

Founding Act

I hereby found — as alone as I have always been in my relation to the psychoanalytic cause — the *Ecole Française de Psychanalyse*,¹ whose direction, concerning which nothing at present prevents me from answering for, I shall undertake during the next four years to assure.

That title, in my understanding, represents the organism in which a labor is to be accomplished — a labor which, in the field opened up by Freud, restores the cutting edge of his discovery — a labor which returns the original praxis he instituted under the name of psychoanalysis to the duty incumbent upon it in our world — a labor which, through assiduous criticism, denounces the deviations and compromises that blunt its progress while degrading its use.

This working objective is inseparable from a training to be dispensed within that movement of reconquest. Which is to say that therein those whom I myself have trained will be fully empowered and that invitation is extended to all those who can contribute to substantiating the ordeal of that training.

Those who will enter the *Ecole* will commit themselves to fulfilling a task subject to both internal and external supervision. In exchange, they are assured that nothing will be spared in order that anything valid they do be given the repercussions it deserves, and in the place appropriate to it.

For the execution of the work, we shall adopt the principle of an elaboration sustained in a small group. Each of them (we have a name for designating the groups) will be composed of at least three individuals, five at most, four being the proper measure. PLUS ONE charged with selection, discussion, and the outcome to be accorded the efforts of each.

After a certain period of functioning, the elements of a group will be invited to shift to a different group.

The task of directing will not constitute a form of leadership whose service rendered might be capitalized into access to a higher rank, and no one will be inclined to regard himself demoted for entering at a rank of base-level work.

1. [Three months later, the *Ecole Freudienne de Paris*. — J.-A. Miller]

For the reason that every personal endeavor will place its author in conditions of criticism and supervision to which every work pursued will be subject in the Ecole.

This in no way implies an inverted hierarchy, but a circular organization whose—easy to program—functioning will take on consistency with experience.

We constitute three sections, whose progress I shall undertake to ensure along with two collaborators who will second me in each:

I. *Section for Pure Psychoanalysis*, or praxis and doctrine of psychoanalysis properly speaking, which is and is nothing but—something to be established in its place—the training psychoanalysis.

The urgent problems to be raised concerning all the issues of the training analysis will have to make their way here through a sustained confrontation between individuals having had an experience of it and candidates in training. Its *raison d'être* being based on what there is no reason to conceal: to wit, the need resulting from professional exigencies every time they entail for the analysand in training the incurring of a responsibility construable, if ever so slightly, as analytic.

It is within that problem and as a special case that the entry into the supervisory phase is to be situated. A prelude to defining that case according to criteria other than those of the impressions of all and the prejudices of each. For it is known that such is at present its only law, when the violation of the rule implicit in the observance of its forms is permanent.

From the start and in every case qualified supervision will be within this framework assured to every practitioner trained in our Ecole.

There will be proposed for the thus established course of study the characteristics by which I myself break with the promulgated standards of training practice, as well as the effects imputed to my teaching on the course of my analyses when it is the case that, as students, my analysands are in attendance. Included therein, if necessary, will be the sole impasses to be retained from my position in such a School, to wit: those that the very induction toward which my teaching aims would engender in its work.

These studies, whose point is the calling into question of the established routine, will be gathered and compared by the directorate of the section, which will oversee the most propitious ways of sustaining the effects of their solicitation.

Three subsections:

1. doctrine of pure psychoanalysis
2. internal criticism of its praxis as training
3. supervision of psychoanalysts in training

Finally, I posit as a doctrinal principle that this section, which is the first, as well as that whose destination I shall indicate in Part 3, will not be limited in

its recruitment to the medical degree, pure psychoanalysis not being in itself a therapeutic technique.

II. *Section for Applied Psychoanalysis*, which means therapeutics and clinical medicine.

To which will be admitted medical groups, whether or not they be composed of psychoanalyzed subjects, to the extent that they are capable of contributing to the psychoanalytic experience; through the criticism of its indications in its results; through the testing of the categorical terms and structures that I have introduced as sustaining the undeviating course of Freudian praxis, this in clinical examinations, in nosographical definitions, in the very positing of therapeutic projects.

Here too three subsections:

1. doctrine of therapy and its variations
2. casuistry
3. psychiatric information and medical exploration

A directorate for authenticating each work as part of the school, and such that its composition excludes all preconceived conformism.

III. *Section for Taking Inventory of the Freudian Field*

It will first of all be responsible for the summarizing and critical censuring of everything offered in this field by publications claiming to be so authorized.

It will undertake to publish those principles from which analytic praxis is to receive its statute within science. A statute which, however idiosyncratic it must be recognized to be, cannot be that of an ineffable experience.

Finally, it will call for the instruction of our experience as for its communication, in whatever coefficient of structuralism in specific sciences can cast light on that whose function I have demonstrated in our own, — and inversely in what in our subjectivation those same sciences can receive as a complementary inspiration.

In the last analysis, a praxis of theory is required, without which the order of affinities delineated by the sciences we call conjectural will remain at the mercy of that political drift which rises by dint of the illusion of universal conditioning.

Thus, again three subsections:

1. continuous commentary of the psychoanalytic movement
2. articulation with related sciences
3. ethics of psychoanalysis, which is the praxis of its theory

The financial holdings constituted initially by the contributions of the members of the Ecole, by the funding it will eventually receive, indeed by the services it will render as a school, will be entirely reserved for its publishing efforts.

In the first rank, an annual will gather the titles and abstracts of works —

wherever they have appeared — of the Ecole, an annual in which will appear, at their mere request, all those who will have been functioning therein.

Membership in the Ecole will entail presenting oneself in a work-group constituted as we have said.

Admission initially will be decided by myself without taking any account of positions taken by anyone toward my person in the past, sure as I am of those that left me that it is not I who begrudge them it, but they who will begrudge me still more their not being able to come back.

My answer, moreover, will concern only what I am able to presume or observe from evidence of the value of the group and the place it is initially intent on filling.

The organization of the Ecole on the rolling principle I indicated will be determined by the efforts of a commission approved by a first plenary assembly to be held a year from now. That commission will elaborate it based on the experience completed at the end of the second year, at which time a second plenary assembly will have to approve it.

It is not necessary for members to implement the entirety of this plan for it to work. I don't need a numerous list, but determined workers, such as I already know.

Adjoining Note

This founding act holds simple habits as nil. It nevertheless appeared to leave some questions open to those who continued to be governed by those habits.

A user's guide, in seven parts, herewith gives the most asked for answers (from which the questions they dissipate may be supposed).

I. *Concerning the Trainer*

A psychoanalyst is a trainer, for having conducted one or several analyses which proved to be of a didactic nature.

Such empowerment is *de facto*, and has always in fact transpired in such manner, being referable to an annual confirming such facts without even having to claim to be exhaustive.

The custom of peer consent is rendered null for having allowed the very recent introduction of what is called "the list" to the extent that a society has been able to use it to ends that misconstrue in the most glaring manner the very conditions of analyses to be undertaken as well as of analyses in progress.

Conditions of which the essential one is that the analysand be free to choose his analyst.

II. *Concerning Candidacy to the Ecole*

Candidacy for the Ecole is one thing; qualification for a training analysis another.

Candidacy to the school requires selection procedures to be regulated according to its working goals.

The initial charge will be held by a simple admissions committee, to be called *Cardo*, that is: *hinge* in Latin, which indicates in what spirit it is to operate.

Let us recall that a training analysis is required only for the Ecole's first section, even if it be desirable for all.

III. *Concerning the Training Analysis*

The qualification of a psychoanalysis as didactic (or in the order of training) has been exercised until the present according to a procedure concerning which it is sufficient, in order to judge it, to observe that it has not allowed for an articulation of any of its principles for as long as it has lasted.

None has any chance of being evolved in the future, unless it first break with a custom open to derision.

The sole sure principle to be posited—and this all the more to the extent that it has been misconstrued—is that a psychoanalysis is constituted as didactic by the will of the subject, and that he be advised that the analysis will contest that will to the very extent that the desire it conceals is approached.

IV. *Concerning the Training Analysis within Participation in the Ecole*

Those who undertake a didactic (or training) analysis do so by their own choice and on their own responsibility.

Section I of this note even implies that they can be in a position to authorize their psychoanalyst as a trainer.

But admission to the Ecole imposes on them the condition that they have committed themselves to the undertaking—where and when.

For the Ecole, at whatever moment the subject enters into analysis, must place that fact into the balance with the responsibility that it cannot refuse its consequences.

It is a constant that psychoanalysis has effects on every practice of the subject committed to it. When that practice proceeds, however slightly, from psychoanalytic effects, he finds himself engendering them at the very spot at which he is to acknowledge them.

How can one not see that a control is required at the very moment of those effects, and first of all in order that he who comes to these effects in the position of a patient be protected from them?

At stake here is a responsibility which reality imposes on the subject, when he is a practitioner, to be assumed at his own risk.

Pretending not to know this fact is the incredible function that is maintained in the practice of the training analysis: the subject is alleged not to be a practitioner, or held to be violating on his own a rule of prudence, indeed of honesty. That by observing that rule, the subject comes to be deficient in relation to his function is not beyond the bounds of what transpires, as is known, moreover.

The Ecole, by virtue of the very work it has been made to ensure, can in no way remove itself from that disastrous state of things.

That is why it will ensure the supervision appropriate to the situation of each individual, while confronting a reality of which the analyst's agreement forms part.

Inversely, an insufficient solution will be able to motivate a breaking of the contract.

V. *Concerning Joining the School*

There are at present two ways of joining the Ecole.

1. The group (which will be called a *cartel*) constituted by mutual choice in accord with the founding act presents itself to my discretion along with the work that each individual plans to pursue.
2. Those individuals wishing to make themselves known for whatever project will be advised to consult a member of the *Cardo*: the names of the first to have accepted the charge at my request will be published before July 20. I will myself direct to one of these, whoever should request it of me.

VI. *Concerning the Statute of the Ecole*

My personal role as director is provisional, although promised for four years. They seem to us necessary for starting up the Ecole.

If its statute is henceforth that of an association as promulgated according to the law of 1901, we feel it necessary first of all to enter into its movement the internal statute which will be, in a brief while, proposed for approval to all.

Let us recall that the worst objection that can be made to Societies in the form in which they currently exist is the slacking off of work—manifest even in quality—that they cause among the best.

The Ecole's success will be measured by the appearance of works that are receivable in their place.

VII. *Concerning the Ecole as an Inaugural Experience*

This aspect is sufficiently called for, we think, in the founding act, and we leave it to individuals to discover the promises and obstacles entailed.

To those who are able to pose the question of what it is that guides us, we shall unveil its reason.

The teaching of psychoanalysis can be transmitted from one subject to another only by way of a transference.

The “seminars,” including our course at Hautes Etudes, will found nothing if they don’t refer back to that transference.

No doctrinal apparatus, and in particular our own, however propitious it be in the orientation of one’s work, will be able to prejudge the conclusions which will be its issue.

PREAMBLE

The question may first be raised concerning the relation between the decision of this act of foundation to the teaching which does not leave this act without guarantee.

It shall be posited that however qualified those within it will be to discuss that teaching, the Ecole is not dependent on nor does it dispense that teaching, since it is pursued on the outside.

If, indeed, the existence of an audience — which has not yet taken its full measure — for that teaching was revealed at the same juncture as that which imposed the very existence of the Ecole, it is all the more important to underscore what separates them.

Ecole Freudienne de Paris — that title, which was kept in reserve in the founding act, clearly announces to whoever limits himself to its terms the intentions from which we proceed.

Let us pass by the site from which we reclaim, not without being entitled to do so, along with the original shield, the act of defiance already saluted by Freud that it entails: the Ecole affirms itself to be first of all Freudian, for the reason that — if there were ever a truth undoubtedly sustained by a presence patient in its reiteration, but which by dint of that effect has become the conscience, as it were, of the French soil — it is that the Freudian message, in its radical thrust, goes far beyond the use to which it is put by practitioners of Anglophonic obedience.

Even if one lends a hand in France, as elsewhere, to a practice mitigated by the unfurling of a form of psychotherapy associated with the needs of social hygiene, — it is a fact that no practitioner can fail to manifest his discomfort or aversion, indeed his derision or horror, in proportion to the opportunities he affords himself to dip into the open space in which the practice hereby denounced enters its imperialist phase: conformist in its aims, barbarous in its doctrine, a complete regression to psychologism, pure and simple, — the whole thing poorly compensated for by the promotion of a cleresy it would be easy to caricature, but which in its solemnity is indeed the residue bearing witness to the training through which psychoanalysis does not come totally undone in what it is propagating.

An image of that discord may be derived from the evidence that springs forth upon asking if it is not true that in our era psychoanalysis is everywhere, and psychoanalysts elsewhere.

For it is not a vain matter that astonishment may greet the fact that the name of Freud alone, by virtue of the hope of truth it bears with it, is of an order to confront the name of Marx, the still undissipated suspicion, even though it is plain that its abyss is unfillable, that in the path opened up by Freud might be perceptible the reason why Marxism fails to account for an increasingly immoderate and insane power insofar as politics is concerned, unless what is in play is a reverse effect of its contradictions.

That psychoanalysts are poorly situated to judge the ills in which they are immersed, but that they feel themselves to be missing therein is sufficient to explain why their response has been an encystment of thought. An abdication that opens the way to a false complacency, affording its beneficiary the same effects as the genuine kind; in this case, the authenticating mark — they sully — of terms whose keep is vouchsafed them for an enterprise which does not at all fall within the province of the prevailing economy, but the conditioning of those it employs is convenient, and even in its highest reaches: psychological orientation and its various offices.

Thus psychoanalysis is too expectant and psychoanalysts too overextended for the suspense to be resolved from any other site than the very point at which they separated: to wit, in the training of the psychoanalyst.

It's not that the Ecole does not dispose of what assures it of not breaking any continuity: to wit, psychoanalysts who are irreproachable from whatever point of view they be regarded, since it would have been enough for them, as it was for the rest of the subjects trained by Lacan, to forsake his teaching in order to be recognized by a certain "Internationale," and that it is a matter of notoriety that they owe it solely to their own choice and discernment to have forsaken that recognition.

It is the Ecole which calls back into question the principles of an investiture, and with the consent of those who are known to have received it.

Wherein it proves to be still Freudian, the term *school* comes now under our scrutiny.

It is to be taken in the sense in which in ancient times it meant certain places of refuge, indeed bases of operation against what might already be called the discontents of civilization.

Limiting ourselves to the discontent within psychoanalysis, the Ecole intends to accord its space not only to a labor of criticism: to the opening up of the grounds of our experience, to the questioning of the manner of life to which it leads.

Those who commit themselves herewith feel themselves to be sufficiently solid to articulate the manifest situation: that psychoanalysis at present has nothing more sure to put forth to its credit than the production of psycho-

analysts—even if the bottom line should appear to leave something to be desired.

Not that one need yield to any self-accusation. For it is understood that the results of psychoanalysis, even in the dubious truth that is their status, are of a more worthy cast than the fluctuations of fashion and the blind premises on which so many types of therapy rely in that domain in which medicine is as yet not finished seeking its bearings in regard to its criteria (are those of social adaptation isomorphous with those of the cure?) and seems even to have retreated insofar as nosography is concerned: we are speaking of psychiatry's having become a question for all.

It is even rather curious to see how psychoanalysis at this point plays the role of a lightning rod. Without it, how would those who have invested their worth in opposing it manage to have themselves taken seriously? Whence a status quo in which the psychoanalyst draws comfort from the gratitude he receives for his own insufficiency.

And yet the original distinction of psychoanalysis lay in giving access to the notion of a cure within its domain, to wit: restoring to symptoms their meaning, according a place to the desire they mask, rectifying in an exemplary mode the apprehension of a privileged relation, — and it would still have been necessary to be able to illustrate it with the distinctions of structure required by the forms of illness, and to recognize them in the relations of the being who demands, and who identifies with that demand and with that identification itself.

It would further be necessary for the desire and the transference animating them to raise those experiencing them to the point of finding intolerable concepts perpetuating a construction of man and God in which understanding and will are distinguished by an alleged passivity of the first mode and an arbitrary activity attributed to the second.

The revision of thought called for by the connections with desire that Freud imposes on it seems to be beyond the means of the psychoanalyst. No doubt, they are eclipsed because of the accommodation deflecting them toward the weakness of those he assists.

There is one point, however, at which the problem of desire cannot be eluded—when what is at stake is the desire of the psychoanalyst himself.

And nothing is more exemplary of sheer chatter than what has gained currency on that score: that that is what conditions the sureness of his intervention.

To pursue in its alibis the misprision sheltering itself with false papers requires the encounter between what is most valid in a personal experience with those that would call on it to confess, regarding it as a commonly held good.

The scientific authorities themselves at this point are the hostages of an insolvent pact with the result that it is no longer from without that a requisite control—that would be on the agenda anywhere else—may be awaited.

It is the affair solely of those, be they psychoanalysts or not, who take an interest in psychoanalysis in the act.

It is to them that the Ecole is opened, that they may put their interest to the test—it not being forbidden them to elaborate its logic.

June 21, 1964