

Hurly-Burly

No. 4
October 2010

		Bernard Seynhaeve, "A Pass in Three Phases"	102
	9	Rose-Paule Vinciguerra, "Authorising Oneself, But Twice Over"	107
	15	Patrick Monribot, "The Lasting Desire to Last"	113
	25	Laure Naveau, " <i>Médusée</i> "	117
		Monique Kusnierek, "Going Back to my Analyst"	123
		Dominique Laurent, "To Dream Beyond the Worst"	127
	35	Marie-Hélène Brousse, "Fury"	135
		Workshop	
	39	Florencia F.C. Shanahan, "Normally Mad, <i>Diseases of Mentality, Ordinary Psychosis</i> "	143
		Armelle Gaydon, "Celebrities and the Anonymous Tell the Story of their First Psychoanalytic Session"	147
	55	Studies	
	61	Jean-Luc Monnier, "On Geneviève Asse"	155
	65	Ruth Ronen, "Dying of Shame, Consumed by Anxiety"	157
	69	Jacques Aubert, " <i>Passed Over Stories</i> "	167
	73	Sophie Marret, "Reading Joyce"	185
	79		
	83	Hypermodern Times	
		Jacques-Alain Miller, "Financial Crisis"	203
	89	Graciela Brodsky, "Contemporary Utopias"	207
	95	Jean Luc Monnier, "Shame, An Old-Fashioned Affect?"	219
	99	Eric Laurent, "New Erotics of the Divine"	231

is not the Name-of-the-Father, which
ay, to control bodies and their jouissance,
ssance for everyone, not even the fiction
analysis is sometimes sought. Its tool to
law called the symptom. And it does not
resource – an ingeniousness even – for

the Spanish by Florencia F.C. Shanahan

1954. E. P. Dutton & Co., 1958, "Section VII: Morals."

discours de février 1793" in *Annales historiques de*
E.

analysis, transl. by D. Porter, New York, Norton

Complete Edition in English, transl. by B. Fink, New

Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological

of Captain Grant, Book I, Chapter XXIV.

Principles of its Power", in *Écrits, op. cit.*, (IV:3-4)

analysis, *op. cit.*, p. 292.

and A. Michelson in *Television/A Challenge*
Norton & Co., 1990, p. 22.

Congrès de l'École freudienne de Paris- La Grande
1975, p. 78.

of Seminar XI]" in *The Seminar, Book X*
trans. by A. Sheridan, Penguin, 1977, pp. 104-5.

Press, 1948, pp. 104-5.

freudienne, Issue 58, October 2004, pp. 125-14

Editorial
Event The WAP Congre
Event The WAP Congre
Workshop
Studier
Hypermodern Times

Jean Luc Monnier

Shame, An Old-Fashioned Affect?

Seminar XVII ends on a culminating note: shame.¹ This seminar, which Lacan held over 1969-70, published in French in 1992, is in my view a pivotal one. It brings to an end the treatment of the father undertaken by Lacan in 1964 with his Seminar *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis*, which as you know came in place of the seminar on *Les noms du père* that he declined to give due to his excommunication. No doubt one might also say that at the time Lacan judged this seminar, *Les noms du père*, which was going to put the father in question by pluralizing it, to be premature: getting on to the father in such a head-on way was no doubt inadmissible, psychoanalysts were not ready for this and the ensuing events proved as much.

Nevertheless, the four fundamental concepts, which Jacques-Alain Miller has said are names of the father as traces of the miscarried seminar, opens up Pandora's box by returning to transference, repetition, the drive and the unconscious, in order to transmute them. Lacan did not get on directly to the father, but he got on to the fundamental concepts invented by the father of psychoanalysis. *Seminar XVII* would conclude this cycle by bringing about a scaling down of the father, whose function can be fulfilled, as Lacan shows, by the master-signifier in the discourse he calls "the master's discourse". *Seminar XVII* ends the work of dressing down the father, who appears for what he is: a *semblant* one may make use of. The nether side of psychoanalysis is from this point of view just as much the nether side of Freud as the father of psychoanalysis whom Lacan makes use of while all the while going without him!

The Seminar opens with the four discourses which set down, black and white in letters, the decline of the father and his truth: the father is and always has been castrated. This was in tune with the times, and it was also the times themselves that allowed Lacan to take this step. We're in 1970, so after 1968. The father who had already been greatly diminished since the nineteenth century was crumbling, ideals were running out of steam in the face of the blows sustained from science and technology which hold out the prospect of a possible satisfaction for everyone, and which may be equated with a provocation, to take up a term Heidegger employs to qualify modern technology, a *provocation* to enjoy. From this point of view, *Seminar XVII* also marks the end of an era. The thriving post-war economy would come up against the first oil crisis, the dollar was to become free-floating, and "financial speculation resolutely supplanted the industrial revolution in the development of capitalism."²

It closes on shame which, on first read, seems unusual. Nevertheless, there is a logic; this is how Lacan brings a culminating note to his seminar. This *Seminar XVII* is ballasted with *jouissance*, and shame is linked more to *jouissance*, whilst guilt matches up with desire. This foreshadows the shift in perspective of *Seminar XX* where *jouissance* would replace the Other of the signifier as prior to any Subject; this *jouissance* that it will no longer be a question of the master forbidding, but instead administrating.

The prevalence of *jouissance* in contemporary society is therefore the consequence of the father's decay, a foreshadowed decay that is but the social, contingent realisation of its foundation: castration.

Shame in the Latin lexical field: from dishonour to modesty

Shame seems to be one of humanity's common goods: all the great civilisations have dealt with it. It can be found in the Qur'an (Sura XVI for instance), in Confucius, and in the Bible. It is an essential element in Japanese culture, where *seppuku* was for a long time its corollary.

Closer to home, it punctuates the writings of Latin authors and shapes a fairly extensive lexical field going from *dedecus*, dishonour, *turpitude*, fault, moral ugliness, *indignitas*, lowering of social value, *flagitium*, disgraceful act or *probrum*, condemnable behaviour, and *infamia*, discredit. I would refer you to Jean-François Thomas's captivating work, *Déshonneur et honte en latin: étude sémiotique*.³

We can recognise familiar signifiers here: but the fundament of all these lexical units is the relation to the Other. Each of these signifiers specifies a mode of apperception of the subject by a moral and social Other. From *dedecus* which designates the a subject's insurmountable break from the social body, from *decus*, the honourable setting, a subject whose conduct stands out, to *ignominia*

which qualifies the action and the subject to qualify this action in accordance with the

The lexical field around two other terms, *pudeur* and *verecundia* is also polysemous. *Pudeur* "shyness", "modesty" is a measure of the subject's humiliation, while *verecundia*

We may note that they stand in a relation of objective point of denotation in *pudor* and *verecundia* are "senses" of the subject concerned. The subject's demeanour

In the objective sense, shame in the subject is related to the phenomenon of shame. In the subjective sense, shame in the subject denotes both the

The French term *vergogne*, Latin, its roots is *vergo* and *vergogne*. It denotes a broken away from

Shame in the Seminar

Lacan also inscribed white in his seminar in relation to the other

But Lacan would be analytic clinic, in the object. Thus we may see ambitious passage in Seminar *La relation*

courses which set down, black and white
his truth: the father is and always has
the times, and it was also the times
this step. We're in 1970, so after 1968.
diminished since the nineteenth century
out of steam in the face of the blows
which hold out the prospect of a possible
be equated with a provocation, to take
modern technology, a *provocation* to
also marks the end of an era. The
against the first oil crisis, the dollar
and speculation resolutely supplanted
ment of capitalism.”²

seems unusual. Nevertheless, there
culminating note to his seminar. This
essence, and shame is linked more to
the desire. This foreshadows the shift in
essence would replace the Other of the
essence that it will no longer be a question
demonstrating.

contemporary society is therefore the
reshadowed decay that is but the socially
castration.

Id: from dishonour to modesty

common goods: all the great civilisations
the Qur'an (Sura XVI for instance), in
element in Japanese culture, where

ings of Latin authors and shapes a fair,
ecus, dishonour, *turpitude*, fault, mora-
value, *flagitium*, disgraceful action
infamia, discredit. I would refer you to
ck, *Déshonneur et honte en latin : étude*

ns here: but the fundament of all these
Each of these signifiers specifies a mode
and social Other. From *dedecus* which
table break from the social body, from
whose conduct stands out, to *ignominia*

which qualifies the affront to the name: *nomen*, the Other is both partner to the
action and the locus in which its value is revealed. In a certain sense, it is possible
to qualify this part of the lexical field as an objective field, i.e., shame varies in
accordance with the point of view of the Other of the body, and through this Other.

The lexical field – which may then be qualified as subjective – is organised
around two other signifiers: *pudor* and *verecundia*, which in French would give
pudeur and *vergogne*, in English “modesty” and “shame”. Their use is deeply
polysemous. Depending on the era, they mean “the feeling of honour”, “reserve”,
“shyness”, “limit”, and “shame”, but above all they carry with them the subject’s
measure of his unworthy conduct, the sense of his stigmatisation and
humiliation, with regard to his conscience.⁴

We may note that both the objective lexical fields and the subjective ones
stand in a relationship of inverted denotation and largely overlap. Shame from the
objective point of view, i.e., the point of view of the social Other, finds its
denotation in different signifiers, whilst from the subjective point of view, *pudor*
and *verecundia* denote widely contrasting “states” of self-awareness, contrasting
“senses” of the subject as far as his active or passive moral integrity are
concerned. They likewise denote the limits of this integrity, as well as the
subject’s demeaning, degrading position when these limits are breached.

In the objective approach, it is the Other as exterior to the subject that causes
shame in the subject whose social status is affected. In the subjective approach
to the phenomenon, it is in the eyes of an inner Other that the subject feels
shame. In the social approach, *degradation* stems from a scale of values whilst
in the inner approach to the feeling, the barrier that has been breached inscribes
shame in the binary register of all or nothing, which moreover is why *pudor*
denotes both “limit” and “shame”.

The French signifier *honte* is not properly speaking a signifier from classical
Latin, its root is Germanic, it was Latinised late on and doubles up the signifier
vergogne. It denotes therefore both “the disqualification of the subject who has
broken away from society”⁵ and “his own measure of his unworthy conduct”.⁶

Shame in the Seminar of Jacques Lacan: from lack to the object

Lacan also inscribes shame into the relation to the other. He says it in black and
white in his seminar on the Wolf Man: “Shame only gets inscribed within a
relation to the other.”⁷

But Lacan would go on to share out the Latin categories, in the light of the
analytic clinic, in accordance with an axis along which shame shifts from *lack* to
object. Thus we meet up with the objective approach in what Lacan mentions of
ambitious passion, of lack of assurance, or even in more precise terms in the
Seminar *La relation d’objet* of the shame the young boy can experience “faced

with the fundamentally deficient character of the phallus.”⁸

There is a step forward in *Séminaire VI*⁹: shame is deployed in the transference; the Other takes on the figure of the analyst, but shame is caused in the patient by his narrative of an *activity* of a sexual order. In *Séminaire VIII*, the reference to modesty is explicit, Lacan speaks of Alcibiades’ shame when before everyone he exhibits his target of jouissance in the person of Socrates.¹⁰ Likewise, in “The Signification of the Phallus”, Lacan stresses the unveiling of the phallus, i.e., the foregrounding of its “jouissance use” which causes shame and the intervention of *Scham*, the demon of modesty.¹¹ This shame is the shame of the fantasy that is avowed.

The horizon line is more the object now than deficit, and shame is no longer the index of lack (*cf.* the young boy) but the index of jouissance. And so, coming back to what he calls its “structure of desire”, attributed to the object, I shall quote Lacan again in *Le désir et son interprétation*:

...precisely this function of signifying this point at which the subject cannot name himself, at which shame, I would say, is the royal form of what is converted into symptoms of shame and disgust.¹²

Shame referred to jouissance

In this way, one female analysand explained how:

When we were in Finistère I hadn’t built up any social network, I would walk around on my own and I was ashamed of that. For me, being alone means no one likes me: everything you do on your own is a bit shameful. Likewise, when I snack too much between meals, my tummy gets fat, and I’m ashamed because it’s a trace of an excessive solitary pleasure that can be seen on my body.

In this we can recognise, in barely veiled form, the phallus as index of jouissance – in this instance, the oral jouissance in excess.

Or another analysand, whom we shall call Anna, “confesses” that her complaints, which she qualifies as the complaints of a little girl, screen off something she won’t entertain having to say in analysis, so ashamed is she of it:

To make love, I need to be in a degraded position. To take pleasure in it, I have to think of rapes with words... words I’d like to say, which I don’t because I’m ashamed. It’s the same shame I feel when I get my boyfriend to buy things for me. I don’t want them, and yet I accept.

Anna relates this to some extent on the pill, she told me that with everyone.”

In this sequence, the dimension from which the

Two quilting points

The affect of shame in Jacques Lacan, between both cases he focuses on changes. In one case, it is precisely what we are

Two brilliant texts of Alain Miller, from 29 May, and Alain Miller gives in Paris the act of saying, I shall

First, in *Séminaire*, an example of Sartre in Beau

What occurs suddenly, not of the other, he is trying

Shame breaks out where which connects the gaze subject his status as to specifies this, based on is the one who surprises also his own – based on

There is a tipping point revealed as being, the object whose absence the Being of jouissance, emerges here on page 182 of the *Sé*

Shame is the affect of the agency of the Other, of the imposition, stress he is a subject of the sign from the Villa of the M. Ste

er of the phallus.”⁸
*Séminaire VI*⁹: shame is deployed in the
ure of the analyst, but shame is caused
y of a sexual order. In *Séminaire VIII*, the
eaks of Alcibiades’ shame when before
ce in the person of Socrates.¹⁰ Likewise,
an stresses the unveiling of the phallus,
ce use” which causes shame and the
desty.¹¹ This shame is the shame of the

ow than deficit, and shame is no longer
ne index of jouissance. And so, coming
cesire”, attributed to the object, I shall
erprétation:

at this point at which the subject
ame, I would say, is the royal
ptoms of shame and disgust.¹²

ned how:

to build up any social network,
t was ashamed of that. For
er everything you do on your
snack too much between
shamed because it’s a trace
can be seen on my body.

form, the phallus as index of jouissance
excess.

hat, call Anna, “confesses” that her
complaints of a little girl, screen off
say, in analysis, so ashamed is she of it:

ted position. To take pleasure
words I’d like to say, which
the same shame I feel when I
n’t want them, and yet I

Anna relates this to something her mother said: “When I asked her if I could go
on the pill, she told me to be careful with my body, implying: don’t go sleeping
with everyone.”

In this sequence, shame is again being referred to jouissance, to its imposing
dimension from which the subject obtains an unspeakable satisfaction.

Two quilting points in the Seminar

The affect of shame functions on at least two points as a quilting point for
Jacques Lacan, between 1964 and 1970, from *Seminar XI* and *Seminar XVII*. In
both cases he focuses on jouissance to stress its presence, but its nature
changes. In one case, Lacan makes it an indication, in the other case, a use. This
is precisely what we shall be examining now.

Two brilliant texts on shame, one by Éric Laurent, the other by Jacques-Alain
Miller, from 29 May and 5 June 2002 in the framework of the Course Jacques-
Alain Miller gives in Paris, will back up and clarify what Lacan says, and indeed
the act of saying. I shall therefore lean on these two texts.

First, in *Seminar XI*, on page 182. I quote Lacan commenting on the famous
example of Sartre in *Being and Nothingness*:

What occurs in voyeurism? [...] The gaze is the object lost and
suddenly refound in the conflagration of shame, by the introduction
of the other. Up to that point, what is the subject trying to see? What
he is trying to see, make no mistake, is the object as absence.¹³

Shame breaks out where the gaze and the Other meet. Shame is that affect
which connects the gaze to the Other in as much as this Other signals to the
subject his status as object, revealed in the surprise. However, and Lacan
specifies this, based on Sartre’s text, this Other is an imagined Other. The subject
is the one who surprises himself as a voyeur in the Other’s gaze – which is thus
also his own – based on a sound, a rustling of leaves, a footstep in the corridor.

There is a tipping point. The subject-voyeur entirely absorbed in this gaze is
revealed as being, in his own eyes, through the intervention of this Other, this
object whose absence he is trying to seize through the keyhole. His Being, as a
Being of jouissance, emerges “in the conflagration of shame” as Lacan puts it
here on page 182 of the Seminar.

Shame is the affect that accompanies the subject’s return to the stage by the
agency of the Other, i.e., the return of a symbolic figure apt to give the measure
of the imposition, stressing for this subject supported by his identifications that
he is a subject of the signifier; the presence of the *flagellum* in the mural scene
from the Villa of the Mysteries is a precise indication of the bonds that the fantasy

of flagellation, shame, modesty, the phallus and the signifier's mark on the body maintain with jouissance. Here I would refer you to *Séminaire V*, pages 348 & 384¹⁴, and, by anticipation, to *Seminar XVII*, page 50.¹⁵ Here we are in the register of the subjective, of *pudor* and *verecundia*, but clearly *not without the Other*.

1964 is a crucial year. We stride into the "Lacanian universe" of this troubled time when Lacan's teaching was to take on its *real* dimension. The object *a* grasped by Lacan on the basis of his own experience, having been bargained over by his peers and students, an experience he would designate as one of the commonest human modalities, here acquires its almost definitive version. The truth of the subject is in his object-Being. This is what he puts forward, adding moreover in this regard: "even when [the subject] is in the position of master [...], to bring this object out into the light of day is really and truly the essence of comedy."¹⁶

Lacan is yet to develop his discourses, and the S_1 is not yet operational, but one can see that what is involved is the gap between the master signifier and the object *a*, i.e., the gap between the subject and his identifications and his nether side of jouissance.

The other major development concerning shame can be found in the last chapter of our *Seminar XVII, The Other Side of Psychoanalysis*, titled "The Power of the Impossible" in which Lacan questions the students at Vincennes. This was back on 17 June 1970: six years have gone by, and above all May 68 has concluded *Les Trente Glorieuses*, heralding, as we may read with hindsight, the shift into the post-industrial era. Furthermore, note that Lacan invents the capitalist discourse just as the way out of it can already be made out: moreover, Lacan himself in his '67 "Proposition..." hints at what our post-capitalist world is: a world of segregation.¹⁷

There is a third, less known development on shame – his own – in a passage from *Seminar XVI*: in the 19 March 1969 lesson, in which he tells of how he visited a production line in a factory – the Fiat plant – being shown around by its boss.¹⁸ Lacan is bringing up shame again in its link to the gaze, to what constitutes a blot on the landscape – in line with the example of the sardine can in *Seminar XI*.

In his delivery at Jacques-Alain Miller's Course on 29 May 2002, Éric Laurent lays out the bases of the developments that would follow. He establishes a link between Lacan's development on shame, addressed to the analysts at the end of the chapter "The Power of the Impossible"¹⁹, which I have already mentioned, namely: "I happen to make you ashamed" with the few words he uttered before the Vincennes students in December 1969 (page 208): "look at them enjoying". This link is of course reminiscent of the little scene (of the sardine can) from *Seminar XI*; the gaze is likewise implied in this "look at them enjoying".

There is however a difference: indeed, in one case, shame arises when the Other unveils to a subject his object status, in as much as he is surprised in his revealed jouissance, whilst in the second case, jouissance is out in the open:

Lacan through his master to arouse sh

A mutation in hy

On entering the post-individualism that pe

as an affect of the sub
Furthermore, on p
no longer any shame
when the gaze of the O
brings shame."

To die of shame a
weakening of the mas
in favour of his name
notably honour.

Jacques-Alain M
primum vivere rather
beyond "death, pure a
the subject in his relat
in passing that Saba
inscribed upon his tom
for him. *Jouissance* a

Foucault would br
a famous, condensed
sovereign power of th
letting live, but name
underlines in *The Hist*

The old c
carefully
calculated

He too lays the accent
of the subject. For Fou
term "population" re
the numerisation of th
The disappearance of
evaporation, in accord

On one hand, the
leave room for a pu

us and the signifier's mark on the body refer you to *Séminaire V*, pages 348-349 and page 50.¹⁵ Here we are in the register of the *Real*, but clearly *not without the Other*.

In the "Lacanian universe" of this troubled subject, the object *a* is on its *real* dimension. The object *a* is an experience, having been bargained for, hence he would designate as one of the objects of his almost definitive version. The object *a* is what he puts forward, adding that the subject is in the position of master [...], that *a* is really and truly the essence of the subject.

But the *S₁* is not yet operational, but the tension between the master signifier and the subject and his identifications and his nether world is there.

To die of shame, as Vatel did, is no longer proper.²⁰ In other words, with the weakening of the master-signifier, of the subject's singularity in modern society in favour of his numerisation, life takes precedence over any other category, notably honour.

Jacques-Alain Miller reminds us with Lacan that our era is the era of the *primum vivere* rather than Heideggerian being-unto-death where what counts beyond "death, pure and simple" is the relation to the signifier that represents the subject in his relation to the world, i.e., to the second death. We might recall in passing that Sade, the master in *jouissance*, did not want his name to be inscribed upon his tombstone: the body's death being worth more than any other for him. *Jouissance and jouissance alone!*

Foucault would broach this mutation in his own way when he underlined in a famous, condensed formula that modern power, biopower, contrary to the sovereign power of the *Ancien Régime*, is no longer that of *putting to death or letting live*, but rather that of *putting to life and letting die*. Indeed, Foucault underlines in *The History of Sexuality*,

The old power of death that symbolised sovereign power was now carefully supplanted by the administration of bodies and the calculated management of life.²¹

He too lays the accent on the *primum vivere* generalised with this disappearance of the subject. For Foucault, this mutation corresponds to the appearance of the term "population", i.e., the statistical treatment of the mass. Here again we meet the numerisation of the subject, i.e., his disappearance as such, as a singularity. The disappearance of shame was to follow the curve of the master-signifier's evaporation, in accordance with two axes.

On one hand, the tension, the polarisation between *a* and *S₁*, diminishes to leave room for a pulverisation of the identifications whose multiple and

Lacan through his imperative "look at them enjoying" lends his voice to the master to arouse shame.

A mutation in hypermodern civilisation

On entering the post-industrial era, the rising power of subjective rights, of the individualism that goes along with production and mass consumption, shame as an affect of the subject has effectively tended to disappear.

Furthermore, on page 182 of the same *Seminar XVII*, Lacan says, "There is no longer any shame", i.e., as Jacques-Alain Miller specifies, "we're in an era when the gaze of the Other has paled away, and when at the very least it no longer brings shame."

To die of shame, as Vatel did, is no longer proper.²⁰ In other words, with the weakening of the master-signifier, of the subject's singularity in modern society in favour of his numerisation, life takes precedence over any other category, notably honour.

Jacques-Alain Miller reminds us with Lacan that our era is the era of the *primum vivere* rather than Heideggerian being-unto-death where what counts beyond "death, pure and simple" is the relation to the signifier that represents the subject in his relation to the world, i.e., to the second death. We might recall in passing that Sade, the master in *jouissance*, did not want his name to be inscribed upon his tombstone: the body's death being worth more than any other for him. *Jouissance and jouissance alone!*

Foucault would broach this mutation in his own way when he underlined in a famous, condensed formula that modern power, biopower, contrary to the sovereign power of the *Ancien Régime*, is no longer that of *putting to death or letting live*, but rather that of *putting to life and letting die*. Indeed, Foucault underlines in *The History of Sexuality*,

The old power of death that symbolised sovereign power was now carefully supplanted by the administration of bodies and the calculated management of life.²¹

He too lays the accent on the *primum vivere* generalised with this disappearance of the subject. For Foucault, this mutation corresponds to the appearance of the term "population", i.e., the statistical treatment of the mass. Here again we meet the numerisation of the subject, i.e., his disappearance as such, as a singularity. The disappearance of shame was to follow the curve of the master-signifier's evaporation, in accordance with two axes.

On one hand, the tension, the polarisation between *a* and *S₁*, diminishes to leave room for a pulverisation of the identifications whose multiple and

successive bonds with the object *a* become flexible and fuzzy in the terms of the logic of the same name: fuzzy logic. Our relation to the object is no longer organised in accordance with the logic of classical sets – belonging or not belonging – but on the contrary in accordance with the logic of fuzzy sets.

On the other hand, numerisation has abolished the subject's singularity along with its corollary, truth, in so far as truth cannot be said to be whole. The subject becomes a shadowless subject, one that is transparent to the Other. The sociologist Zygmunt Bauman, whom Jacques-Alain Miller borrows from in his lesson of 12 March 2008, speaks of modern society as a liquid society.

He is qualifying both these spheres of influence of subjects and objects and the fluctuating world they evolve in. Subjects, whose *jouissance* no longer finds itself tuned into the Other, come to reduce themselves to it spontaneously, turning the shifting adjustment to an object into a lifestyle.

The S_1 is dissolved and becomes anonymous whilst the distance between the signifier and the object is reduced, sometimes to the point of being mixed up without specific necessary conditions: it is thus equally private and public that one can see getting mixed up in a self same space. From this point of view, television has done a great deal and the staging of the private in Reality Television shows clearly intersects with our argument. The gaze occupies a preponderant place here and one may observe how shame is not really an affect that counts and limits anymore. People watch these shows with their families and friends.

The consequences of *mass communication* may be interpreted with the help of the elements that Freud gives us in his work on the *Masse*. Mass communication dilutes the intimate and widens the frame of the fantasy to a collective that is mythical and yet operative and well-established over the long term (contrary to masses that form contingently).

From this point of view, May '68 was an initiatory breakthrough to the lasting consequences on the subject's relations and his *jouissance*.

This is what Jacques-Alain Miller seems to be confirming in his Comandatuba lecture in a twofold indication when he asserts that,

The discourse of hypermodern civilisation has the structure of the discourse of the analyst! [...] ...the relation between civilisation and psychoanalysis is no longer a relation of one side to the other side – we could say that this concerns rather the relation of convergence, that is to say that each of these four terms [*a*, S_1 , S_2 , and $\$$] remains disjoined from the others within civilisation. [...] In civilisation, these different elements are scattered.²²

The scattering of places, the depolarisation of the subject's bond and the object's, blunts the subject's responsibility with regard to his *jouissance* and authorises the fantasy to pass over the barrier of the private to spread out into public space which supports it.

We could bring up shame in the Comandatuba lecture on psychoanalysis, in pure psychoanalytic elements] are organised into a

Binding the subject to the

In *La troisième*, a lecture delivered in Rome, Lacan furnishes a precise Alain Miller has said. In this lecture, discourse that binds the analyst to

This means that the psychical of the discourse – of the analyst – semblant of the object *a*. And he can make himself subject, afresh, to the discourse. The operation is two-fold: Other, and on the other hand he

Does this mean that one can give his object, to re-polarise the fantasy? Shame would then be a threshold *not to be crossed* to give a "complex". This in any case from Lacan to be found on page 1

You will say to me, on the other side of psychoanalysis, is, "You've got enough of this, then do a bit more of yours run up against

Shame, "the hole from which it also be called "the circle closed" putting it ten years earlier in time which it is a matter of getting a "precious because it signals the likewise sealed over by the master

Lacan was already saying that

We would now say that the encounter with the Other, which it would be

...ne flexible and fuzzy in the terms of the
...ur relation to the object is no longer
... of classical sets – belonging or not
... dance with the logic of fuzzy sets.

...abolished the subject's singularity along
... cannot be said to be whole. The subject
... that is transparent to the Other. The
... Jacques-Alain Miller borrows from in his
... ern society as a liquid society.

...f influence of subjects and objects and
... ects, whose jouissance no longer finds
... duce themselves to it spontaneously,
... ect into a lifestyle.

...ymous whilst the distance between the
... etimes to the point of being mixed up
... s thus equally private and public that
... same space. From this point of view,
... aging of the private in Reality Television
... ent. The gaze occupies a preponderant
... ame is not really an affect that counts
... shows with their families and friends.
... cation may be interpreted with the help
... in his work on the *Masse*. Mass
... widens the frame of the fantasy to a
... ve and well-established over the long
... gently).

... initiatory breakthrough to the lasting
... and his jouissance.
... er seems to be confirming in his
... on when he asserts that,

... eation has the structure of the
... eation between civilisation and
... ection of one side to the other side
... rns rather the relation of
... of these four terms [a , S_1 , S_2 ,
... rners within civilisation. [...] In
... are scattered.²²

... the subject's bond and the object's, blunts
... s, jouissance and authorises the fantasy to
... out into public space which supports it.

We could bring up shame as a pointer, even as a threshold indicator.

In Comandatuba, Jacques-Alain Miller added that: "it is only in psychoanalysis, in pure psychoanalysis, that these terms [these scattered elements] are organised into a discourse."²³

Binding the subject to the object

In *La troisième*, a lecture delivered at the VIIth Congress of the *École freudienne de Paris* in Rome, Lacan furnishes a precise indication that gives some relief to what Jacques-Alain Miller has said. In this lecture, Lacan says: "A psychoanalyst is responsible for a discourse that binds the analysand [...] to the analysand-analyst couple."

This means that the psychoanalyst is the one who binds the analysand by means of the discourse – of the analyst – to the analyst, in so far as he makes himself the semblant of the object a . And by putting this simple device in place, an individual can make himself subject, afresh, the accountant of his jouissance in a reinstalled discourse. The operation is twofold, on one hand because it refers jouissance to an Other, and on the other hand because it renders the subject responsible.

Does this mean that only the psychoanalyst is able, in binding the subject to his object, to re-polarise the terms of the discourse and thereby re-privatise the fantasy? Shame would then once again indicate, for the *subject of the social*, the threshold *not to be crossed* of a narcissism that from then on will once more give a "complex". This in any case would be coherent with the following statement from Lacan to be found on page 182 of *Seminar XVII*:

You will say to me, "What's the use of shame? If that is what the other side of psychoanalysis is, we don't want any." My reply to you is, "You've got enough to open a shop." If you are not yet aware of this, then do a bit of analysis, as they say. You will see this vapid air of yours run up against an outlandish shame of living.²⁴

Shame, "the hole from which the master-signifier arises" (page 189), that may also be called "the circle cleared by burning the brush of the drives" as Lacan was putting it ten years earlier in his "Remarks on Daniel Lagache's Report"²⁵, and which it is a matter of getting as close to as possible in analysis, is in any case "precious because it signals the fault hollowed out by jouissance, signalled but likewise sealed over by the master-signifier."²⁶

Lacan was already saying this in the lesson from 17 June 1964:

We would now say that we base the assurance of the subject in his encounter with the filth that may support him, with the *petit a* of which it would be untrue to say that its presence is necessary.²⁷

The discourse of the analyst promotes shame, it causes it to arise by summoning the subject of jouissance in the end-stops of the signifier, it exploits its value as an indicator, a guide to clear the way for the construction of the fantasy in the transference.

Marie came to see an analyst to "make herself heard" and because she is "too docile", which she deems to hinder her life.

With the father of her children, her husband, she practices bondage. She spoke about it back in the first sessions, without any particular embarrassment. She is from a large family, one of three daughters. She describes a father that was hard to reach due to a cold and depressive mother who was repeatedly hospitalised in a psychiatric clinic.

I was never able to conquer my father, I was never able to have any relationship with him. My mother was jealous of us, she put a barrier between him and us because she couldn't manage to communicate with him, so what if we had succeeded?!

The shame arose when she remembered, during the analysis, having seen her father beating her sister who had stayed out late. "He never said anything to me about it, I was the youngest and the favourite." The shame is the indicator of the incestuous desire, it then becomes connected to the fantasy: "to be beaten by the father" which the practice of bondage is a manifestation of. The shame then becomes a pressure point for the construction of the fantasy and the insight Marie will be able to have into her jouissance, thus freeing her from its tyranny.

Translated from the French by Adrian Price

- 1 Lacan, J., *The Seminar, Book XVII, The Other Side of Psychoanalysis*, transl. by R. Grigg, New York, Norton & Co., 2007.
- 2 Miller, J.-A., "Psychoanalysis Stripped Bare by its Bachelor", transl. by T. Sowley in *The Bulletin of the NLS*, Issue 1, 2007, p. 78.
- 3 Thomas, J.-F., *Déshonneur et honte en latin : étude sémantique*, Bibliothèque d'études classiques, 2007, Leuven.
- 4 *Ibid.*, p. 395.
- 5 *Ibid.*, back cover.
- 6 *Ibid.*, p. 395.
- 7 Lacan, J., *Séminaire sur l'homme aux loups*, 1952-3, unpublished.
- 8 Lacan, J., *Le séminaire, Livre IV, La relation d'objet*, Paris, Seuil, 1994, p. 193.
- 9 Lacan, J., *Séminaire VI, Le désir et son interprétation*, unpublished.
- 10 Lacan, J., *Le séminaire, livre VIII, Le transfert*, Paris, Seuil, 2001, pp. 213-4: "Here, Socrates is no more than the envelope of what the object of desire is.
"It is to mark the fact that he is merely this envelope, that Alcibiades wanted to show that Socrates, in relation to him, is the serf of desire, that Socrates is served up to him by desire, and that Socrates

- is enslaved by desire. Either he manifest itself in its signifier."
"Now, for Alcibiades, to speak in shame and turns his desire into modesty, which I spoke of, is that there lies unveiled in that resort of desire, this something of this fall of the Other. And it is on this occasion it appears that he specifically to make Socrates..."
- 11 Lacan, J., "The Signification of the Symbolic", in *The Symbolic*, ed. by B. Fink, New York, Norton, 1996, p. 10.
- 12 Lacan, J., "Lesson of 3 June 1971", in *The Seminar*, Book XVII, trans. by R. Grigg, New York, Norton, 2007, p. 10.
- 13 Lacan, J., *The Seminar*, Book XVII, trans. by R. Grigg, New York, Norton, 2007, p. 10.
- 14 Lacan, J., *Le séminaire*, Livre XVII, trans. by R. Grigg, Paris, Seuil, 2007, p. 10.
- 15 Lacan, J., *The Seminar*, Book XVII, trans. by R. Grigg, New York, Norton, 2007, p. 10.
- 16 Lacan, J., *The Seminar*, Book XVII, trans. by R. Grigg, New York, Norton, 2007, p. 10.
- 17 Lacan, J., "Proposition of 3 June 1971", in *The Bulletin of the NLS*, Issue 6, 1995, p. 10.
- 18 Lacan, J., *Le séminaire*, Livre XVII, trans. by R. Grigg, Paris, Seuil, 2007, p. 10.
- 19 Lacan, J., *The Seminar*, Book XVII, trans. by R. Grigg, New York, Norton, 2007, p. 10.
- 20 Fritz Karl Vatel was in the same position as the latter had entrusted him with the task of preparing the supper and the next day he was to survive this affront", with a drawing of a man on page 182 of *Séminaire*, Livre XVII, trans. by R. Grigg, Paris, Seuil, 2007, p. 182.
- 21 Foucault, M., *The History of Sexuality*, Volume 1, trans. by R. Hurley, New York, Pantheon, 1978, pp. 139-40.
- 22 Miller, J.-A., "A Fantasy", in *The Bulletin of the NLS*, Issue 1, 2007, p. 8.
- 23 *Ibid.*, p. 8.
- 24 Lacan, J., *The Seminar*, Book XVII, trans. by R. Grigg, New York, Norton, 2007, p. 10.
- 25 Lacan, J., "Remarks on Daniel's Seminar", in *The Bulletin of the NLS*, Issue 1, 2007, p. 8.
- 26 Merlet, A., "La gloire et la honte", in *The Bulletin of the NLS*, Issue 1, 2007, p. 8.
- 27 Lacan, J., "From Interpretation to the Subject of the Signifier", in *The Bulletin of the NLS*, Issue 1, 2007, p. 8.

ame, it causes it to arise by summoning
cs of the signifier, it exploits its value as
r the construction of the fantasy in the

herself heard" and because she is "too
fe.

husband, she practices bondage. She
without any particular embarrassment.
daughters. She describes a father that
depressive mother who was repeatedly

was never able to have any
was jealous of us, she put a
case she couldn't manage to
we had succeeded?!

ed during the analysis, having seen her
out late. "He never said anything to me
ute." The shame is the indicator of the
ected to the fantasy: "to be beaten by
ce is a manifestation of. The shame then
struction of the fantasy and the insight
ance, thus freeing her from its tyranny.

lated from the French by Adrian Price

of *Psychoanalysis*, transl. by R. Grigg, New York,

Eschschol", transl. by T. Sowley in *The Bulletin of*

de *Semantique*, Bibliothèque d'études classiques,

published.

Paris: Seuil, 1994, p. 193.

published.

Paris: Seuil, 2001, pp. 213-4: "Here, Socrates is no

fe.

ce that Alcibiades wanted to show that Socrates
he is served up to him by desire, and that Socrates

is enslaved by desire. Socrates' desire, even though he knew what it was, he wanted to see it
manifest itself in its sign so as to know that the other, object, *agalma*, was at his mercy.

"Now, for Alcibiades it is precisely on account of having failed in this undertaking which covers him
in shame and turns his confession into something so loaded. It is that the demon of *Αἰδώς*, of
modesty, which I spoke to you about back when, is what intervenes here. This is what's violated. It's
that there lies unveiled in front of everyone, in its mark, in its secret, the most shocking one, the last
resort of desire, this something that always more or less obliges in love to conceal it – his aim is
this fall of the Other, *Autre* with a capital A, into other, *autre* with a small a. And to crown it all, on
this occasion it appears that Alcibiades failed in his enterprise, in so far as this enterprise was
specifically to make Socrates come down in the world."

11 Lacan, J., "The Signification of the Phallus", in *Écrits, The First Complete Edition in English*, transl.
by B. Fink, New York, Norton, 2006, p. 581.

12 Lacan, J., "Lesson of 3 June 1959", from *Le séminaire VI, op. cit.*

13 Lacan, J., *The Seminar, Book XI, The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis*, transl. by A.
Sheridan, Penguin, 1994, p. 182.

14 Lacan, J., *Le séminaire, Livre V, Les formations de l'inconscient*, Paris, Seuil, 1998.

15 Lacan, J., *The Seminar, Book XVII, op. cit.*

16 Lacan, J., *The Seminar, Book XI, op. cit.*, p. 5.

17 Lacan, J., "Proposition of 9 October 1967 on the Psychoanalyst of the School" transl. by R. Grigg, in
Analysis, Issue 6, 1995, p. 12.

18 Lacan, J., *Le séminaire, Livre XVI, D'un Autre à l'autre*, Paris, Seuil, 2006, pp. 238-9.

19 Lacan, J., *The Seminar, Book XVII, op. cit.*, pp. 193.

20 Fritz Karl Vatel was initially *maître d'hôtel* to Nicolas Fouquet, then to the Prince de Condé. The
latter had entrusted him with organising a *fête* in honour of Louis XIV. Some organisational hitches
marred the supper and the next day, when the seafood failed to arrive, Vatel declared: "I shall never
survive this affront", withdrew to his room, and ran himself through with a sword. Lacan cites Vatel
on page 182 of *Seminar XVII, op.cit.*

21 Foucault, M., *The History of Sexuality, Vol. I: An Introduction*, transl. by R. Hurley, New York, Random
House, 1978, pp. 139-40.

22 Miller, J.-A., "A Fantasy", transl. by T. Sowley, in *Lacanian Praxis*, No. 1, May 2005, pp. 7-8.

23 *Ibid.*, p. 8.

24 Lacan, J., *The Seminar, Book XVII, op. cit.*, p. 182.

25 Lacan, J., "Remarks on Daniel Lagache's Report", in *Écrits, op. cit.*, p. 558.

26 Merlet, A., "La gloire et la honte", in *Carnets cliniques de Strasbourg*, No. 5, 2003, pp. 164.

27 Lacan, J., "From Interpretation to the Transference" in *The Seminar, Book XI, op. cit.*, p. 258.