

The Lost Archive: On Events in Difference of Repetition

Emily ShuHui Tsai

National Chung Hsing University, Taiwan

The Freudian notion of the compulsion repetition governed by the death drive beyond the pleasure principle with its inherent persistence of a nostalgic dream both to restore the earlier state of things and to return to the inanimate state has attracted philosophers, particularly Deleuze and Derrida, to revise, enrich, and broaden the concept in their theories of difference in repetition and the archives. Deleuze reconnects it with Nietzsche's notion of eternal return to tackle with the phenomenon of the events returning in difference of repetition. As to Lacan, the post-Freudian psychoanalyst, the death drive is in search of the lost Object, the original loss within the subject, Derrida theorizes the concept of archives in the unconscious memories to further elaborate that the death drive, in its interiorly-dialectical conflicts on the way to search for "a priori," namely, "the origin," has encountered the loss. Thus, the death drive, haunted by the specters of the past, develops the archive fever with the persistent passion to reach trembling sublimity. The movie, *The Legend of 1900*, directed by Giuseppe Tornatore, helps understand the problem that the talented pianist, 1900, abandoned in the ship by his birth parents when he was born and raised by a black worker as his foster father who died by accident, chooses to die with the ruined ship, "his only home," in absolute solitude although he was once driven by his passionate love for a woman to get off the ship and he failed the chance. The 1900's official identity is the lost archive on the land; he has been haunted by the lost archive: no memories of his birth parents.

Keywords: archive, the death drive, difference, repetition, the dark precursor, the haunting specter

Introduction

The Freudian notion of the compulsion repetition discussed in his psychoanalytic essay "Beyond the pleasure principle" is quite a mystery. The force-driven energy in persistence is the death drive¹ that longs for a return "to restore an earlier state of things" with its sublime dream of nostalgia, and also "to return to the inanimate state" although it cannot actually return to where it begins. To Freud, the compulsion to repeat has "the phenomena of heredity and the facts of embryology" (Freud, 2001, p. 37). From the Lacanian interpretation in his Seminar VII, the death drive is destined to look for something which is originally lost within the subject. The loss which exists in disappearance is the destined target for the death drive to move forward till its own

Emily ShuHui Tsai, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Department of Foreign Languages and Literature, National Chung Hsing University, Taichung, Taiwan.

¹ The two words, instincts and drives, can be used interchangeably (*The Language of Psychoanalysis*, p.214). I have noticed that to Freud, he usually uses the term, "instinct"; to Lacan and the post-Lacanian philosophers, they use the term "drive" frequently. In Freud's essay "Beyond the Pleasure Principle", Freud says that "all instincts tend towards the restoration of an earlier state of things" (Freud, 2001, p. 37). To Freud, there are two kinds of instinct (drive): the death instinct (ego instinct) and the life instinct (sexual instinct). The former with a conservative and retrograde character clings to a compulsion to repeat, to restore an earlier state of things; the latter tends towards a prolongation of life with its character of coalescence. But "All living substance is bound to die from internal causes" (Freud, 2001, p. 44). This is what I mean in my paper, a mystery: the secrecy of immanence.

energy exhausts itself because “this original Loss” cannot be retrieved. What can be rediscovered is the substitute of resemblance. In consequence, the death drive with its own ideal in its struggling process of the self-conflict moves onward the law-breaking road to the end of life.

The compulsion repetition as the secrecy of the death drive creates “the repetitious enjoyment” in a negative way for the subject; to Freud, this destructive negativity as the symptom of “the unconscious writing” bears tremendous *jouissance*² that may lead one to an unexpected misfortune or a regretful event in reality. Any event that repeats in difference is recognized as contingency in unpredictability, demonstrating a shocking phenomenon. Whenever it happens, the one who suffers suddenly stays frightened; he or she could not figure out why the contingent events happen in a familiar way as if the time events in the past repeat in difference. This repetitious phenomenon in difference of the death drive is strikingly mysterious; it has aroused a research passion, including those postmodern French philosophers, such as Jacques Derrida and Gilles Deleuze, although they have approached this issue in a different way.

Archives and Haunting Specters

As Freud interprets that the dream, the royal road to the unconscious, works with its own logic, that is, condensation and displacement, it means that something is forever repressed and there exist “screen memories”; some memories remain forgotten and what is shielded is buried in the bottomless void of the psyche. From this understanding, Derrida in his book, *Archive Fever*, argues that “The theory of psychoanalysis, then, becomes a theory of the archive and not only a theory of memory” (Derrida, 1995, p. 19). Metaphorically speaking, to Derrida, the unconscious is the house or the museum of memories, which can be understood as the reservoir of archives, in other words, the images of memories, including those forgotten, repressed, and excluded.

The concept of archive, as Derrida explains the word *Arkhē*, at the beginning, means “the commencement and the commandment”: the former with the physical, historical, and ontological principle refers to “the originary, the first, the primitive”; the latter with the nomological principle refers to the given order. Derrida elaborates more about *arkheion*, the Greek word, which means a house, and *archons* are those who give commands and guard the documents. The archontic guardianship has the power of consignment, which not only means entrustment, but also signs-gathering together (Derrida, 1995, pp. 2-3). It is quite a marvelous interpretation—thinking of the unconscious as the fundamental residence of heterogeneous thoughts, classified like archives which are guarded by an unnamable power, the unknown archon. Perhaps, this archon can be either understood as the unconscious censorship when dreams work or recognized as the judgment of the superego in Freudian libido economy.

Derrida emphasizes more on the archival order, law and power. Derrida says that the first figure of archive is “institutive and conservative” and also “revolutionary and traditional.” From this nomological perspective, “the house” as “domicile” or “family”, like an institution, has its own law (Derrida, 1995, p. 7). By the same token, from Freudian understanding, the unconscious has its own order to preserve those archives of memories. The problem, which can always be arguable, is that the original time event, the lost archive as the void, has always remained as an enigma; this “Real” force of the unnamable searching for the loss is the driving power that creates a series of repetitious events in difference. We repeat unknowingly because we have repressed our primal desire in the first place. And this is the sublime mission of the death drive to retrieve what has been

² In the Freudian-Lacanian psychoanalytic context, the French word, “*jouissance*” basically means “enjoyment” but it is pleasure in pain or displeasure.

repressed and lost. Unexpectedly, whatever returns or each time it repeats is the different shocking event in a familiar way. Derrida describes the problem of the Freudian notion of the death drive as the following:

It is as if Freud could no longer resist, henceforth, the irreducible and originary perversity of this drive which he names here sometimes death drive, sometimes aggression drive, sometimes destruction drive...this three-named drive is mute. It is at work, but since it always operates in silence, it never leaves any archives of its own. It destroys in advance its own archive...It works to destroy the archive: on the condition of effacing but also with a view to effacing its own "proper" traces...It devours it even before producing it on the outside. This drive, from then on, seems not only to be anarchic, anarchotic: the death drive is above all anarchivic, one could say, or archiviolithic. It will always have been archive-destroying, by silent vocation...There is no archive without a place of consignment, without a technique of repetition, and without a certain exteriority.... (Derrida, 1995, pp. 10-11)

In other words, this psychic energy is rather self-contradictory and paradoxical; the mission of death drive persistently is in search of what is excluded in its interior process of archivization. The loss of archives as the structurally-excluded resists symbolization and becomes the unknown force because it is self-effacing and self-subversive. Moreover, the death drive is the disturbing force of transgression, with its law of "the house" where preserves the archives of the memories but something has always already been lost forever.

The original archive belongs to a priori, the pure time event, the void, and the loss. It is the absence of the self-disappearing archive that cannot be signified and forever remains as the unknown, the irretrievable and the inaccessible, corresponding to the Žižekian notion of the Real. To be more precise, what is "Real" is the shocking truth; it is veiled, screened, shielded, and excluded. The main problem is that what is excluded still exists inclusively within the psychic structure although it cannot be represented by language and "this lost archive" becomes a void with an invisible force disturbing the subject. The death drive is self-immersed in its archive fever because with its interior law, it keeps searching for what is originally excluded or the loss. Whatever returns is not the same as the original one but its "resemblances," namely "the difference." As such, the death drive in its unrepentant persistence inevitably steps into "the devil's advocate" that gives rise to the disastrous events in reality. For this reason, the death drive is destructive and aggressive and simultaneously inversive but transcendental, encountering the unknown and the sublime void.

As Derrida argues that ontology has become hauntology, the subject is haunted by the specters of the past or by the search for "the origin" of the pure time, the lost archive. The movie, *The Legend of 1900*, in 1998, directed by Giuseppe Tornatore, is a good example here for a better understanding of the death drive. 1900 is the name of the baby abandoned in the ship by his birth parents when he was born and fostered by a black worker who died by accident afterwards. In other words, 1900 is confronted by the events that repeat in difference: the loss of the parents twice with no reasons. These two traumatic events cannot frustrate him; he is self-revolutionary but self-disciplined and talented. At first, he resists the rigid discipline of the captain but his self-discipline proves he is a man with a gifted art. He creates his own music and becomes the best pianist who attracts a large crowd from the land to the ship to listen to his fascinating music. 1900 has his own world of creativity, in which fame, competition and money are not included in his evaluation of a happy good life. The weighted loss of memory of his birth parents work in silence; the ship is symbolized as his "home," a house where the archivization of his life and his created pieces of music take place, although people never think this ship is his "residence" and he should get off the ship to enjoy wealth and to get married with a good woman. The problem is that when the moment he feels compelled to get off the ship, beyond people's expectation, he still immediately clings back to "his familiar ship" and chooses to die in absolute solitude with this old ship,

“his only home”—becoming the ruins with no official archives of his life on the land.

1900 has been haunted by his past, by the myth of his birth, the loss of the parents. The past has become the haunting specters, like the gravitational pull that imperceptibly forces him unable to move forward to create a life with people on the land. The ship has become “a house” or “a museum” of the whole archives of his memories in life although it has also brought him a great fame to forget his traumatic loss instantly. Whenever he ponders over the issue of what his true identity is because he has no official archive on the land, his identity, “the loss of the archive” as his symptom, provokes him repetitiously. It seems the question of identity itself attacks him like the return of the Real, the traumatic kernel of his psyche—the myth of the lost archive of his birth parents and the real lost archive of his identity on the land. At the end, the ship is too old to carry passengers on board and it has to be exploded; 1900 chooses to die with his ship—his true identity, his “true home” and his real archives of life without leaving any traces. This is the secrecy of his immanence. Isn’t it the death drive working in silence in him that has destroyed the archives of his whole life and eventually has arrived at sublimity of a shocking tragedy—a lonely death with the old ship? 1900 becomes the loss of the official archive on the land.

The Dark Precursor and Difference in Repetition

From the previous discussion, the death drive, like the haunting specter of the past, has its self-contradiction of the interior law: a persistent restoration of an earlier state of things, and such a nostalgic dream is the sublime road to the impossibility. Moreover, its self-destruction must engulf itself in the inherently-unnamable and unpredictable disturbance of forces. It reminds me of the notion of the dark precursor in Deleuze’s theories. The term, the dark precursor, is first discussed in his book, *Difference and Repetition*³, with a connotation of the invisible force of disturbance, the imperceptible darkness of interior obfuscation and unpredictable aggression; to be more precise, it is the dark affects at work in silence, like the haunting specters of the unconscious Real within the subject. In *Difference and Repetition*, Deleuze probes deeper into the controversial issue of “dark” enjoyment in the virtual with a purpose to revise, enrich and broaden the Freudian notion of the death drive. Psychoanalytic theories have been reintegrated into philosophy. Deleuze elaborates further to connect it with the Kantian notion of noumenon⁴ to tackle with the fundamental issue of the

³ The book, *Difference and Repetition*, was published in 1968, one year before Deleuze met Félix Guattari in 1969. Afterwards, in 1972, they published their influentially-collaborated book, *Anti-Oedipus*. Félix Guattari criticizes the clinical practices of Lacanian psychoanalysis. Deleuze, influenced by Guattari, criticizes the psychic mechanism of the repression—the major pressure in the unconscious of the subject. The book, *Anti-Oedipus*, by Deleuze and Guattari, aims for the social reformation, fighting against fascism and capitalism as well as the rigid treatment of mentally-ill patients. In consequence, Deleuze and Guattari argue that the unconscious is not the triangular familial romance like a metaphysical theater, but a factory where desiring-machine works in disjunction; it means that desiring-machine breaks away from any suffocating system and moves onwards its own creative way. At first glance, it seems that psychoanalysis sinisterly supports patriarchy and patients are healed to fit into the rigid ideology of patriarchal capitalism. Their “schizoanalysis” is to deconstruct psychoanalysis. Even though Freudian and Lacanian psychoanalytic practices are criticized by the great thinkers, their understanding of psychic structure and the problems of drives or instincts cannot be entirely denied or denigrated. They have their important contribution. Deleuze did not want to appropriate their psychoanalytic terms; therefore, Deleuze and Guattari create their own terminologies and use the terms “the virtual” and “the actual” to replace the psychoanalytic notions of the unconscious and the conscious.

⁴ In Kant’s philosophy, particularly in his first critique, *The Critique of Pure Reason*, he argues that there is a great gap between noumenon (beyond empirical experiences) and phenomenon (the empirical world). Thus, “any knowledge” gained intuitively and directly from the noumenon to the empirical world in fact falls into the problem of paralogism. It is an illusion. In Kantian age, even though it was the age of enlightenment, there was no such a concept like “the unconscious” within the subject. Therefore, in the 20th century, the philosophers have tried to reconsider the Kantian concepts such as “a priori,” “the pure reason” in the dimension of noumenon. Lacan tries to subvert those concepts in his book, Seminar VII, and to question the notion of God.

problematic causality of the time events. The secrecy of immanence involves the mystery of the pre-individual singularities, including the dark precursor as the disturbing force of the unnamable; the time events in different forms of repetition really portray the labyrinth of the psychic immanence weaved by the forces of dark affects of the death drive.

Deleuze, in *Difference and Repetition*, reconsiders the repetition of the death drive from the more affirmative perspective of philosophy because its transcendental “journey” is beyond the pleasure principle.

Death has nothing to do with a material model. On the contrary, the death instinct may be understood in relation to masks and costumes. Repetition is truly that which disguises itself in constituting itself, that which constitutes itself only by disguising itself...In short, repetition is in its essence symbolic...Difference is included in repetition by way of disguise and by the order of the symbol...It seems that the idea of a death instinct must be understood in terms of three paradoxical and complementary requirements: to give repetition an original, positive principle, but also an autonomous disguising power; and finally, to give it an immanent meaning in which terror is closely mingled with the movement of selection and freedom. (Deleuze, 1994, pp. 17, 19)

From the above-mentioned ideas, the repetition, forced by its internally-hidden disequilibrium, because of dissymmetrical blockages or gaps, appears in disguises, namely, the difference. In consequence, what is originally lost cannot be retrieved; the origin is the loss, or the difference itself. The persistence to find the original loss is the will wasted in vain and it inevitably incurs the disastrous events; each detour leads to further infinitely-digressive ways till one truly gets lost. Therefore, difference in repetition cannot dissociate itself from the images of monstrosity, evil, cruelty, curse, and dark affects.

Deleuze further explains the subtlety of differences to a great extent that complicates the circular struggles of repetition in difference. He argues that difference is not diversity or otherness (Deleuze, 1994, p. 30). Difference in this context refers to opposition or contrariety because each genus with the inherent differences of singularities, namely, the essence, reveals contrariety or contradiction. The immanent self-conflicts of differences allow its structural dissymmetry to stumble over the invisible blockages, gaps or excesses. When Deleuze associates difference in repetition with the Nietzsche’s notion of eternal return, he never interprets that this returning with the extreme will to power does not introduce the events of theatrical metamorphoses that indicate evil. Deleuze thinks that the Nietzsche’s notion of eternal return invites chaos; therefore, chaos and eternal return are “a single and same affirmation.”

With eternal return, chao-errancy is opposed to the coherence of representation...Re-petition opposes re-presentation...Repetition is the formless being of all differences, the formless power of the ground which carries every object to that extreme “form” in which its representation comes undone. The ultimate element of repetition is the disparate, which stands opposed to the identity of representation. Thus, the circle of eternal return, difference and repetition is a tortuous circle in which sameness is said only of that which differs. (Deleuze, 1994, p.57)

For this reason, differences govern eternal return each time it repeats itself with extreme intensities of affects. Obviously, it is against Descartes’ famous idea: “I think therefore I am”; perhaps, it should be revised into “I think therefore I am not or I don’t think therefore I am.” To be more precise, yet not to those Freudian or Lacanian followers’ surprises, there exists a fissure or a crack in the structural concept of I; as such, this fractured “I” conceals the truth of Lacanian triad of psychic structure—the Real, the Imaginary and the Symbolic, which responds to Freudian triad of psychic libido dynamism—id, ego, and superego. Both of them share the same idea that the concept of “I” is the imaginary construct or a mask; it means that part of “I” remains in the unconscious, unbeknown to the consciousness of “I.” Thus, one’s consciousness of

self-understanding is half true and half false; besides, the more one tries to understand the full sense of the whole self, the more one feels frustrated and depressed because it is an impossibility; one cannot exhaust its endless interpretations. Each interpretation functions like a metaphor, idealizing the sense of self, like the two major principles of dream work: condensation and displacement. Memories enjoy this free imagination, like the art of cinematic montage; each image, covering up what is shielded, pieces together “the fractured I.”

The psychic structure is based on the groundless ground, the void, where the disturbing forces of the unknown Real persist in striking back repetitiously. Eternal return involves the unnamable forces of multi-layered heterogeneity of differences; thus, its internal chaos “affirms” the extreme forces of returning. Isn’t it an internal secrecy of revenge that affirms the road of returning to search for its own identity? Those excluded become “the unknown heterogeneous differences” which cannot be properly represented—the truth of the self is irrecoverable. This unresolved problem is destined to return to attack the subject with events in differences. The invisibly-unsettling forces of eternal return as difference in each structure, including the subject, are called “the dark precursor” in Deleuze’s theoretical context. The concept of I as the wholeness is a myth: it has “the order” of self-concealment, because something has been lost and excluded in the psyche.

It has no place other than that from which it is “missing”, no identity other than that which it lacks: it is precisely the object = x, the one which ‘is lacking in its place’ as it lacks its own identity...In other words, these express only the manner in which it conceals itself under its own effects, because of the way it perpetually displaces itself within itself and perpetually disguises itself in the series...We call this dark precursor, this difference in itself or difference in the second degree which relates heterogeneous systems and even completely disparate things, the disparate. In each case, the space in which it is displaced and its process of disguise determines a relative size of the differences brought into relation. (Deleuze, 1994, p. 120)

Isn’t it that this dark precursor with self-concealment disguises and displaces itself persisting in the painful path of difference of repetition in eternal return? This is its “jouissance.” What kind of loss is it searching for? What the eternal identity it needs persistently for the sense of “wholeness”? If not the origin, which is fundamentally the difference, what else it feels compelled by the immanent impulses to search for it with such a great but unreachable ideal? The origin as the event of pure time is the lost archive that has aroused such a tremendous power to develop “the archive fever” that leads to the royal road to trembling sublimity.

In the movie, 1900 has tried to contact women on the land by telephone several times but these are not the happy experiences; each time he fails, the less courage to pursue love itself. The women’s voices on the line often sound sarcastic, insensitive, impatient or unromantic as if they are seriously disturbed by a stranger on the other line. These recurrent traumatic failures repeat in difference and his dreams for love are entirely disillusioned. But when 1900 suddenly has a chance to fall in love with a woman stranger at first sight, it is a mesmerizing moment. This pretty woman shows up when he is composing one lovely piece of music for the recording. The music is being composed when his eyes are glued to each movement the woman moves outside the cabin. The pretty woman, 1900’s creative inspiration, does not notice that she is gazed by him with his true love. After 1900 has finished composing the music, he thinks he can send the phonograph record as the gift of unforgettable memory to the woman he highly adores. They encounter each other on the deck on the raining day; the woman notices him. She talks to her friends that she wants to hear the voice of the ocean. It reminds him of a man who was once with him saying the same thing: “the voice of the ocean.” 1900 thinks he is the woman’s father. At that crucial moment, 1900 is so reserved that he does not pour out his passion of how he has composed the music for her. She walks away with her friends in silence.

The dark precursor or the force of the Real seems to work in silence for this failure because 1900, haunted by the disturbing specter of the memories, has not actually freed from the past. When the woman has to leave the ship to go back home to her father, 1900 rushes through the crowd to find her and tells her that he knows her father who was on board several years ago. The woman is so touched that she gives him a friendly kiss on his cheek. 1900 is too touchingly-stunned to offer the phonograph record as the gift of love to her. Obviously, she is pushed forward by the crowd and does not hear what he says except “good luck” as his polite farewell. Being so depressed and diffident, he fails to give her his phonograph record, the token of his love. As she disappears entirely, the ship sails to the opposite direction and he stays in his own cabin breaking the phonograph record into several pieces. This phonograph record has almost become the lost archive: the loss of his true love. To the outsiders, it is easier to think otherwise that 1900 should have empowered himself to go with her with courage to leave the ship to start a completely-new life and he should not have surrendered himself to the haunting specter of the past.

Although he has tried once to get off the ship to look for that pretty woman, he still clings back to the ruined old ship. Since the recurrences of the failure of love have repeated several times, he could either have no courage to face an entirely-new life or keep disappointed with no real identity at all. 1900 has been seriously attacked by the series of subtle differences of painful repetitions in his solitude. These time events drag him to withdraw from his consummating unity with love. It is the demonic evil, the dark precursor that manipulates imperceptibly to force the woman images to repetitiously disappear: the first is his birth mother as the lost archive; the second is the pretty woman on board, who inspires him to compose music, as the “real” archive of memories for love although afterwards he tries to destroy it without any traces at all. Luckily, this broken phonograph record afterwards is rediscovered and saved in the antique shop of musical instruments.

In fact, he does not know what that pretty woman really needs. He thought the phonograph record of his creative music were the best gift he could offer his true love to her. Unexpectedly, this is only an unconsummated love because the way he shows his love is not the way she really understands or desires. Or perhaps, the pretty woman gets on board after the piano duel, and she does not actually watch how successfully 1900 in the piano duel shows such a great talent to defeat the other pianist who challenges him with too much pride. She only views him as an ordinary man, one of her father’s acquaintances in that ship. But to 1900, she has only become the inaccessibly-sublime Object in the highly-elevated state in his mind. On the other hand, 1900’s good partner, Max, a fantastic trumpet player and also the narrator of this movie, is as impressive as 1900 because of his faithful friendship with 1900. The ship has its life circle too and it has been ageing: when the ship, emptied of all passengers, becomes the ruined one, 1900 still stays there to wait for his own solitary death—a voluntary suicide with the ruined ship and the entire self-destruction of his whole archives of his life as the ruined memories. It is his best friend, Max, who keeps going back on board to look for 1900 in the ruins and to persuade him to get off the ship to start a completely-new life, although he fails this mission. The only archive 1900 has left is his touchingly-creative music, inspired by a romance, in Max’s unforgettable memories.

Conclusion

From this movie, *The Legend of 1900*, it helps understand the individual mystery of immanence. Something is at work in silence though 1900 has tried his best to create music to heal his childhood trauma: “the lost archive of the memory of his birth parents” to know his real identity. The ship as his recognized “home” with “its limited territory” can infinitely carry him to travel all over the world. Different people from

all walks of life on board who come and go are greatly entertained by his impromptu creative music. To 1900, the life of the land is too immense for him to feel secure; he is not sure if he can lead a good life with the woman he highly admires. The “anticipated” discouragement, as the affects of the dark precursor, blocks him from the pursuit of a different life; intrinsically he is entirely defeated by his old “habit” that has pushed him to withdraw into his absolute solitude. Repetitions in difference are inscribed in the future to come: the illusion of the restoration of the earlier state of life, namely, the nostalgic loss, in reverse moves onward its own promised future. It demonstrates the truth of psychic time: the coexistence or contemporaneity of the past, the present and the future. By creating music, 1900 can instantly forget who his real identity is, even though he can not entirely deny the fact that he has been haunted by the specters of his past. Derrida thinks that the death drive is “the violence of forgetting, superrepression, the anarchic, in short, the possibility of putting to death the very thing, whatever its name, which carries the law in its tradition....” (Derrida, 1995, p. 79). The “tradition” here, to 1900, is the way of his habit, his history of life in that old ship. Nevertheless, his creative music—becoming the virtual archives of memories—still has been playing in people’s mind, particularly, his best friend, Max.

The weighted burden of the loss in the past, though an unconscious trauma, paces the unpredictable way of life—a response to the future. 1900 is unable to control his future not to fall into his psychic trauma, such an internal law of circular differences in repetition. The secrecy lies in the fact that the unknown and the unnamable part of the selves within the concept of “I” remain inaccessible; thus it renders impossible the full revelation of the whole truth of “I.” The fractured I is burdened with the inherently-unnamable forces of the unconscious. As to this ontological enigma or hauntology, it does not entirely mean that our lives have been already predetermined and haunted by the specters of the past and we are just the puppet playing the roles of the script written by the persistent forces of the death drive for the different stages of lives. Quite contrary to the passive idea, the actual level of “the conscious I” indeed can play the major role of forging the negative forces into a more positive way in its affirmative transmutation of values by tackling with the disturbing elements of “the dark precursor” in its invisible form of various differences. From the more positive perspective, 1900, though revolutionary and undisciplined by any rigid rules, indeed has created a marvelous life with his unprecedentedly-creative music. Moreover, he shows empathy and humility toward people on board. He creates impromptu music in accordance with each movement of different people who reveal their stories on their faces. The destiny of the death drive in repetitious differences to restore the earlier state of life, a nostalgic dream, is sublimated into a more dignified life of music in 1900—his ethical act to achieve his great art of music for life.

References

- Deleuze, G. (1972). *Proust and Signs*. Trans. R. Howard. New York: George Braziller.
- Deleuze, G. (1994). *Difference and Repetition*. Trans. P. Patton. London: The Athlone Press.
- Derrida, J. (1976). *Of Grammatology*. Trans. G. C. Spivak. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Derrida, J. (1995). *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*. Trans. E. Prenowitz. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Evans, D. (1996). *An Introductory Dictionary of Lacanian Psychoanalysis*. New York: Routledge.
- Fink, B. (2016). *Lacan on Love: An Exploration of Lacan’s Seminar VIII, Transference*. Malden: Polity.
- Freud, S. (2001). “*Beyond the Pleasure Principle*.” *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, Vol. XVIII, 1920-1922. London: Vintage. 7-64
- Lacan, J. (1992). *The Ethics of Psychoanalysis 1959-1960*. Ed. J. A. Miller. London: Routledge.
- Laplanche, J., & Pontalis, J. B. (1973). *The Language of Psychoanalysis*. Trans. D. Nicholson-Smith. New York: W. W. Norton.