

Interview

Ana: A very good day to you.

JM: Good morning, Ana. How are you?

Ana: Very well, quite happy to be able to be here speaking with you today. In fact, I am extremely happy because I said to Carlos Mario Jaramillo, who brought about this meeting and this interview, to converse from curiosity is a truly fine thing. In the end, what encourages one is the desire to know, to be aware of things, and the disciplines in which you move, the fields in which you inquire are, for some of us, in the Faculty of Arts, a territory not really well explored, but very stimulating. That is the starting point of this talk.

As not everyone who listens to or reads us knows who you are, it would be very good if you told us about that relationship with psychoanalysis, which is long-standing (I believe), in your life and also with philosophy. Let's talk about the point where these two fields converge for you.

JM: Ana, well, first you put me on the spot because presenting oneself is always a problem, even an aesthetic problem, because either one sins by default or by excess, but let's say, for the sake of this presentation and possible acquaintance that my name is Juan Manuel Uribe, that I've earned some things in the sphere of academia and, more than these things, at the level of titles that are presented to one, I could tell you that I have been rather a man who questions constantly, who constantly inquires and that reaches what we might call the world of thinking, not only as a profession, if that can be called a profession, but with concerns ... very clear, that begin with a question about death, which progress to a question about the human condition, to sustain you right off the bat that I have been able to answer neither.

JM: ... with which I am guaranteeing that at least I will spend a lot of time circling around these fundamental questions because of the condition and the sensation of the condition of man. Philosophy was what allowed me in some way, to counteract the order of mathematics and physics, which was the first thing I came across. I am not a mathematician but I love mathematics and as the years have gone by I have realized that it is possible to mathematize as much philosophy as to make psychoanalysis a field of knowledge that is fundamentally supported by mathematics.

Ana: ...Very interesting. Could you expand on this idea?

JM: Yes, yes ... and let's say that, after certain questions on the order of the personal, I arrive at psychoanalysis and there ... I would say that an immense desire is caused, to go a little beyond what is customarily thought of on purpose, that is our condition of being exhibitors and inhabited by an unconscious. So, it is not just a field, there are many fields among which, I would have to say, that through both philosophy and psychoanalysis, the arts are present, and perhaps it would be good to put a turning point, because the basic condition of Man is determined by art in its multiple meanings, both in the order of the Greek world and in the order of psychoanalysis, that is to say in philosophy and this knowledge about the unconscious condition of man, art is *poiesis*, it is production and it is an original production that later is found in empirical manifestations in the order of a *techné* and one and another, both the *poiesis* and *techné* end up being necessarily linked, by an axis common to any knowledge, and it is language. Then language has served to me to be able, effectively to enter into the knowledge, even more distant and disconnected than one can conceive. For example, this question of mathematics. All right...

Mathematics and the social sciences, to say the least, or the human sciences, or art itself, seem to be far apart, but not really; at the very heart of the knowledge of the West and the East, mathematics is always present and a reflection on mathematics does not imply simply and plainly knowing a number of formulas and a technical language. I would say that one can think mathematically and to that extent respect concepts such as rigor, exactitude, beyond harmonies, beyond certain types of figures that speak of equilibrium. When you join these worlds, where I insist again, you are not only constrained by the order of dogmatic precepts of knowledge, the world expands drastically, dramatically, to places that are unsuspected. I would say that, in large measure, presents me.

Ana: Before talking about mathematics and the very clear intentions to link, to make bridges and to find all that is common to ... territories that one might think as distant as mathematics, art, psychoanalysis, philosophy. I also agree with you. It is nice to hear, for example, a mathematician, when he uses aesthetic concepts to refer to what he does when he says: this is a beautiful equation! The idea of beauty in mathematics is a very present idea. But before going there, I believe all this interests us, because we know there are confluences and this is the interest of an interview like this or a conversation like ours. Now, when you say, *language*, I also find it interesting, because the language appears as a great clarity, as the pillar that you designate, that makes possible all these bridges, crosses and others, *language*.

Let's say that for me, the notion of *Language* is not so clear, so I would like to hear you talk about what you understand as language, comprehensive language, the language that communicates everything. Let's say, from my humble rambling, first, it is not the language, but the languages, if we were to get into that idea ... and there's a whole nice critique that I think we could look at, of that which is also a certain logocentrism that comes with all this Western tradition; there is a critique of this idea of language.

JM: First, Ana, I want to thank you for being here talking, for me the conversation has a high level, but I also want to take this opportunity to thank the teacher Luz Marina Monroy who facilitates the meeting with Professor Carlos Mario Jaramillo, to whom I am very grateful. And I make here a precision: I do not have to defend the language, it defends itself, I will put some elements to think about. Undoubtedly the condition ... of being human and I do not put that of being as the problem of substance, is that we have an articulated language, a language that inhabits us. Now, language as a unique entity, could be brought to order and to the registration of the symbolic. To say that there is a standardized language, a universal language, would be to go against the same presumption that language is one, but it is said multiple times, parodying Aristotle himself, I explain: it is one thing to think of language as a unique entity in the order of the symbolic and another its concrete manifestations; its concrete manifestations are languages, that is, what we quickly know as languages. So we have as many languages as we can think of; for our environment we have, for example, English, we have French, German, Italian, which are concrete forms of that language and which do a very important thing, that you and I and all those who are listening to us can understand, without knowing a *strict census*, the rules with which it is possible, that that particular language, that we speak, can be expressed and make us understand. So, first: we are beings that inhabit language and its concrete manifestation are tongues or languages, right? So, to say that we are beings that we inhabit, or rather that the language inhabits us, means that we have a logos and I was struck by the fact that you spoke of logocentrism, because there is a lack of knowledge almost *per se*, because we believe that the Greek word "logos" translates, immediately as reason, and it turns out not to, neither in the etymology nor in the works in the order of the pre-Socratics, not even with classical philosophy and even with what we might call good European philosophers, one could defend directly, the fact that logos is a reason, it is more, it is one of the multiple meanings of logos.

Logos translates as much more than reason, because reason is a metric concept. Reason is an arithmetical concept, not even mathematical, but it is arithmetic. Reason is a measure with which you can regulate and establish criteria of validity or non-validity. A good sense of logos is speech. A good

sense of logos - I am not saying that reason is not good - is speech, word. Logos is word, speech and so we could find that whenever we think, in the order of a principle, an origin or a cause, we are talking about logos. Then we could sustain for example with this small diatribe, that art itself has a logos, it has a logos beyond a reason, beyond the criteria of evaluation.

Ana: When I referred to that criticism of logocentrism, I thought rather of Derridian criticism, say, in the idea of logos, which is not ... I do not think Derrida is as naive, as a criticism of logos, likewise; that is, it is not that simple. I believe that what is striking is precisely that way of questioning the logos as a great center, as that which is common to us, to all humanity, as an origin, as you have just said it, The Origin. What seems nice to me of that creative idea, that of Derrida, is that finally it is precisely all those values that are suddenly questioning, that of the language that is common to all of us, very universal, that of reason united to that, that of the existence of *an* origin. That's what I think it is important to look at; not because the language as you say does not defend itself, but also the language has been put into question, for example by the thought of Derrida that says: I would prefer to speak of writings, I would prefer to talk about the trace, of all that which is a mark that includes even the language and that puts in doubt the existence of *an origin*, of a common origin and beginning for all and then Derrida says, *I prefer to speak of writings and in a multiple sense, than of a logos, central*; it was more in that sense. Now, instead of stopping in this theoretical discussion, -because each one has its own little beacons in that matter-, I think it is very interesting the proposal that you-Carlos Mario told me about that-, have been building with a research group, precisely utilizing interdisciplinary approaches, or multiple ways of looking. What are you doing in this research group? How do you propose a new look at psychoanalysis, within relationships, not only with the University, but with society, ours, here, Medellin, the people? That is to say, a psychoanalysis that is not only the psychoanalysis of formulas, perhaps outdated, that some of us knew, but a local rebirth, therefore open to the world of psychoanalysis as a possibility.

JM: Yes, thank you, Ana. A couple of words about Derrida's complaint about logocentrism, because there you have to leave things clear, and that logocentric denunciation on the part of the French, is tied to the conception of monolingualism, the monolingualism of the other. Well, perhaps, as you rightly point out, it is not the time to enter into theoretical precisions but when I argue that *The Language*, with that big, determined article, is one, effectively we would have to decide what we would call language and the first thing that you could say in the proximity also between Derrida and a man like Jacques Lacan or like Foucault himself, is that undoubtedly speaking, for us of language, for us as human entities, rather than as

human beings, which is a consequence of language, necessarily implies the acceptance that can be demonstrated of the existence of a writing, a writing that begins with traits, that begins with traces and that is very beautiful, because it again appears in the order of art. The notch that is made, recalls Lacan on the Huesmann de Leñense (*this concept refers to the reindeer bone that Lacan observed in the San Germain museum*), that notch that is made there already assigns a writing, a form of letter and about that which is going to be built.

Then the denouncement of a monolingualism, is that indeed, it seems to be, for the West, that there were some categories that cannot even be presupposed, that have to be examined. That is something that is critical and that is lived in the universities and that the professors in one way or another repeat, where it appears one thing that, for me, is tragic and that is that in our universities, not even parodying the same denunciation of men of the likes of Heidegger, Derrida himself and others; something is done by trying to get our students to think and by thinking to think themselves, we do not even do that. Perhaps there was a time when we could consider that there were, in that order of things, thoughts. Nowadays academia, in this speed with which it strives for efficiency, in favor of success, which is undoubtedly an ethical position which we could discuss, leads us to not even put people in the order of production and thinking, but simply put them in order to reproduce, reproduce knowledge, which usually come from other geographies, come from other places, to come to consider that the European world is the absolute mecca and that radiates, for all of us in our universities; until we come to consider that the Spanish language is not a language that is conducive to certain things, to think, that is aberrant to say the least. How is it that I cannot think because psychoanalysis was first said in Germany and then in French. That thing seems to me to be a straitjacket that obscures the very possibility that we believe something.

Well, it turns out that schools of psychoanalysis, that institutions that end up being half psychotic in the beginning, are very good at obeying; and obeying for us is nothing more than repeating phrases and it is only appropriating something that effectively allows someone to be described as: knowledgeable, not knowledgeable, as good, bad or regular. But these are categories -that said in other languages, that said at other times and under other social, political and economic circumstances-, we bring them and we want to implement them as if it were a platform, as if it were a form, to standardize.

Well, this group of teachers and students of psychoanalysis in the first instance accepted a challenge, that psychoanalysis is not simply a closed knowledge about itself, on the basis of it, it is not even because it gives us

to think about it, it is fundamental. Neither the proposal of Freud, nor of the post-Freudians, nor that of Lacan himself, are closed proposals, they are not closed cosmological views, but they always leave open the world, the cosmos and the same interpretations and production itself. So why not have critical thinking about what has been said that cannot be criticized?, why is it that we have simply to repeat phrases and we have to conduct ourselves, in what, in one way or another, I think it is an incorrectness being called pure psychoanalysis?, as if psychoanalysis had no connection with the world, with the social and had the obligation, -because it is not a choice, but an obligation-, to give an account and try to account for many situations in which we see ourselves immersed.

The first thing that this group of researchers recognizes is that there are multiple connections, which are often denied. I remember here, no more as a guide, that Lacan said that there were four types of knowledge that were fundamental in order to think as an analyst, which was part of the formation of the unconscious, that is the analyst, with which we already have a problem, and yes, serious; formation of the unconscious, formation of the analyst and put them in their hierarchy. He said, the first knowledge that one would have to know and at the university level, is linguistics; barely logical, even with what I said previously. Then I placed logic, well, knowing that most of the time in our parish, and not only in our parish, beyond the parish, we do not even know the basic assumptions of a binary logic. That is, we do not know the laws that govern the possibility of communicating in this way, orally. Lacan proposes other logics, until it becomes something that needs to be analyzed a bit more, talk about the logic of the phantom. The third proposal on the side of knowledge is topology and with that we put mathematics. The topology ... forgive me, it gives me some laughter because that makes the brains of the analysts, both practitioners and in training, as to any other interesting chapter of psychoanalysis proposed by Jacques Lacan, and finally what he called the antiphilosophy . Well, those four kinds of knowledge, Ana, imply that psychoanalysis is in contact with other knowledge and in a very particular way and I will bring, not without a purpose, a proximity of these two men that we could, in the cosmos of psychoanalysts, locate , as perhaps, the most preponderant: Freud and Lacan. A very special relationship with art, very special, because one could understand from certain psychoanalytic presuppositions, that art and its multiple manifestations have made possible, in some way, that individuals, for Freud in this case, subjects for Lacan, can deal with the repressive order of law, morality and ethics, that is, art is a way of escape from what we technically call repression.

Ana: Sorry to interrupt you, if I have understood you correctly, it is necessary to make clear that psychoanalysis is a way, a look, an open world;

that does not pretend to be total, closed, that is not quiet, that moves, that is self-critical in some way ...

JM: Yes, let's say that with less presence.

Ana: ... Well, let's hope so, because it's the only way to move. But you come to a very nice subject, because you say: for Freud, for Lacan, art is important as an option, as a way, as an answer, as freedom. In some way before what he calls the law, the repressive, the forms ... and it would be very good if we just heard the idea of a psychoanalysis that does not pretend to be another rigid explanation of the work ..., because I believe that there is a feeling, among many artists in fact, rather a resistance, we might say, sometimes towards psychoanalysis as such, or what is understood as psychoanalysis. I would tell you to talk about concrete examples and that people do not keep trying to understand what we are saying, that, for example, I have worked in some epochs with female artists, feminists, why not say it once and for all, feminist, they claim as feminists in the field of performance, in the field of theater, in the field of plastic arts and ... they say: Freud, well, interesting in many things, but I do not go very far if all this is explained as because I have a great envy of the penis and through that prism you will look or interpret the work. And that of women; let's say, the place that for example Freud, it is supposed, in his most well-known literature gives to the woman in very general terms. At least that is what has spread, expanded, popularized as some points of Freud's theory. That on the one hand and on the other hand, let's say in more political terms, that is also a very political one, but let's say in social terms, to be clearer, many artists who work in the community, here in the neighborhoods, in the Picacho, in Santo Domingo, they would say: very rich to work with psychoanalysts in union for these art projects in the community for example. But the idea of psychoanalysis is also very widespread as a kind of elitist practice, as a practice that does not respond to the problem, that does not approach the concrete problem of the community, because it remains in the cloud, say concepts of the individual, of the subject, of his experience, that seemed already determined; then I am sure that all this is reducing, almost that it would make with you the defense of psychoanalysis because it turns out that I like psychoanalysis a lot and it suits me a lot, it does me good. But it is better to hear it from you, that is, not as a defense, but let's say to expand that perspective of which I speak.

JM: I would say that ... I reiterate again in thanking you for those kinds of questions -where to allow a detour-, and it is a criticism that should be made to the institutions and within them to the university itself. The function of knowledge has been forgotten, it is even conceived that knowledge in any discipline becomes elite, that it becomes closed, that

they become oracular knowledge for initiates, and if we think about it in the order of psychoanalysis, a position of those ..., again it goes against the basic proposition, that is a denial, that is to applaud the thoughts that believe they are closing on themselves, that they are finished, that they can legislate from the top down, leaving the ones below as the who have neither knowledge nor awareness; in short, all those things, which are nothing but the arrogance of those who think they know. The psychoanalytic logos, and see that it is very on purpose, is the generic name of this place where we try to think, the logos, but not as a reason, because psychoanalysis goes against reason in many ways; that is to conceive and accept the existence of the unconscious is to know that there is much more than reason, that there are rational forms as there are irrational forms, just as there are rigid things, there are elastic things and particularly the topology is defined as an elastic rubber geometry.

Well, this place where there are researchers who believe in other types of pathways, where we have to go and search and ask ourselves about the foundation, rather than simply putting ourselves in the order of the echolalia; we defend an epistemological principle and that is that the psychoanalysis that Freud proposed, to that extent I believe, under the discovery of the unconscious, is not the same psychoanalytic proposal that Jacques Lacan does, they are two different things, that is, we do not defend a continuity between the one and the other, and already there is part of the answer I could give you.

It is believed that psychoanalysis is Freud, no, no, no. Undoubtedly we cannot deny the importance and the fact of being - I am going to put a very interesting thing - the conqueror; in some way, the unconscious and another thing is to assume that when you say psychoanalysis everything is remitted to the Freudian theory. This conception with the women you have worked with is determined by the anatomical sexual difference. If we stay in that order, then undoubtedly everything you have told me, what they have said, what they say again and maybe they will keep repeating, would be right in the Freudian order, because the presence in some of one thing is verified while in others it is not. It is a position supported on the anatomical sexual difference. But this is not all psychoanalysis, it is more, for some proposals there is no difference but because there is a signifier, which is put in social use that determines that you are a woman and that I am a man; but it is only a difference in the order of the signifier, determined by a great thing, which is something, that even in the best families, that is, in those who already have some knowledge, to speak no more of academia, is confused and is still confusing and is believing that the phallus is equivalent one to one with the penis, no, no, no, the phallus is much more than that, moreover, the phallus is a signifier.

JM: Then there begins a thing that is very interesting, Ana, how is that? What does a woman have to envy a man, yes, what he has is a penis, which is no more, let's say, the organic presence of a phallus that is also present in you? If we stay in the Freudian proposal, the thing is that then phallus and penis are going to identify and then it would have a place - that of *penis envy*. No, no, psychoanalysis, today, contemporarily does not conceive that possible; although in the interstices, although in the theories, such is still believed. No, we are organized by a thing that is the phallic signifier - well, we are not going to enter into theory - but you are as phallic as I can be phallic. Go! Look! See that the misunderstanding is very beautiful.

JM: I can also be phallic, undoubtedly, then it goes first that all that, it is a lack of knowledge, it is a belief that saying psychoanalysis is Freud, it goes much further, and when that happens, Ana, is when the problems come. It has been said that psychoanalysis is a praxis, ah! Tremendous concept in Greek, because it has been believed that praxis is translated directly into Spanish to practice or experience, as it turns out that no, the opposite of praxis is lexis, and lexis we translate it into Spanish as a discourse, (and)¹ it is much more than that and that implies that we are not in that fight between the theoretical and the clinical; but if this is a praxis then it has a field, a laboratory, where these theories that are made are going to be checked; that become the side of what has been found in the clinic. This to tell you something, it is said: *true psychoanalysis is what is done in the clinic, in the one-on-one*. Well, one-on-one in a closed scenario that we call an office and all these questions, and it would seem that psychoanalysis - where it is carried out in your laboratory - has connotations, first of exclusion; two, it has been said that it is elitist in the economic order, because it turns out that it is possible to at least think about it and rethink it.

The order of money within psychoanalysis is thought of as another object, there are other ways of paying, *verbi gratia* the word that is put there, and something that is placed in the order of trust, being a heavy concept. No, it is not elitist, who says this may have had the misfortune to go to some psychoanalysts ... But that is not the rule, that is not true and I say it by knowledge or if you even want, by my own praxis; but it is elitist, because not everyone is under the decision, under the desire to know about himself and know about the other and that is painful.

Ana: How do you? Because what I am saying is not new, that is, these are the most general prejudices against psychoanalysis in societies like ours. I suppose then that it is something that they ask themselves, that is, how to go with a psychoanalytic proposal or with psychoanalysis as a proposal or

1. This (and) conjunction is an interpretation of the editor.

as a way, to spaces where they have been, shall we say, but rejected as, at least, absent. I imagine that they have thought about it many times, that it is a big research group, that they already do it, we do not know it, but it would be good to hear about those strategies. So that psychoanalysis is not what you say: a knowledge for some intellectuals and people who have a chance to be psychoanalyzed, something outside the real world, of buses, poverty, war, violence, the day-to-day. That is, people do not have to be stratum five, or belong to certain circles to access this, I return and I repeat, it seems to me, a very rich possibility of what you call the techniques of the self as Foucault would say. Caring for oneself, being able to have an examined and reflected life and a look at one to take responsibility for their relationship with the other, that is, finally the simplest but most beautiful principles that I find in psychoanalysis as a possibility.

JM: I'll go back and make a detour. When we think about research in social and human sciences, we believe that the presence of a mathematician, a biologist, is not necessary, because that seems to have other fields, other knowledge. Some of us think that the presence of the mathematician, the biologist and the physicist in social and human research is necessary. The function of psychoanalysis, beyond the one-on-one, is to make a presence in the order of the so-called social phenomena and well, maybe you look at me badly, because that of the phenomena ..., that of the phenomena is rather strange when you think of it, but let's say of those things that happen and that mark an ethos in a society. The real presence of psychoanalysis, which is not necessarily that of analysts, consists, Ana, as a strategy, in having something that most of the investigations and the facts do not count, neither for psychologists nor for anybody and it is to count on something that is somewhat difficult to conceive, but that in the order of practice is clearly manifested, is to have a subject. A subject of the unconscious who speaks in each one of us as me, is to know that there is actually the possibility that the actions - more sublime or more bestial - and I remember old Derrida here, an action cannot be called bestial except because there is already a political thing there; the animals are not beasts, neither sublime nor bestial, if before that is not considered, which in the psychoanalytic proposal is called, what determines the reasons - not profound - the reasons simply, that lead a subject, to an individual, to a society, to a collective, to take certain actions and perform certain acts. The presence of psychoanalysis beyond analysts, which some do not want to leave their office, but actually the Department of psychoanalysis of your university, the University of Antioquia to which we are proud to belong, we know that there are many things to be fixed.

JM: Some do not want to leave their comfort zone, but history has shown, England, France, Argentina and Mexico that there is a chapter

of psychoanalysis that we can call psychoanalysis with groups, psychoanalysis that is there, close to the social problem, that we have resisted here. Perhaps because of our political conditions, although the political also plays as real, but we will not go into theory, it has not allowed us to develop, but the Psychoanalysis Department of this University tries to do psychoanalysis with social problems, with problems of culture, with problems of the body that are already very close to certain constants in the order of psychoanalysis. Psychoanalysis, epistemology and philosophy, which one would believe to be maintained, in the order of the nebulous and abstraction, I believe are the only thing that constructs the world. Let's put it then in this way, all this has to be taken to a thing and it is, the presence of a subject of the unconscious, inexorable in social actions, it is possible to read, and from there, not only make a diagnosis but implement, I do not know if a solution, but paths and strategies -in support of favoring somehow- certain things in the social order. The presence of a psychoanalyst and of the same psychoanalysis begins by knowing that there is a body, which is not said solely and exclusively in the order of the organs, of what we could call our biological reality, but also the concept of body to the social order. Psychoanalysis also works with the concept of body and the body is a social construction -in other words, it can be determined but we will not enter there- then we work with social bodies where they also live, without being able to talk about the existence of a collective subject and all that question, there is a subject of the unconscious, present in that social body and thus psychoanalysis could enter. Now, what we have had as a certain prohibition to make a presence in hospitals, in societies, is determined, I would say, by an arrogant position of some who were in Paris, in Argentina a few years ago and decreed that psychoanalysis was unique and exclusively what was done in the order of the clinic, in the office. Well, neither the group of psychoanalysis, research, nor the logos conceive any of that, that is, we must be in the order of historical events, if they exist as such, and we must be up to the latest and to be at the height of the moment implies knowing and recognizing the multiple productions that are constant in a given time. One could not have a shell that does not allow the new times to have air. The philosopher, like the psychoanalyst, is a man of his time and to be men of his time is to know those things - which do not necessarily have to pass through the taste of the philosopher or the analyst, or of good taste - that which is somehow put in the order of the vanguard.

Ana: What could you propose, I say, already here like dreaming together, let's say in terms, for example of a research-creation, in which art and psychoanalysis could very well share objects of questioning, of creation, but a creative psychoanalysis, which I am sure that it is, and an art open to the concept and to think about psychoanalysis where there would not

have to be that power relationship in the sense of a psychoanalysis that explains art. There are other attempts, but almost always that is the type of relationship, an interpretive, explanatory psychoanalysis of the work or its creator, of the reception; then it is to move from there the possibility of encounter between art and psychoanalysis. This is what would be interesting, otherwise it is about explanatory discourses on the work or hermeneutics already ready, I do not believe that it is the interest of a common investigation or of a joint work but that psychoanalysis also recognizes beautiful fragilities in the field of self-creation. It would be good ... since you have worked in the postgraduate area, and because there is your research group, an open group as you say, porous, that can conceive new ways in the margins and in the liminal. With art, what do you think?

JM: You know you just entered a small reservoir, which for me is a mine. First, indeed, when considering psychoanalysis as a hermeneusis, as a knowledge, in the style of a worldview of a Weltanschauung, then all this research that is already done is at a disadvantage; you look from above to be able to analyze and recognize all that you have said. That is just a false power, because it is not true that psychoanalysis knows everything, knows everything and as powerful as it is, you have to recognize first, that the world is made long before its emergence. Psychoanalysis is a modern knowledge, it can be adjusted from Kant, San Agustín, where you want, from there back to the whole world that you imputed. And there is one curious thing that psychoanalysis, although it conceives art and has worked with art, fundamentally ignores it in its processes of constitution itself. Then you come to judge a work, its effects, its impacts, the one that produced it, but you have never asked yourself why we would somehow call it creation processes, and you have taken art for a few biases that are narrow, for example , the music has not been much considered, the references of psychoanalysis are scarce in this field. The existence of music is known but we could argue that psychoanalysis is deaf to music; see that there, say: psychoanalysis is deaf to music, is to ask why the hell is psychoanalysis deaf to music, why?

Well, possibilities to do a lot of work, but at the beginning is respecting ...

Ana: Change of place ...

JM: ... change, that is, if we are going to investigate X something, well, give me your power as an artist and I will add my power as a psychoanalyst and let's see, we question something, ask ourselves something. It is not a matter of making art a psychoanalytic element or of psychoanalyzing art; nor of making art with psychoanalysis, although I told you that for me everything is linked to the world of art, because living is an art, right? Well,

to speak well, to say well to produce, regardless of what we consider to be good, is an art. I would say that this is perhaps the least explored area we have, but not only in Medellín, in the parish, in Colombia, but in the world concert. This relationship between psychoanalysis and art in a broad sense, is almost to be done in its entirety, in any of its manifestations, but if I arrive and say no, it is that the production of this artist is determined because he is envious of the penis and because He also wants to kill the father, we do not do any research and we do not make any progress, we make an absurdity, where neither art nor psychoanalysis goes anywhere. That is to say, an investigation blending art and psychoanalysis is possible if each one recognizes his field and which element is going to investigate so that indeed there is mutual give-and-take.

Bien, propongo una ya que usted me dice, diga una. Bien, propongo ... perdóname porque voy a hacer un comentario sobre una investigación que se adelantó en la última maestría, la relación lenguaje-música en Lacan y esta investigación, que comienza apenas, a quien te habla lo dejó sorprendido por muchas cosas: primero porque sobre el tema existen muy pocas referencias, tan pocas que uno diría son pobres en términos reales. Tenemos entonces un problema -si pienso no más en música- y es el problema del tiempo, ¿qué sabe el psicoanálisis del tiempo?, ¿qué sabe el arte del tiempo? y aparecen los problemas del lenguaje.

Well, I propose one since you tell me to say one. Well, I propose ... forgive me because I am going to make a comment about an investigation that was advanced in the last masters, the language-music relationship in Lacan and this research, which barely begins, to the speaker who left you surprised by many things: first because there are very few references on the subject, so few that one would say they are poor in real terms. We then have a problem - if I think no more about music - and it is the problem of time, what does the psychoanalysis of time know? What does the art of time know? and the language problems appear.

Ana: ... of the times, as well.

JM: ... of the times, of course. A work appears, for us it is eternal, it does not change. Then things are made that go through changes and time and that leads us to think about the order of truth. That substantialist language of being, that substantialist language of logos as reason, leads us to think that art is a truth, that psychoanalysis has a truth and yet neither is the truth, because truth is one and just one. Well, the world is one and multiple, in other words we are, I would say, that in default of starting to search, how to investigate psychoanalysis, art, with objects that are even totally alien to some extent; then all that is to be done, Ana.

Ana: With this invitation many possibilities open up, and that is the idea, that we begin to walk the path between the faculties of there and these of here. Although probably this has also been done and what I just said is silly because it is part of the founding myth. There are people who have tried and also that should be looked at; that there is a background of work between art and psychoanalysis, maybe they are not very applauded or they have not been given the space they deserve. But in any case, to continue that possible journey between some faculties and others and between these faculties with Medellín, with the city, with the people, I think that is even more interesting.

Well really thank you very much, because things are clarified, invited; the invitation that is such a beautiful gesture.

JM: Always, part of the fun. With the greatest pleasure, Ana.