



"I'M NOT MY MOTHER!" – psychoanalytic discussions on Freud's "The Denial".

DANIELE EVELIN VIANA PINHEIRO

Psychoanalyst.

Director and Coordinator of the Center for Freudian Studies of Belém

JESSICA SAMANTHA LIRA DA COSTA

Psychoanalyst.

Master and Doctoral Student in Psychoanalysis – theory and clinic (UFPA)

Student in Philosophy (ESTÁCIO).

Professor and Assistant Coordinator of the Psychology Course at Estácio – Nazaré (BELÉM)

ABSTRACT

The present work is a brief excerpt from our analytical clinical practice and its main objective is to investigate and investigate the relationship between denial, so present in the speeches of the analysands, and the notion of Unfamiliar in Freud. For that, we start from Freudian texts, in order to understand the real conception that is presented to us by Freud and only in this way to relate it with our clinical practice. As promised, this is just a brief essay that discusses, from the clinic point of view, issues that deal – through the analysands' speeches – on the denial and the unfamiliarity that comes from it. It appears that Psychoanalysis manages to understand, and therefore its ethics is founded on the unconscious, that we are not adaptive subjects. In what sense? What practice has the power to tame our drives, our words, our unconscious and that this emerges in one way or another. Simply because any therapy that aims to facilitate the subject's adaptation to the environment, whether this environment is the social, family or professional environment, is a therapy that contributes to making the human being more mediocre.

KEYWORDS: Denial; Unfamiliar; Clinic; Psychoanalysis.

Received 01 Jan, 2022; Revised 08 Jan, 2022; Accepted 10 Jan, 2022 © The author(s) 2022.

Published with open access at www.questjournals.org

I. INITIAL QUESTIONS

What is familiar to this short and dense text by Freud, entitled "The Denial" (1925) with "The Unfamiliar", the title of the new 100-year commemorative translation of Freud's "Unheimliche" text? What are the implications that denial ruminates in contemporary clinic? These are princeps questions that we can raise and that make us move towards a possible detailed understanding of the reasons that lead us today to bring this work by Freud.

Based on such inquiries, we will take the text "The Denial" (1925) together with the text *Das Unheimliche* (1919), both by Freud, as central axes to try to tie our discussion together. Considering that the crossing of the texts took place automatically. Talking about psychic denial is talking about what is disturbing in each one of us. With resonances from the daily clinical practice of the authors circumscribed here.

A Negação (or A Negativa, depending on the translation) is a text from 1925, published a little later and in which Freud calls us to think about what is on the edges of the Self – pleasure and displeasure, the refusal of a thought and why there is so much horror when faced with issues that ground us as subjects. If we take the understanding to the letter of what desire means, we will understand why we deny and reject so much the issues that announce desire. After all, desires are uncommitted crimes, unexperienced passions and repressed loves. Therefore, this initial understanding seems to assert itself when we try to understand the reasons that lead to this rejection of desire, as well as this disturbing strangeness when it approaches our consciousness.

It is in this sense that we will privilege the clinical aspects of our own analytic practice, because when we take clinical sections of our daily clinical practice we are faced with a whole repetitive movement (more neurotic impossible, by the way) of functionings that try, with great difficulty, to deny that that founds them.

That is, denying the truth of the unconscious that overflows with desire. Our function is to try to approximate, through speech, language, speech, the origin of these rich psychic materials.

From this moment on, we will focus on the discussion and interweaving of the aforementioned and circumscribed themes.

II. SOME CONSIDERATIONS ABOUT THE UNHEIMLICHE TEXT, BY FREUD (1919).

This is a classic text by Freud and one of the most beautiful ever written by the present author (and note that selecting the most beautiful texts ever written by Freud is not an easy task, considering that the stylistics of Freud's writing is sublime). According to Strachey (1996), this little book by Freud was released in the autumn of 1919 and was mentioned by Freud himself in a letter he sent to Ferenczi on May 12, 1919. and started working on it again.

In other words, this theme had already aroused interest in Freud for some time. To be very specific, in 1913 we already have in Totem and Taboo a reference by Freud on this theme. However, it was in the year of publication of O Infamiliar (1919) that Freud decided to take up this text and finally publish it.

Commenting on the Freudian text, psychoanalysts Iannini and Tavares (2019, p. 5) state that:

Freud appropriates a relatively commonly used word in German (at least in its adjective-adverbial usage), lends it a conceptual status, transports it through various linguistic and philosophical fields, examines the literary experience that best engenders it, scrutinizes the real experience that she cuts out, to, in the end, return the word to the language, but this time with the perennial seal of psychoanalysis.

Initially, Freud (1919[2019]) criticizes a “non-practice” by most psychoanalysts of his time, as according to Freud himself, it is only rarely that psychoanalysts are interested in investigations of a strictly nature aesthetics. In the author's own words:

The psychoanalyst only rarely feels stimulated to aesthetic investigations, even if he does not restrict aesthetics to the doctrine of beauty, but describes it as the doctrine of the qualities of our feeling. It works with other layers of soul life and has little to do with the goal-inhibited, stifled emotions, dependent on a great number of concomitant constellations, which in general constitute the stuff of aesthetics. Anyway, here and there, he realizes that he may be interested in a specific domain of aesthetics, and so, it is something commonly left out, neglected by the specialized literature (p.46).

Very likely, Freud made this criticism initially due to the fact that the Freudian text itself would address, in a very direct way, aesthetic conceptions. However, we feel that we are disappointing the father of psychoanalysis, but our intention is also not to embark on an aesthetic analysis when taking the text in question here. Rather, it is about showing how it is possible for us to understand the direct relationship between unfamiliarity and denial.

However, even if we do not stop at the aesthetic path when relating the Freudian text, this in no way detracts from the relationship that we proposed to carry out here. Because, as pointed out by Freud (1919[2019], p. 47): “(...) the unfamiliar is a kind of what is terrifying, which refers to the old acquaintance, which has long been intimate. How it is possible, under what conditions, for what is intimate to become unfamiliar, terrifying, is something to be demonstrated next.” This passage from the Freudian text is the definitive proof that the relationship that we propose to carry out between the works of the said author is undoubtedly evident, since the background of such relationship is that what is at stake is the notion of the unfamiliarity of human desire.

How well would Jorge Forbes point out and question: “Do you want what you want?”. Our desire is the most unique thing we possess, but it is also the most frightening thing we have. Sometimes we fight against them, because they expose us to the worst in relation to the cultural norms that we need to submit to on a daily basis. So whenever our desires are thrown open, they remind us of the central Freudian concept of unheimliche. Moreover, at the same time, it is also the basis of all the negative action and human experience. So:

The German word unheimlich [unfamiliar] is clearly the opposite of heimlich [familiar], domestic, intimate, and we come closer to the conclusion that something would be frightening because it would not be known and familiar. But, of course, not everything new and unfamiliar is scary; the relationship is not reversible. It can only be said that what is innovative becomes easily frightening and unfamiliar; not everything new is scary. The new and the unfamiliar must, at first, add something to make it unfamiliar”. (...) In short, familiar [heimlich] is a word whose meaning developed according to an ambivalence, until it finally merged with its opposite, the unfamiliar [unheimlich]. 6 Unfamiliar is, in a way, a kind of familiar. Let us add this result not yet clarified with justice with the definition of unfamiliar by Schelling (FREUD, 1919[2021], p. 51).

We believe, in the sense that we are dealing here, that the nodal point of the discussion that we aim to raise here is that the uncontrollable way in which we are usurped by our most remote desires and how, through a forced exercise of our so-called protective barriers, namely, repression, we can elevate our desires to the opposite, making what gains an increasing space in our experiences and realities to be precisely the defense mechanism entitled here denial.

III. THE DENIAL (1925) – YOU ONLY DENY WHAT YOU WANT? IF YOU ONLY WISH WHAT YOU DON'T HAVE?

The Freudian text entitled "The negation" or "The negative", depending on the translation, should initially, according to Freud, be titled "The negation/negative and the refusal", however, Freud chose to isolate only the first term, leaving the second to work on the article that would later be called "Fetishism".

The text gained great importance after the rereading of Lacan in seminar 3 (Lacan 1967-68/ Psychoses) and after the debate with Jean Hyppolite (in *Escritos*) and having a strong influence on the study of passions. Lacan presents the weakness of the argument that interprets the Freudian statement "the unconscious does not know the contradiction", reducing it only to the failure of the grammatical operation: $\neg(\neg A)=A$, and insists that, in grammar, the place where the subject of the enunciation is more visible is precisely in the use of this "no".

When we pay attention to the initial aspects of the text, as well as to our critical reading of these initial aspects, we can notice that The mechanism of denial is present in neurosis, psychosis and perversion. In all three cases, we would be facing different types of denial. In other words, what founds us is the denial that we were, so to speak, barred.

Perhaps the denial is of that order or disorder of what is "unfamiliar" to us. I deny what is strange – familiar – different to me. In principle, what is bad, what is alien to the Self and what is outside it is identical to it, Freud points out. A question of the outside and the inside, the unreal. The conception of negation that fits very well with the fact that in analysis there is no "no" coming from the unconscious, and that the recognition of the unconscious by the Self is expressed in a negative formula.

There is no stronger proof of the successful discovery of the unconscious than when the analysand reacts to the sentence: "It wasn't what I thought" or "I didn't think about it (never)" (FREUD, 1925, p. 146), you see. It is assumed that this is not something that should not be there, that the subject actually said something, but that he denies this truth, he denies what was said.

Currently in the clinic, it is common to hear statements that are loaded with a negative that points to the other side. Ex: "I have nothing against gays, I even have some friends who are"; "I'm not racist" is something that was repressed, something that was forgotten, that was in the unconscious came to the fore and that now receives it a value of moral judgment, therefore it receives a NO, it is not admitted by conscience, but it is not that, because I didn't want it to be that, because we think, I wouldn't want it to be that. Starting from the logic that the unconscious does not have the value of moral judgment, it does not have The Negative, who carries the negative is the conscience or in Freud's writing it would be the I.

In his text Freud proposes us to observe the way that our patients present their thoughts that occur to them during the analytic work that lack interesting observations: "now you will think that I mean something offensive, but I really don't have that intention". We understand that this is the refusal of a sudden thought that has just emerged, by projection. And that the patient has no desire to admit their events.

Nor could it, in fact, because "to bank" its desire is to recognize itself in that limbo of the desiring formation of the three pillars, that is, crimes not committed, passions not experienced and loves repressed.

Who, in their right mind, would admit to wanting what is on the order of the impossible? Who can see themselves, without regret, as the protagonist of a Greek tragedy? After all, even though we know from a purely theoretical point of view that Oedipus are all of us, seeing such a premise in ourselves from an existence point of view is completely unbearable.

Furthermore, we can see how this mechanism of denial has been present since the beginning of our constitution as a subject, after all, regardless of the path we "choose" when we encounter a symbolic barrier, we had to act with this fundamental denial, either by repressing desire or denying it or even excluding it, in any case, there was a denial there and it is precisely for this reason that such a mechanism is present in every movement we carry out as desiring beings.

Jorge Forbes, in his famous work entitled "Do you want what you want?" it attests to what any average Afghan who has read for 15 minutes a few pages of the robust Freudian work would understand, namely, that we most likely do not want what we are supposed to want or vice versa. It's because? Why do we deny something that we weren't even accused of? Why do we want what we deny? Why don't we desire what we cry out to the four corners of the outdoors that we long for? What kind of psychic movement is this that makes us reject what our inner self really desires to possess?

It is these questions that Forbes makes us reflect in his well-known and above-referenced work. What was supposed to be just a mere consequence of mismatched words, unknown tastes and unfortunate moments are consequences of our constitution, our identifications, our drives and the role of psychoanalysis, of analysis is to make us understand, deal with, recognize everything this that founds us as subjects of the unconscious.

IV. WORDS FOR A SHORT CLOSING

This brief essay has come to this point, which arose out of clinical debates and discussions between two psychoanalysts who were similarly traversing recurrent complaints on the part of their patients. What united us in the writing of this article is an insurmountable reality, after all, one certainly denies what is desired. Or even, we identify with what is strange and familiar at the same time.

In this way, it is important that we do not let the contemporary discourse, which unrestrainedly seeks a so-called truth, deafen us in the analytical setting. Because the way the subject and the discourse he brings with him arrive in our office, it is easy for an unsuspecting (and unanalyzed) analyst to fall into the shackles of the unconscious, thus deviating from the princeps ethics of analysis.

Jacques André, French psychoanalyst, has a book entitled "L'inconscient est politiquement incorrect", in free translation: "The unconscious is politically incorrect". What the author generally argues is that even in times of "positive life"; "personal development"; "self help", etc. practices that focus on an adequate behavior of the subjects and their psychic lives, even when these productions are on the rise, psychoanalysis goes against these practices.

Psychoanalysis manages to understand, and therefore its ethics are founded on the unconscious, that we are not adaptive subjects. In what sense? What practice has the power to tame our drives, our words, our unconscious and that this emerges in one way or another. Simply because any therapy that aims to facilitate the subject's adaptation to the environment, whether this environment is the social, family or professional environment, is a therapy that contributes to making the human being more mediocre.

Because it excludes uniqueness, it suppresses differences. Therefore, this would be the criterion: therapies aimed at adaptation are not possible on psychoanalytic grounds. On the contrary, they are targets of attack, repulsed by analytical practice. We cannot have a science of the unconscious with this kind of forced reality like adaptation, for example.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

- [1]. ANDRÉ, J. *L'inconscient est politiquement incorrect*. Paris: Stock, 2018.
- [2]. FORBES, J. *Do you want what you want?* São Paulo: Manole, 2016.
- [3]. FREUD, S. (1925). *The Denial*. In: *The unfamiliar*; translation by Ernani Chaves, Pedro Heliodoro Tavares. – 1st ed. – Belo Horizonte: Authentic, 2019.
- [4]. LACAN, J. (1962). *The Book 3 Seminar, The Psychosis*. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Editors, 2004.
- [5]. _____. (1962). *The Writings*. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge ZaharEditores, 1998.