



SOCIETÀ AMICI DEL PENSIERO



THE DEFENCE

AND MISTAKE OF THE COMPETENTE THOUGHT.

THE “RESULT” OF PSYCHOPATHOLOGY

by Giacomo B. Contri¹

The whole semantic field of the word “defence” is concerned with this current Course’s theme:

1° The one regarding physical, biological, predatory (including social class predation), military and potentially whodunit, ideological and educational invective. Let us consider the self-managed defense excess’s invective as well. We are dealing however with a cease of deferred defence, which can strive to becoming preventive.

2° We fall however in the current mistake, which is insulting as well, by not placing first in rank the meritorious defence, or otherwise called proactive or “virtuous”: we include here the cases of defending a thesis, as well as a company, a position or one’s idea/thought (even one’s desire: they are synonyms). This is not a preventive defence, but is rather inventiveness, initiative, that provides for its own non-offensive defences only in second order of importance (it is in the paranoid’s and envious’ character to get offended by someone else’s initiative and offend him back afterwards). This is the case of the defence *of*.

There isn’t even one field of experience that is not concerned with the theme of defence, both *of* and *from*.

Every profession regarding defence is concerned with the theme as well: medical, legal, and especially juridical, educational, union, political. As far as the psychologist is concerned, he might actually defend, we don’t deny it but instead hope for it, but neither we can claim this a priori: that his first personal matter is to defend, and his professional class is not able to answer for him (this is instead the doctor’s case, with the exception of what is prescribed by the law).

However there is one case of defence which is not contemplated by current Law, nor it is remotely touched by civil rights, that just get around it. It’s what Freud used to write for in 1938, that is what not even free England could support: the defence of thought.

We are going to get a move on from this particular case of defence, preliminary to any defence in any field: the defence of thought, *of* and *from*, whether the first good, or the first skill or even someone’s capacity.

¹Milan, August 2008. Courtesy translation by Bernardo Contri.



Thought is as promotional as needy of defence: defending it implies bringing it back to promotional, and not importing psychic stuffs from the Africa of its underdevelopment.

Within “*of*”, thought is way of perception (both sensorial and economic together: *modus recipientis*) and production.

Within “*from*” instead, it’s this very thought the one to suffer offence, which is followed by renounce to double perception, which is wisdom (“The be out of one’s mind”).

History of... thought has not been meritorious either in making or in defending this distinction: we are not allowed to say that the history of thought has been very friendly to thought, or to thought as a friend.

It is in regard of this matter that we promoted “Freud’s Tribunal”.

Psychoanalysts failed their calling by only classifying defence within “*from*”, and furthermore as it were pathological (“the defence mechanisms”): as a matter of fact, psychoanalysis, until a new order occurs, does not deprive of defence, not even of the pathological one which, while its needed, has its own legitimacy and dignity.

The word “resistance” is commonly used in the class vocabulary of psychoanalysts: lexical tolerance aside, this very word appoints something very different from pathological defence. Let us pay heed to J. Lacan who used to suggest that the psychoanalyst offers a typical example of “resistance” to us when he opposes his own solution, and not because he maintains a pathological defence, or to put it better, he’s not entirely cured.

We will start of from Freudian clue: thought gets its offence when double error is forced into it: 1° concerning omission (for example “the removal”, which we could compare to an illegal exile), 2° concerning the tendency to systematize that, due to the suture with “loss of substance” method, censors the omission’s actual happening (similarity is Freudian).

Our personal lives have all been systematized either in an evident or a hidden pathological way, up till a new order.

This double error due to a preliminary one as well: thought’s renounce to its own competence or authority, that is to introduce, (both sensorial and economical perception together: it’s the similarity of fertilizability).

Once thought has renounced it’s ability as compass or tendency, it actually loses its compass, or its mind.

It will later accept any subservience voluntarily (I’ll bring back here E. de la Boétie, “Speech Of The Volunteer Servitude”).

The tormented mind’s immediate wish is for defence *from* its thought: instead curing it means bringing it back to the defence *of* thought.

Psychotropic drugs, opium, different ideologies satisfy this immediate wish: up to the very belief that the desire to sleep is actually the desire to send thought to sleep (dream’s very existence denies this belief).



SOCIETÀ AMICI DEL PENSIERO



It's not the unarmed, who doesn't won any weapon, the one to be defenceless, even if he will soon come to discover the it's better to be prepared. The unarmed can be innocent (an in-nocent thought, that is a thought which does no harm and received no harm): but even if it were prepared, innocent thought couldn't be offensive, not even for defensive purposes.

It is the naïve the one to be defenceless against the offence to thought operated by a greater Idea, that hijacks its own competence (wisdom, reality principle). His naivety can afterwards bring him to the passion of war: World War I happened to be also the war of mass naivety. Idea is the virus of thought, since they are birds of a feather, noetic and linguistic. The falling in love due to the arrow thrown by the evil God Eros makes you loose your mind and so your competence. Let's not be astonished by the expression “ falling for war”. Freudian “psychology of masses”, or groups', is a belligerent one: and here we are, facing the two decades that divide the World Wars. The silent worldwide effectiveness of reactive formation, that is our days, remains fully unexplored (which can't b solved by the “sporty spirit” because it is not exempt from this itself).

We shall explore in every possible experience field to find the presence of the insult to thought: within the error of thought, starting from History of thought, within the psychopathology that comes out of it as “outcome” of the error.

In the end: the “Defence” theme arises as easily suitable for the Seminar of “Psychoanalytic Work”, contemporary to the Course.