychoanalyst of the School, in *Analysis* 6, 1995, p. 6.

<sup>8</sup> Lacan, J. *Talking to Brick Walls*, op. cit., p.19.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., p. 83.

<sup>10</sup> Lacan, J. *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan Book XIX, ....or Worse*, trans. A. R. Price, Cambridge, UK and Medford, Ma: Polity Press, p. 60.

By looking “beyond the wall”,<sup>11</sup> beyond sense, which the *objet a* hollows out, this “object utterly foreign to the question of meaning”.<sup>12</sup> By being oriented toward “the real that is signaled precisely by the impossible”.<sup>13</sup>

Stumbling block, absence of a final conclusive word, encounter with an impossible: from this is made the knowledge that an analyst produces to make the analytic discourse function, this “discourse at the palpable frontier between truth and knowledge”.<sup>14</sup> The treatment of the truth in its function in psychoanalysis, truth which can only be half-said through language, leads to producing an unprecedented and singular relation to knowledge, to the desire for knowledge.

Shaking off passionate ignorance, established knowledge, the ‘I don’t want to know anything about it’, yet not holding to the position of the learned ignorant [*doctes ignorants*] wishing not to know the limit of articulated knowledge, then the analyst “*knows that he is reject. This is what the analyst must at least have made him sense*”.<sup>15</sup> This is what Lacan writes, some months after his presentations at the Sainte Anne chapel, to another audience, this time an Italian “tripod”. “*Rejects of learned ignorance*”,<sup>16</sup> to precisely define what constitutes the mark of an analyst. The analyst is not defined by a mastered knowledge, but more by that which remains unthinkable, unrepresentable. And in his Letter, Lacan reformulates it thus: “The analyst houses a different knowledge, in a different place but one which must take into account the knowledge in the real”.<sup>17</sup> Reject of the one who has understood the horror of what he knows, the horror of the castration of the Other. A bar is placed on the Other.

In other words, that there is the knowledge that does not know itself, namely the incompleteness of the knowledge that allows a glimpse of an impossible. The analyst would know a certain ignorance. A knowledge of the psychoanalyst, at once singular and assured, carrier of an “unprecedented desire”.<sup>18</sup>

*Translated by Devra Simiu*

---

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., p. 61.

<sup>12</sup> Lacan, J. *Talking to Brick Wall*, op. cit., p. 87.

<sup>13</sup> Lacan, J. *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan. Book XIX, ....or Worse*, op. cit., pp. 60-61.

<sup>14</sup> Lacan, J. *Talking to Brick Walls*, op.cit., p. 10.

<sup>15</sup> Lacan, J. *Note italienne. Autres écrits*, op.cit., p. 309.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., p. 308.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., p. 309.

## The Maelström of a psychoanalysis

Juan del Pozo (Donostia-San Sebastián, FP of the Basque Country, Spain)

I, and several colleagues from both sides of the Atlantic met around the topic of the end of analysis and its implications, namely, the pass to the analyst, the desire of the analyst, the interventions and effects of the analyst in the final phase of the analysis, the changes in the economy of jouissance of the subject who is transformed by the analysis ... my focus being 'from the symptom to the *sinthome*'. The question about what an Analyst of the School is has led us to investigate based on the texts that have arisen from various testimonies of the dispositive of the Pass and elaborations of the Analysts of the School themselves. This material helps us to at least grasp the logic of the transformation of the subject after the clinical analysis of their case.

Besides that, every cartel member is linked to the others through an ignorance that makes a question arise for each of us in our own way. The balance of loneliness of a more or less prolonged analytical experience creates a bond between we cartelizands around the points of ignorance that guide our work.

Although the theory about the end of the analysis is mostly shared and accepted, that which is related to the vital, existential experience of the participants provokes a tension aimed at questioning the analytical experience and its end. Our cartel has an amusing side since we prefer not to take any established knowledge for granted in an unreflective way, for this may prevent our exchanges being fluid. This makes the interventions go through an enunciation tinged with our reading and discussion of writings that have been selected because of how they resonate to all of us and our relationship with psychoanalysis.

The structure of the cartel combines touches of humor and seriousness, as well as anti-dogmatism. The best way I can put it: we take a distance from psychoanalysis to investigate the innermost part of it, giving shape to its effects beyond the foundational belief of the initial movement of transference. The cartel is not the work of a cult that idealizes a master of

knowledge. The artifice should be built out of shreds of knowledge, but without a jouissance/defense against the not-all of the fog of the real.

Precisely, one of the texts by an Analyst of the School that we use as a source is the one entitled *Fog*, by our colleague Camila Vidal.

Due to its embodiment in the living individualities of those who make the analytic experience, the knowledge of psychoanalysis does not admit completeness, totalization. Moreover, the experience of analysis is the experience of some sort of expulsion, of a certain exile from the field of a unified, supposed knowledge. A psychoanalysis allows the clinical and singular experience of a non-totalization of knowledge, not just a theoretical one. To be the refuse of discourse, to go through the horror of knowledge and to find some satisfaction: that is the surprise and the contribution of psychoanalysis.

The symptom that appears in the transference may change at the end of an analysis, being of some other use than the one related to the jouissance of belief or the error of the subject-supposed-to-know. Knowing how to use the symptom for something other than jouissance, to cause the desire to know, would be what we call *Sinthome*. A use: to give place to a desire (unprecedented, since it takes the real into account). To cause psychoanalysis. In the cartel, we asked ourselves about the experience of the horror of going through the analysis that could be read in parallel with what Lacan said about analysts being horrified by their act. Two different maelstroms come from literature: the first one from Jules Verne's *20,000 Leagues under the Sea*, where lightness and relief are recounted by the survivor of the Nautilus; the second one from E. A. Poe's, 'A Descent into the Maelström', where the writer himself testifies to his transformation. These two depict different aspects of the experience of subjective transformation in literature.

The testimonies and writings that we have worked with share the assertion that the transformation produces a change in the libidinal economy, some sort of freedom and lightness in the maneuvering of the new analyst. This is shown in the form of an affect of satisfaction. But, at the same time, appears the difficulty for words of reaching a rational transmission that claims to be complete. There remains a desire to be transmitted through the singular clinic of each analyst. Maybe, what should be awaited is not a rounded testimony but the resonance of a bold act: to take a step beyond the horror of knowing.

Camila Vidal states that in contrast to the capitalist discourse that veils its own impossibilities showing nothing more than its achievements, psychoanalysis allows us to perceive the refuse of discourse that we all are, but the essential point is that a new satisfaction can come from it.

The destitution of the believing subject that takes place at the end of the analysis may give rise to the appearance of a *dupe* in a good way

Nevertheless, the questions that interest us all are still alive. That of the singular moment of the appearance of a change in the subjective position of the analysand. That of the importance of the intervention of the analyst in the final moments of the analysis so that it may be articulated with the purposes that are proper to it. The cartel encourages us to remain neither excessively fascinated nor frustrated by the experiences of the testimonies of the pass that are always at fault with respect to knowledge that is claimed to be constituted as a whole.

*Translated by Sebastián Báquiro Guerrero*