

The Lacanian Review

Hurly-Burly

SEX ALL OVER THE PLACE
CENSORED
COVER INSIDE

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL

- 5 Véronique Voruz, *Sex All Over The Place: "Fuck!"*

THEMATIC SECTION: SEX ALL OVER THE PLACE

- 9 Jacques-Alain Miller, *Truth is Coupled with Meaning*

THE DIALOGUE

- 21 Jack Halberstam and Marie-Hélène Brousse, *"Queering Psychoanalysis"*

UNCOUPLINGS

- 30 Pierre-Gilles Guéguen, *Manipulation of the Imaginary in a Homosexual Couple*
43 Paul Verhaeghe, *The Scandal of Sex: We Hate the One We Love*

PAWNED FANTASIES

- 58 Laurent Goumarre, *Let's Talk About Porn... To Camera*
62 Gustavo Freda, *The Scopic Emptiness of Pornography*
65 Christiane Alberti, *What Remains of Our Fantasies*

CHOOSING NOT TO CHOOSE

- 70 Jorge Assef, *What Sexuation Can We Trust?*
83 François Ansermet, *To Choose One's Sex: the Paradox of the Parlêtre*
88 Pamela King, *The Third Sex: an In-Between*

WHITHER THE PHALLUS?

- 94 Bruno de Halleux, *Sexuality at the Time of the Speaking Body*
105 Jacques-Alain Miller, *A New Alliance with Jouissance*

FORMATIONS OF THE ANALYST

SUPERVISION

- 118 Éric Laurent, *The Logic and Surprises of Supervision at the Time of the Parlêtre*
133 Patrick Monribot, *The Possibility of an Act*

REDUCTION: ANALYSTS OF THE SCHOOL

- 137 Anne Lysy, *"This is Not a Clinical Case"*
140 Anna Aromí, *The Fall of the Case*
144 Marie-Hélène Brousse, *On Pass Testimonies*
146 Débora Rabinovich, *My Bestiary*
150 Luiz Fernando Carrijo Da Cunha, *The Risk of an Invention*
154 Ram Avraham Mandil, *Making a Stepladder of the Sinthome*
158 Jésus Santiago, *The Speaking Being Beyond the Man/Woman Binary*

OUR CONGRESSES

CLINICAL ORIENTATION

- 166 Miquel Bassols, *Psychosis, Ordered Under Transference*
171 Jean-Pierre Deffieux, *Modes of Enjoyment, Time to Choose*
178 Herbert Wachsberger, *From the Enigmatic Experience to the Elementary Phenomenon*
184 Claudia Iddan, *Push-to-the-Man*

SEX ALL C

The title to the Symposium "What I... next to... exclaimed: "Sex... the word "fuck"... only agree with... language. And p... evidence-based m...

The substitut... sexual difference... now that it is all... field of gender st... analysis is tied to... normativity – an... oppressive past. S...

It is true that... can be done eith... subjectivity, gran... enjoyment, or tr... times intrusive:...

SUPERVISION

Two analysts speak, one as a supervisor and one as a supervisee, of their experience of supervision. Éric Laurent situates supervision in the Lacanian orientation with respect to Lacan's concern with "what is an analyst", with founding a School that guarantees the formation of analysts, and with the practice of supervision at the time of the parlêtre. Patrick Mouribot distinguishes sharply between being a clinician and the analytical act, concluding that the analytical position, the ability to act analytically, is never acquired once and for all.

THE LOGIC AND SURPRISES OF SUPERVISION AT THE TIME OF THE PARLÊTRE

Éric Laurent

How can we conceive the formation of psychoanalysts today, in the psychoanalytic orientation deduced from the teaching of Jacques Lacan? To consider this formation, Lacan based himself on what grounds the psychoanalyst's position, namely the existence of the unconscious, as brought to light by Freud. From this emphasis a paradoxical statement can be deduced: "There is no formation of the psychoanalyst, there are only formations of the unconscious."¹ Today we can appreciate the significance of this sentence like never before. Today, when multiple powers are seeking to legislate, in the place of psychoanalytic societies, on the titles that they give, and when ever-increasing sources of institutional legitimisation (from the university to health care systems) encourage new forms of authorisation.

In a first sense, Lacan's sentence implies that the analyst must, first and foremost, learn [*se former*] to understand the rhetoric of the unconscious. In a second sense, it implies that he must do this to the formations of his

own unconscious, not only interpreting but also making himself a being-there? The

With Freud

In each country as an offshoot of the research discipline showed that he therapeutic dimension that this did not analytic science ideology. He put of *Lay Analysis* the science of the psychoanalysis sciences are to analysis in the analysis."² At someone who representatives of the to devote their research discipline paradox: it is not of treatment, transmitting to civilisation as to work. As part must prove the promote the ex requires a certain with petty restrictions.

We know with psychoanalytic other words curb went from the A

Éric Laurent is an Analyst Member of the School (AMS), member of the ECF and NLS. He is former President of the WAP.

1. Lacan, J., "Intervention à l'EFP, le 3 novembre 1973", *Lettres de l'EFP*, No. 15, p. 191.

2. Freud, S., "The Science of Psychoanalysis", *Collected Papers*, p. 248.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 248.
4. [TN: This is Sigmund Freud's translated "careful" analysis of the psychoanalytic process.]
5. *Ibid.*, p. 249.

... as a supervisee,
... situates supervision
... concern with "what
... guarantees the formation
... at the time
... distinguishes sharply
... about, concluding that
... analytically, is never
... all.

ND SURPRISES N AT THE TIME THE PARLÊTRE

Éric Laurent

tion of psychoanalysts today, in
deduced from the teaching of
formation, Lacan based himself
lyst's position, namely the exist-
at by Freud. From this emphasis
"There is no formation of the
of the unconscious."¹ Today we
tence like never before. Today,
e, in the place of psychoanalytic
when ever-increasing sources of
ersity to health care systems)

that the analyst must, first and
he rhetoric of the unconscious.
do this to the formations of his

own unconscious and thus, first and foremost, analyse himself. The analyst only interprets because he is part of the unconscious and because he has made himself the product of its operation. How can we get used to this being-there? This is what is meant by "formation of the psychoanalyst".

With Freud

In each country, psychoanalysis was established in conjunction with and as an offshoot of socially recognised forms of the desire to cure. Freud showed that he was prepared to negotiate the safeguards placed on the therapeutic dimension of psychoanalysis with powers of the state, provided that this did not compromise its higher mission: the one he gave to psychoanalytic science. He was constantly on his guard against therapeutic ideology. He put this in a decisive manner in his 1926 text, *The Question of Lay Analysis*: "I only want to feel assured that the therapy will not destroy the science",² he said. He also evoked the counterpoint to this deviation of psychoanalysis as therapy: "If the representatives of the various mental sciences are to study psycho-analysis [...] they must learn to understand analysis in the only way that is possible – by themselves undergoing an analysis."³ At the start, the teaching analyst, the *Lehranalytiker*, was not someone who trained therapeutic analysts, but an analyst of these representatives of the human sciences. They must have had a "careful education"⁴ to devote their attention to someone who chooses psychoanalysis as a research discipline for the examination of civilisation. Let us note the paradox: it is not a question of teaching psychoanalysis, but a certain kind of treatment, a new kind, beyond therapy, one by one, with the aim of transmitting to others the contribution that psychoanalysis can make to civilisation as such. It is a matter of arousing something like a transference to work. As part of the "careful education" of these analysts, however, they must prove themselves in the therapeutic field. Freud thus does not promote the existence of two categories of analysts. "All this, however, requires a certain amount of freedom of movement and is not compatible with petty restrictions."⁵

We know what kind of reception Freud's proposals had in existing psychoanalytic societies. Opening up the profession to non-physicians, in other words curbing the therapeutic dimension, was to go down badly. This went from the Americans' blank refusal to the lip service paid to it by the

2. Freud, S., "The Question of Lay Analysis" (1926), *S.E.* XX, p. 254.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 248.

4. [TN: This is Strachey's translation of Freud's "*sorgfältig Ausbildung*", which could also have been translated "careful formation" or "training". The French here is "formation soignée".]

5. *Ibid.*, p. 249.

member of the ECF and NLS. He is former
... *lettres de l'EFP*, No. 15, p. 191.

Far from engaging with the world, far from engaging in the social sciences, they have barricaded themselves behind a narrow end in view than that of the natural sciences. In the human sciences, in the social sciences, in the arts, an exceptional status is being granted, without having tried to redefine the study programmes, or giving priority to human studies, or giving priority to a compendium of what has ended up at an impasse: a system work, in the right

While Freud distinguished his psychoanalytic School, he distinguished psychoanalysis, and more [*psychanalyse didactique*]. An Ideal trait? The stake

The section for pure psychoanalysis, for applied psychoanalysis, and for psychoanalytic practice that he understood in Anglo-Saxon countries, from a European perspective prevails, its value as a doctrine, a complete negation, in contrast, as far as the section for psychoanalytic practice underlined its value, and its importance. There is no doubt that Lacan was aware of this, and that, for him, psychoanalysis was something to be wary of.

The third section of the *Lehranalytiker*, by adapting Freudian project was set out and with a particular focus on the system, the intelligent.

6. Jones expressed himself as follows: "a lay analyst can in many cases – but assuredly not in all – conduct an analysis almost as well as a physician, and consequently, with certain precautions and in a subordinate way, find his place in the psychoanalytic organisation", quoted in Schneider M, *"La question de l'analyse profane"*, Gallimard, Folio Essais, Paris, 1985, p. 166. [TN: translated from the French.]
7. I am following here the movement of Lacan's texts. I am aware that one could object that for the Lacan of the 70s, *jouissance* is primary. Dialectics require that we start from the Other to go to the other. Only then does one travel the other way.

8. Lacan, J., "The Founding of Psychoanalysis," in Denis Hollier et al. (eds.), *La Cause du sujet* (Paris: Seuil, 1968), pp. 103-104.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 103, from the text: "the use to which it is put in France, as elsewhere, to adapt it with the needs of social life."
10. *Ibid.*

adherence on the part of the
though he was by his therapeutic
lin Institute – as far as authorisa-
established, then transmitted in an
Non-physicians would have a place
or transitory way.

sis through the analysis of children
unknown category, that of child
n-physicians, like Anna Freud and
ar period saw a tacit pact emerge
ca and Brazil. The obvious service
ic application being borne out by
o had undergone a psychoanalytic
tacto toleration of the therapeutic
ology also wanted to dive into the
the title and practice of university
me psychologists joined psycho-
physicians would soon be divided
ioners, and the rest. The problem
practical response. Does this addi-
d's question? It must be preserved
ensure their necessary legitimization
to heal [*désir thérapeutique*], and
ould otherwise arise, but it is not
oanalysis. For Freud, something
analysis within civilisation.

the system functioned in a way that
first imagined it: the system was
ic side. The spontaneous ideology
more: thinking that the individual
dividual from the social, and other
t refuses to see that the Other, the
ar from assuring the link between
the class of “most well-trained”
a-territoriality of psychoanalysis.

Far from engaging with the thorough reworking of the social sciences, far from engaging in the 20th century's “linguistic turn”, psychoanalysts barricaded themselves behind vague biologising references, with no other end in view than that of affording themselves an exceptional status within the human sciences in the name of the biological fiction of the “drive”, and an exceptional status in medicine in the name of the unconscious. After having tried to redefine the existing course structure, hierarchies, and then study programmes, in classically conceived psychoanalytic societies, by giving priority to human sciences and literary studies, conceived as a compendium of what is said about love and phallic adventures, Lacan ended up at an impasse. It was necessary to re-found in order to make the system work, in the right way.

While Freud distinguished two levels of functioning, therapy and civilisation, Lacan distinguished three. To begin with, in the Founding Act of his School, he distinguished a first section devoted to the investigation of pure psychoanalysis, and more specifically the real problem of the training analysis [*psychanalyse didactique*]: how can the analyst be defined other than by way of an Ideal trait? The stake of the pass would be deduced from this question.

The section for pure psychoanalysis is linked to the second, the section for applied psychoanalysis: “which means therapeutics and clinical medicine.”⁸ Lacan carefully distinguished therapeutics from psychotherapy, a practice that he underlined had not been as developed in France as in Anglo-Saxon countries,⁹ but that there, where the psychotherapeutic perspective prevails, its effects are “conformist in its aims, barbarous in its doctrine, a complete regression to psychologism, pure and simple.”¹⁰ By contrast, as far as the section for applied psychoanalysis is concerned, Lacan underlined its value, and linked psychoanalysis with “therapeutic projects”. There is no doubt that for Lacan, there is only one form of therapeutics and that, for him, psychotherapy does not exist, or at least exists as something to be wary of.

The third section takes up, in a clear fashion, the aim of the Freudian *Lehranalytiker*, by adapting it to the situation existing in the 1960s. The Freudian project was contemporary with a certain form of “the University” and with a particular form of “dropout” [English in the original] from the system, the intelligentsia which psychoanalysis first recruited from. The

many cases – but assuredly not in all – conduct
ently, with certain precautions and in a subor-
isation”, quoted in Schneider M, “*La question*
5, p. 166. [TN: translated from the French.]
I am aware that one could object that for the
require that we start from the Other to go to

8. Lacan, J., “The Founding Act”, in *Television: A Challenge to the Psychoanalytic Establishment*, transl. Denis Hollier et al, Norton, London, 1990, p. 99.

9. *Ibid.*, p. 103, from the “Preamble”: “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...”

10. *Ibid.*

students of the sixties were made of different stuff. On the basis of psychoanalytic publications, this third section was to extract the principles of its practice that could attain a scientific status, learn from the reorganisation of the human and more widely “conjectural” sciences, and underline the contributions made by psychoanalysis, whether to knowledge or the field of ethics. In fact, it was a question of reasserting, in the whole field of culture, the irreducible contribution made by psychoanalysis: the respect for subjective particularity at the time of the universal of science. This goes beyond respect for the rights of man.¹¹

From all this and from this reconstruction of the Freudian project, let us concentrate on the elements that the analyst in formation [*qui se forme*] circulates between. He is required to be able to answer questions bearing upon pure psychoanalysis, in other words the end of analysis, the necessity of supervision, the way the treatment is adapted for each case, etc. It is also necessary, whether he is a physician or not, for him to be able to have a formation in applied psychoanalysis, come to know the indications for psychoanalysis, their limits, learn how to conduct a clinical interview, how important it is to orient oneself in the diagnosis and adapt the treatment to different therapeutic ends. He must finally be able to answer for the ethics of the analytic act, and for its place among the actions and human institutions that defines the time.

After Freud: What is an analyst?

The key to the renewal of this mechanism, the originality of the Lacanian orientation is this exploration of what a psychoanalyst “is”. So, as soon as Lacan founded his School, he immediately created what he called a “section of pure psychoanalysis” or of the “praxis and doctrine of psychoanalysis properly speaking”, which is nothing other than the isolation of the problem of what constitutes a training analysis as such.

It took the institution developed by Freud to be able to measure the effects of deferred action [*après coup*] of such an institution, and to propose another model for it. In the same way that Freud’s first analysis with Fliess was necessary for him to be able to repeat it with another subject. It was in this repetition that the first psychoanalysis was carried out.

What Lacan proposed for the psychoanalytic institution is a temporality of the same order. First, it was necessary for Freud to propose an institution centred on the “dead father”, an empty place from which the identificatory marks of the sons of the primal horde could be removed.

Freud’s institution. No one knew what its structuration that it was a member to “confront” the milieu to deal with the runs through its movement to exist. It was published by Freud, the study for verifying it.

The other pole of the think of each person furnished with a that Valéry designated “professions”. With the and intellectuals, and a lot in order to be members of the society.

These two incidents of polymorphism and of the big society, delighting in them.

In a first moment by case extension, disseminated. This question of knowledge model only answers. However, in the time of Freud, the shapes of

Beyond this, the question of knowledge

The consistency of the circulation of Freud’s work is not enough. One what a psychoanalyst seems to escape. In a model, the definition in a first sense, the identification with the subject operation. This identification of the analysand’s ego exists.

Freud managed to the constitution of

11. Cf. on this point Éric Laurent’s editorial “L’institution, la règle et le particulier”, in *Mental*, No. 2, *Vouloir des institutions particulières*, ECF, Paris, 1998.

ent stuff. On the basis of psycho-
as to extract the principles of its
s. learn from the reorganisation
“rational” sciences, and underline the
whether to knowledge or the field
asserting, in the whole field of
by psychoanalysis: the respect
the universal of science. This goes

tion of the Freudian project, let
analyst in formation [*qui se forme*]
able to answer questions bearing
the end of analysis, the necessity
adapted for each case, etc. It is also
not, for him to be able to have a
me to know the indications for
conduct a clinical interview, how
agnosis and adapt the treatment
finally be able to answer for the
among the actions and human

?

hanism, the originality of the
what a psychoanalyst “is”. So, as
mediately created what he called
“praxis and doctrine of psycho-
nothing other than the isolation of
g analysis as such.

Freud to be able to measure the
ch an institution, and to propose
t Freud’s first analysis with Fliess
it with another subject. It was in
s was carried out.

alytic institution is a temporality
r Freud to propose an institution
ce from which the identificatory
ld be removed.

Freud’s institutional choice allowed psychoanalysis to exist in the world. No one knew what psychoanalysis could be, but thanks to the identificatory structuration that Freud chose, one knew what to do for each psychoanalyst member to “conform” and feel “like the others”. It is a tendency of the milieu to deal with the feeling of impotence, even of impossibility, that runs through it, through a concern for conformity. Conformity allows the movement to exist. Beyond the mode of organising psychoanalysts established by Freud, the milieu of 19th-century hypnotists could serve as a field study for verifying what happened.

The other pole that the milieu oscillates towards is, on the contrary, to think of each person as profoundly different from the other, each one furnished with a unique *savoir-faire*. It is the symptom of the professions that Valéry designated with a word that Lacan used once, the “delusional professions”. With this, he was referring to people of letters, writers, authors and intellectuals, all those professions where you have to believe in yourself a lot in order to be able to exist. One could also add actors and other members of the society of the spectacle in the widest sense.

These two inclinations are reconciled by the paradox of narcissism. Its polymorphism allows the subject both to think himself unique and be part of the big society of the Narcissi, those who have made the choice of delighting in themselves.

In a first moment, with simple definitions of standards, and with a case by case extension, Freud succeeded in getting his model accepted and disseminated. This model, Lacan will say in his “Proposition”, leaves the question of knowing what a psychoanalyst is completely to one side. The model only answers for this in one respect: Freud knew the answer. However, in the time in which we are situated, that of the after-effect of Freud, the shapes of Freud’s desire appear.

Beyond this identification through which Freud defined himself, the question of knowing what a psychoanalyst is remains untouched.

The consistency of the psychoanalyst’s position is deduced from the articulation of Freud’s work and is now completed by Lacan’s teaching. But this is not enough. One can run oneself ragged trying to define the criteria for what a psychoanalyst is through standards, yet the essence of the definition seems to escape. Lacan notes that, in the existing societies following Freud’s model, the definition oscillates between an identification with the analyst in a first sense, *the conforming analyst*; and then, in a second sense, an identification with the sane part of the ego of the analyst who has supported the operation. This identification is only possible if the “sane part” of the analysand’s ego existed before the treatment. In that case, why do an analysis?

Freud managed to build quite a disparate group around himself, before the constitution of the International Society, in the name of a definition

centred on transference and the unconscious. A psychoanalyst is someone who believes in transference and the unconscious. This implies that one would agree on the definition of transference and the unconscious... After Freud's death, unity was no longer possible. However, it was on the basis of Freud's authority that analysts as different as Jung, Abraham, Ferenczi, Groddeck, Ruth Mack Brunswick, Helen Deutsch, Lou Andreas-Salomé, Aichhorn, Pfister... could appear on the same list. This list brought psychiatrists, physicians, writers, educators, and instigators of social movements together. Freud could find his way with them, and it was on the strength of his authority alone that he could unite the *seven* members of the committee, which he had designated in the manner of a romantic fellowship.

At bottom, the model that inspired Freud, which he set up to accompany him in his lifetime, was that of a romantic order of knights, a heroic model. This is what preceded the model that he established to survive him, the bureaucratic model derived from the Church and the Army, which he studied in the 1920s. Through these two models, the trait of identification, and consequently the note of idealisation, were not put in question.

By contrast, Lacan based himself on strict experience. Without any *a priori* concern for conformity, he proposed that the results of a psychoanalytic treatment conducted to the point at which it comes to a halt of its own accord be examined. Not in the name of a standard duration, or a pre-agreed duration, or a reasonable duration, but *of its own accord*. It is enough to consider that psychoanalysis, whether beyond its therapeutic effects or not, must be conducted to its end.

Once the "experimental" necessity of going to the end of an unprecedented experience of language had been established, Lacan proposed that what is effectively transformed for each person who engages in it should be examined. It is what he calls the verification of the effects of the structures of psychoanalysis for a subject.¹² The term experience is opposed to that of *standard*. In the standard, one verifies that the conditions of the experience are compliant. In an experiment, one examines the results obtained.

The novelty, in 1964, consisted in being sceptical about all established psychoanalysts, those who already took themselves to be psychoanalysts, in order to examine the question of what guarantees the psychoanalyst's being. Lacan's intuition was that, between themselves, psychoanalysts are like cardinals – they understand one another without speaking. Only the presence of candidates in juries brings the necessity of developing arguments. It was because of the need for reasoned justification that Lacan re-examined all the professional qualifications of psychoanalysts.

Lacan did a great deal for psychoanalytic societies. It was not simply a question of its own sake. From a perspective of introducing all to the transmission of psychoanalysis and teaching analysis, Lacan is rigorously separated from identification, in order to be the sole interlocutor in the work. The IPA is to submit the work with the analyst – in other words, transference, defined as zero. A good analysis is at the perspective that Lacan that his adventures set him apart from analyst like others. He is not identical to everyone else because of *Psychology and the Analysis of Identification* is that the hegemony.

Thus Lacan considered safeguarding the parties wanted to condemn identification what allowed him to set his own analysands into supervision did not aim at the practice of supervision. Psychoanalytic Society defended by Vilma Kowak of the systems set was able to have. Laplanche and Robert Lefort are present and one would be hard.

From the moment Lacan set out to interrogate modalities of his practice. Can we say that, in the finity of the WAP, Lacan's answer must be no. The singular one. Its possibility for it assumed. However, practice in a psychoanalytic

12. Cf. Lacan, J., "Proposition of the 9th of October 1967 on the Psychoanalyst of the School", transl. Russell Grigg, *Analysis*, No. 6, 1995, p. 1.

A psychoanalyst is someone conscious. This implies that one and the unconscious... After However, it was on the basis of Jung, Abraham, Ferenczi, Grodtsch, Lou Andreas-Salomé, list. This list brought psychiatrists of social movements and it was on the strength of members of the committee, romantic fellowship.

id, which he set up to accompany the order of knights, a heroic he established to survive him, church and the Army, which he models, the trait of identification, were not put in question.

et experience. Without any a that the results of a psychoanalysis which it comes to a halt of its a standard duration, or a pre- of its own accord. It is enough beyond its therapeutic effects or

ing to the end of an unprecedented, Lacan proposed that on who engages in it should be of the effects of the structures experience is opposed to that of the conditions of the experience nes the results obtained.

sceptical about all established selves to be psychoanalysts, in tees the psychoanalyst's being. elves, psychoanalysts are like thout speaking. Only the pre- ssity of developing arguments. eation that Lacan re-examined analysts.

the Psychoanalyst of the School", transl.

Lacan did a great deal to change the standards operating within classical psychoanalytic societies. He systematically deregulated the old system. Yet, it was not simply a question of blind deregulation, of abolishing rules for its own sake. From a perspective that is always kept in sight, it was a question of introducing all the necessary changes in the practice that organised the transmission of psychoanalysis, which linked the teacher, supervisor and teaching analyst. In a classic society, each one of these three functions is rigorously separated in the laudable concern to distribute the risks of identification, in order to avoid the poor candidate being faced with one sole interlocutor in these three registers. As the fundamental doctrine of the IPA is to submit the end of analysis to the criterion of identification with the analyst – in other words, in reality, to a “he is like the others”, the transference, defined as the residue of each analysis, must be reduced to zero. A good analysis allows one to treat all analysts alike. This is precisely the perspective that Lacan radically separates from, irrespective of the fact that his adventures set him apart as not being in the position of a psychoanalyst like others. He mistrusted this conception of everyone being identical to everyone else because it is exactly what Freud denounced in *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego*. The sole condition for such an identification is that the Ego Ideal be occupied by an object.

Thus Lacan considered that it was possible to collectivise a room while safeguarding the particularity of each person in it; there where people wanted to condemn identification he indicated the opposite effect. It is also what allowed him to conduct an original practice of supervision, taking his own analysands into supervision with him. It was only possible once supervision did not aim at standardising a practice. In a sense, Lacan restored a practice of supervision that had taken place at the heart of the Hungarian Psychoanalytic Society at the time of Ferenczi, and which had been defended by Vilma Kovács. In another sense, he generalised it. The verification of the system's effects is shown by the variety of students that Lacan was able to have. Laplanche, Pontalis, Anzieu, Mannoni or again Rosine and Robert Lefort are people and personalities that are extremely different and one would be hard pushed to find in them an effect of standardisation.

From the moment he founded his School, in “The Founding Act” itself, Lacan set out to interrogate the effective consequences of the particular modalities of his practice. Where are we now in relation to this discussion? Can we say that, in the École de la Cause Freudienne or in the wider community of the WAP, Lacan's practice is taken as a model to be imitated? The answer must be no. This practice of combatting standards can only be a singular one. Its possibility had to be demonstrated in act and responsibility for it assumed. However, it is certainly very difficult to generalise such a practice in a psychoanalytic community, including one that is outside standards.

In training with only one person, as student, as practitioner, as analysand, there is a significant risk of producing isolated monads, clans that have no relation to one another. In fact we must not forget the emphasis that Lacan placed on the invention of collective procedures to counter these effects, from the procedure of the pass to those Bourbakist groups characterised by the absence of personal signatures. Lacanian deregulation is fundamentally the wish to refuse the isolating barriers sought and maintained at the heart of practice, by the IPA. It is also based on the wish to take account of each person's particular mode of incarnating the desire of the analyst. The stake then becomes that of grasping the unity of the desire of the psychoanalyst beyond the diversity that it can present and without resorting to any *a priori* criteria.

The procedure of the pass thus took several different forms, according to Lacan's negotiations with the analytic group and the different directions taken by his own research in his lifetime. After his death, other variations came about. However, these different forms always drew their inspiration from the procedure proposed in 1964: organising a confrontation between trainers [*formateurs*] and candidates on the results of a training analysis [*analyse de formation*], without defining these results in advance. It is a matter, before anything else, of examining the singularities of the desire produced, and of the analytic act as such.

Landmarks for the Pass

The guidelines for the experience were defined in the "Proposition of 1967..." It rests upon the binary symptom/fantasy, whose resonances in Lacan's teaching have been sounded out by Jacques-Alain Miller in his Course. If the entry into analysis is defined on the basis of the symptom, the end can only be calculated on the basis of fantasy. It is a doctrine that secures the place of what Lacan called preliminary interviews at the start of the experience. At this time, the formal envelope of the symptom is explored and the transformation of the symptom into a symptom addressed to the psychoanalyst occurs.

According to Lacan the logic of the course of an analysis seems to follow the exploratory paths of this impossible reconciliation. They are not, for all that, leading to an impasse. The topology of surfaces allows us to represent the enumeration of the possible paths on a *surface organised by a hole*. It is impossibility that organises the paths. These could also be accounted for through a logic of knowledge, just as well as through a logic of paths [*parcours*]. The advantage of the fantasy in relation to the symptom in this regard is that it is not liable to displacement. Its very inertia allows for the enumeration of a certain number of logical permutations. Thus an exit

from the treatment is not inert, transindividually, key to the most singular.

So, the work programme of psychoanalytic organisations is the destitution of the master without for all that the master of his jouissance forever returned to the analytic community. Psychoanalysis allows this but through a transference of analytic discourse, from the analyst, which makes it possible. An act still without measure, whether through the transference through recourse to the symbolic.

We must respect the desire to find the means of sustaining that always knows how to be a analyst or of the psychoanalyst of knowledge. It is the psychoanalytic cause, at the moment where, for a moment, the thing he brought back again, in its logical structure. Founding Act of the Society to the psychoanalytic cause, to be alone, sublime. It is always others, for even with others, etc. Lacan's work was not a level on which the desire. This level of desire. Tsar of psychoanalysis, "of" is, it is a lot more something; something with what Lacan notes, concerned, *each person*.

13. Lacan, J., "De Rome," Paris, 1968, p. 49. reprinted

14. Lacan, J., "The Founding Act of the Society to the psychoanalytic cause,"

student, as practitioner, as being isolated monads, clans et we must not forget the of collective procedures to he pass to those Bourbakist signatures. Lacanian dere- the isolating barriers sought e. It is also based on the ar mode of incarnating the that of grasping the unity of ersity that it can present and

different forms, according and the different directions of his death, other variations ways drew their inspiration ng a confrontation between results of a training analysis e results in advance. It is a e singularities of the desire

defined in the "Proposition of fantasy, whose resonances in Jacques-Alain Miller in his the basis of the symptom, fantasy. It is a doctrine that ary interviews at the start of evelope of the symptom is into a symptom addressed

an analysis seems to follow ellation. They are not, for surfaces allows us to repre- a surface organised by a hole. se could also be accounted as through a logic of paths tion to the symptom in this s very inertia allows for the permutations. Thus an exit

from the treatment is constructed on the basis of the fantasy. The fantasy, inert, transindividual, and even trans-nosographical, is thus revealed as the key to the most singular paths.

So, the work programme that Lacan urges us towards is to construct a psychoanalytic organisation which accounts for an end point defined by the destitution of identifications obtained through the process itself, without for all that accepting the cynical perspective of a subject who is master of his jouissance thanks to the fact that his transference has been forever returned to zero. Lacan's ambition was to demonstrate to the analytic community, and not only that of his students, that the truth of psychoanalysis allows singularities to hold together, linked not by an ideal, but through a transference to psychoanalysis, a transference to the psychoanalytic discourse. This transference is another name for the desire of the analyst, which makes itself responsible for an act "still without measure".¹³ An act still without measure against which there is no reason to take refuge, whether through the fantasy of power, a narcissistic self-adornment, or through recourse to experience.

We must respect the aporia proper to the psychoanalytic discourse and find the means of situating it "in the right way". In other words, in a way that always knows how to preserve the place of the desire of the psychoanalyst or of the psychoanalyst's body, beyond the mirage of the supplement of knowledge. It is the level where the analyst is alone in his relation to the psychoanalytic cause. What is exposed in Freud's *Selbstdarstellung* is the moment where, for a long time, he finds himself alone in his relation to the thing he brought into the world. Lacan took up this historic moment again, in its logical structure, in the sentence with which he opens the Founding Act of the School: "As alone as I have always been in my relation to the psychoanalytic cause."¹⁴ This does not mean that he imagined himself to be alone, sublime Narcissus; he had never been alone and there were always others, for example, Serge Leclaire, René Major, François Perrier, and others, etc. Lacan knew this full well. But this does not mean that there was not a level on which he was alone, and at a certain level that is Lacan's desire. This level of solitude did not consist in his taking himself to be the Tsar of psychoanalysis, or the founding father. This is not at all what "desire of" is, it is a lot more complex, it is not a question of taking oneself for something; something else is at stake. On the other hand, it is compatible with what Lacan noted: as far as psychoanalysis and its transmission are concerned, *each person must reinvent psychoanalysis*. In other words, there is

13. Lacan, J., "De Rome 53 à Rome 67: La psychanalyse. Raison d'un échec", *Scilicet*, No. 1, Seuil, Paris, 1968, p. 49, reprinted in *Autres écrits*, Seuil, Paris, 2001, p. 348.

14. Lacan, J., "The Founding Act", *op. cit.*, p. 97.

a level at which each person is alone in his relation to the psychoanalytic cause, and in his analysis, it is necessary that he has, to some extent, touched this point where he feels that he is alone, there, at that point, in relation to that point. It is what, at this moment, leaves open the possibility of knowing that psychoanalysis must be reinvented in relation to what one has touched.

At the time of the WAP Congress, I noted that, to the same extent that we place ever-greater emphasis upon singularity in the experience of the pass, a new relation to supervision must be conceived in this new phase, that of the articulation between the Psychoanalytic School and the psychoanalytic discourse by means of the pass of the *parlêtre*.

Supervision and the *Parlêtre*

At the time when the symptom was thought of as an effect of meaning, Lacan made supervision the demonstration *par excellence* that the unconscious is structured like a language. It bore out the fact that it is possible to grasp something of a subject's unconscious by recounting what he has said [*ses dire*s]. In fact, the analytic community already recognised that the very practice of supervision – giving an oral account of an analysis to an experienced analyst – proved that something of the experience could be transmitted, despite everything that resisted being said: the presence, the posture, the habitus, and the real of what is ineffable in the encounter. In this first perspective, which is that of the “Rome Discourse”, supervision demonstrated the domination of the symbolic over the imaginary: “if the intervention of speech were not essential to the analytic structure, the supervision of an analysis by an analyst who only has the verbal account to go on, would be strictly unthinkable, yet it is one of the clearest and most fruitful forms of the analytic relation.”¹⁵

Supervision is also the place where the mystery of a supposedly unfathomable gift for the clinic disappears. It is because the young analyst is not meant to make a show of his gifts that he is a better “sensitive plate”,¹⁶ I could say to make use of this anachronistic expression that Lacan will later apply to passers¹⁷ and that J.-A. Miller has used in a similar way:

15. Lacan, J., “Discours de Rome”, delivered on 26 September 1953 to introduce his report “The Function and Field of Speech and Language in Psychoanalysis”, in *Autres écrits*, Seuil, Paris, 2001, p. 145.

16. Lacan uses the expression “sensitive plate” to designate the innocence of the slave from Plato's *Meno* in *Seminar XV*, “*The Analytic Act*”, lesson of 29 November 1967, unpublished. J.-A. Miller took up the expression to qualify the mode of innocence of the passer in his lecture at Granada on 27 October 1990. Cf. Miller, J.-A., “L'École et son psychanalyste”, *Quarto*, No. 110, April 2015, pp. 10-19.

17. In the procedure of the “pass”, established by Lacan, these are “passers”, analysands who are at one point less advanced than he, for being still in analysis, who transmits to the “cartel of the pass” the testimony of the “passand”. As a result, the passand can be nominated “analyst of the School (AS), a title given for three years to those whose course through and end of analysis has the value of a teaching.

his relation to the psychoanalytic that he has, to some extent, touched there: at that point, in relation to es open the possibility of knowing relation to what one has touched. and that, to the same extent that we ty in the experience of the pass, a ved in this new phase, that of the ol and the psychoanalytic discourse

ought of as an effect of meaning, on *par excellence* that the uncon- out the fact that it is possible to s by recounting what he has said already recognised that the very count of an analysis to an expe- of the experience could be trans- ng said: the presence, the posture, ble in the encounter. In this first of Discourse”, supervision demon- ver the imaginary: “if the inter- to the analytic structure, the no only has the verbal account to t is one of the clearest and most

mystery of a supposedly unfatho- because the young analyst is not e is a better “sensitive plate”,¹⁶ I e expression that Lacan will later s used in a similar way:

Young analysts, who might nevertheless allow themselves to be impressed by the impenetrable gifts such recourse implies, will find no better way of dispelling their illusions than by considering the success of the supervision they themselves receive. The very possibility of that supervision would become problematic from the perspective of contact with the patient’s reality (*réel*) [to be read here not as the real that Lacan will go on to speak of later, but as the ineffable real of the encounter]. On the contrary, the supervisor manifests a second sight – that’s the word for it! – which makes the experience at least as instructive for him as for his supervisee. And the less the supervisee demonstrates such gifts – which are considered by some to be all the more incommunicable the bigger the to-do they themselves make about their secrets regarding technique – the truer this almost becomes. The reason for this enigma is that the supervisee serves as a filter, or even as a refractor, of the subject’s discourse, and in this way a ready-made stereography is presented to the supervisor, bringing out from the start the three or four registers on which the musical score constituted by the subject’s discourse can be read. If the supervisee could be put by the supervisor into a subjective position different from that implied by the sinister term *contrôle* (advantageously replaced, but only in English, by “supervision”) the greatest benefit he would derive from this exercise would be to learn to put himself in the position of that second subjectivity into which the situation automatically puts the supervisor.¹⁸

The more the young analyst can efface himself, the more he becomes the sensitive plate that retransmits the subjectivity of his analysand more faithfully, with the least alienating filter possible. Lacan clarifies this as follows: “here you see the secret of the permanent miracle that is a so-called supervised analysis. But this supposes that, as little as it may be, your personal analysis has made you able to perceive this alienation yourself, which is the main resistance that you have to deal with in your analyses.”¹⁹

How does all this get transformed in the time of the parlêtre?²⁰ For, on the basis of the parlêtre, Lacan structured the experience of supervision and its relation to how the rules of interpretation are transmitted in a completely different way. How can the indication that Miller gave in 2002, at a study day on supervision, be extended?:

1953 to introduce his report “The Func- in *Autres écrits*, Seuil, Paris, 2001, p. 145. the innocence of the slave from Plato’s *Meno* 1967, unpublished. J.-A. Miller took up passer in his lecture at Granada on 27 October *Quarto*, No. 110, April 2015, pp. 10-19. these are “passers”, analysands who are at one who transmits to the “cartel of the pass” the be nominated “analyst of the School (AS), a and end of analysis has the value of a teaching.

18. Lacan, J., “The Function and Field of Speech and Language in Psychoanalysis”, *Écrits*, transl. B. Fink, Norton, London, 2006, p. 210.

19. Lacan, J., “Discours de Rome...”, *op. cit.*, p. 161.

20. The following thoughts were inspired by a discussion with Paola Francesconi and Antonio Di Ciaccia about the opposition between symptom and sinthome regarding supervision, which took place at a Study Day at the Scuola Lacaniana di Psicoanalisi (SLP) in May 2015.

One brings one's division and palpitations to supervision, yet in the act one is supposed to be abstracted from it. This is also what relativises the expression concerning the "secondary subjectivation" of supervision [...] At the time of "Function and Field...", the theory would have it that the analyst operates as a subject [...] Once the analytic act has been defined, where the analyst is located in the position of object little *a*, supervision consists in a resubjection of the analyst, who comes there as a barred subject to bear witness to his want-of-being.²¹

But if, today, we do not only base ourselves on the object *a*, but also on the parlêtre, doesn't this somewhat obscure the luminous evidence of supervision and the valorisation of "secondary subjectivity" as an objective to be obtained?

The Resonance of Equivocation

In the first lesson of *Seminar XXIII*, Lacan shifts the question of supervision by no longer placing the emphasis on a first or second subjectivity, but on two times in the transmission of the rules of interpretation centred on the use of equivocation:

when all is said done the equivoque is all we have as a weapon against the symptom. It so happens that I afford myself the luxury of *supervising*, as they call it, a certain number of people who have authorized themselves, each on their own, to be analysts, in keeping with my formula. There are two stages. There is a stage when they go like a rhino. They go barging in any old how, and I always go along with them. Indeed, they are always right. The second stage consists in playing on the equivoque that might free up something of the sinthome. Indeed, interpretation operates solely through equivoques. There has to be something in the signifier that resonates [...] the drives are the echo in the body of a fact of saying.²²

One thus passes from "they are always right" [*ils ont toujours raison*] to "r-e-s-o-n" [*r-é-s-o-n*], to what resonates [*ce qui résonne*]. How can we learn to pass from one register to the other, from the one where we operate in the name of reason [*raison*], of logos as *reason*, to logos as *reson* [*réson*] and resonance? Lacan continues:

For this fact of saying of *sinthome* must be it is. The body is sets of which is the ear of this that there is

This is what must be. Eros has become the sense of those who contemporary of this of the books that the editions in different choice for the cover made-to-measure to a well-armoured animal. In an analyst. He represents why Lacan says that tations in order to be *ceros*, accounts for First, there was the itself on sense and a play on the equivocation up something of the subjectivity that plays vocation. Lacan no from the symptom a categorical declaration. It is a matter of using of writing [*l'écrit*] all sinthome through a speaking body speaks "the echo in the body."

The emphasis on research guidelines is in the time of the par essentially taught power, that allows it

21. Miller, J.-A., "La confidence des contrôleurs. Le débat", *La Cause freudienne*, No. 52, Paris, November 2002, pp. 142-143.

22. Lacan, J., *The Seminar, Book XXIII, The Sinthome*, transl. A. R. Price. Polity, Cambridge, 2016, p. 9.

23. *Ibid.*

24. Alciati, A. (1492-1555)

25. Cf. *Quarto*, No. 11

26. Miller, J.-A., "L'orientation de l'analyse: Psychoanalysis at the

supervision, yet in the act one
what relativises the expres-
of supervision [...] At the
ould have it that the analyst
has been defined, where the
supervision consists in a
as a barred subject to bear

the object *a*, but also on the
luminous evidence of supervi-
activity” as an objective to be

shifts the question of supervi-
first or second subjectivity, but
of interpretation centred on

have as a weapon against the
the luxury of *supervising*, as
have authorized themselves,
with my formula. There are
a rhino. They go barging in
em. Indeed, they are always
in the equivocal that might
interpretation operates solely
coming in the signifier that
of a fact of saying.²²

“*ils ont toujours raison*”) to
[*qui résonne*]. How can we
from the one where we operate
to logos as *reson* [*réson*]

For this fact of saying to resonate, for it to be consonant, to use another word
of *sinthome masquinas*, the body has to be sensitive to it. And it's a fact that
it is. The body is sensitive to it because it has a few orifices, the most important
of which is the ear because it can't be sealed, shut, or closed off. It is because
of this that there is a response in the body to what I have called the voice.²³

This is what must be added to the stories about rhinoceroses. The rhinoceros has become the animal emblem for the formation of the analyst, in the sense of those Renaissance emblems transmitted to us by Alciati²⁴ – a contemporary of Erasmus, who Lacan liked and whose *Emblemata* is one of the books that runs through European culture, with over a hundred editions in different languages. Dürer's magnificent rhinoceros was a wise choice for the cover of the issue of the review, *Quarto*, devoted to “The made-to-measure formation of the analyst.”²⁵ Yet, we should note that this well-armoured animal is the opposite of the divided, wavering and uncertain analyst. He represents the young analyst gathered up in his act and this is why Lacan says that he is right. He has to unburden himself of his hesitations in order to be in the analytic act. Being there as *rhino*, more or less *ceros*, accounts for only one time; a second time follows for interpretation. First, there was the interpretation of the era of the symptom that based itself on sense and signification, then there is the one that knows how to play on the equivocal, on what is written in speech, which alone can “free up something of the sinthome”. The division is no longer at the level of a subjectivity that palpitates, but at the level of the use of *lalangue* as equivocation. Lacan no longer speaks of the effects of truth that liberate one from the symptom, but of effects of equivocation that operate, with his categorical declaration: “interpretation works solely through equivocation”. It is a matter of using the act of saying [*le dire*] as such, in speech, the effect of writing [*l'écrit*] allows the equivocal to emerge, which alone touches the sinthome through its *réson* or its consonance. If, as we have seen, the speaking body speaks through its drives, it is because they are the traces, “the echo in the body of a fact of saying” which had an impact.

The emphasis on the echo in the body allows us to understand the research guidelines set out by Jacques-Alain Miller regarding supervision in the time of the parlêtre: “Interpretation [...] is creationist [...] What is essentially taught [...] is the method that allows one's speech to acquire power, that allows it to be creationist.”²⁶ But pay attention, the logic of

23. *Ibid.*

24. Alciati, A. (1492-1550), *Emblemata*, first edition in France in 1534, printed by Christian Wechel.

25. Cf. *Quarto*, No. 110, April 2015.

26. Miller, J.-A., “L'orientation lacanienne. L'Être et l'Un”, lecture given within the Department of Psychoanalysis at the University of Paris VIII, lesson of 11 May 2011, unpublished.

Supervision

creationist speech must produce an effect of surprise. It does not have to do with plodding attention and constant surveillance. For attention directed at anything other than surprise and creation tires the unconscious, “As Lacan says in his last published text²⁷ which you have in the *Autres écrits*, on page 571: ‘one only has to be aware of the fact [that one is in it] to find oneself outside the unconscious,’ yet it is nevertheless what it is a question of arriving at through interpretation.”²⁸

As for the remainders of *jouissance*, they defy interpretation and pertain to the most contingent aspect of the interpretative operation, the one that allows one to pass to the other side of the initial trauma by means of which, for a first time, speech was fleshed out/corporised [*a pris corps*].

Translated by Philip Dravers

27. [TN: The “Preface to the English Language Edition of Seminar XI”.]

28. *Ibid.* [TN: Miller is quoting the opening lines of Lacan’s preface here, hence the insertion required to accommodate the English version. However, in the present context, a simpler alternative might be: “one only has to be aware of it [*il suffit qu’on y fasse attention*] to find oneself outside the unconscious...”]

THE P

O ver the c
of super
the Pass
different

During the stud
Jacques-Alain Miller
obligatory; it can on
with regard to ones p
the Pass with regard

The supervision
play is transference
analyst. We can add
at least two reasons

The analyst loses
of the treatment. It s

The analyst wishes
of the School that ca
Commission of the
administrative requ
involved. But the sup
will “catch up with
bility of psychoanal
act implies a promot
grounding of technic
to the appreciation o

I wondered about
respective contributi

During my own
“corpse”, a posture
anything about. Tha
to propose me for th

At exactly the sam
supervision began to

Patrick Monribot is a psych