

**Proposal of 9 October 1967
on the psychoanalyst of the School**

Jacques Lacan*

Before reading it, I underline that it has to be heard against the background of a reading, to be done or re-done, of my article: '*Situation de la psychanalyse et formation du psychanalyste en 1956*'. (Pages 459-486 of my *Ecrits*.)

It is going to be a matter of secure structures in psychoanalysis and guaranteeing their implementation by the psychoanalyst.

This is offered to our School, after organs drafted on restrictive principles have lasted long enough. The only novelty I am introducing is in their functioning. It is true that from there the solution to the problem of the psychoanalytic Society appears.

Which is to be found in the distinction between hierarchy and *gradus*.

At the beginning of this year I am going to bring forward this constructive step:

- 1) produce it - show it to you;
- 2) put you in a position to produce the machinery for it, which must reproduce this step in these two senses.

Let us recall what exists among us.

First a principle: the psychoanalyst is authorised only by himself. This principle is inscribed in the original texts of the School and decides its position.

This does not rule out the School guaranteeing that an analyst has been formed by it.

It can do so on its own initiative.

* *Proposition du 9 octobre 1967 sur le psychanalyste de l'Ecole, Scilicet* 1 (1968): 14 – 30
Translated by Cormac Gallagher 28.6.02 ; Retranslated Easter 2009.

And the analyst may want this guarantee, which from then on can only go beyond: to become responsible for the progress of the School, become a psychoanalyst of its very experience.

(15) Looked at from this point of view, we recognise that from now on it is to these two forms that there respond:

I. The A.M.E., or analyst member of the School (*Ecole*), incorporated simply by the fact that the School recognises him as a psychoanalyst who has proved himself.

This is what the first distinguished guarantee coming from the School, constitutes. The initiative for it falls on the School, where one is only admitted at the base in a work-project and without any regard for provenance or qualifications. An analyst-practitioner is only registered there at the start in the same way as a doctor, an ethnologist and *tutti quanti* are inscribed there.

II. The A.E., or the Analyst of the School, who is charged with being among those who can bear witness to crucial problems at the vital points they are at for analysis, especially inasmuch as they themselves are tackling them or at least striving to resolve them.

This place implies that one wants to occupy it: one can be in it only by having asked for it *de facto*, if not formally (*de forme*).

That the School can guarantee the analyst's relationship to the formation that it dispenses, is therefore established.

It can, and henceforth it must.

It is here that there appears the short-coming, the lack of inventiveness, to fill an office (namely the one that existing societies boast of) by finding different ways to it, that avoid the disadvantages (and the misdeeds) of the regime in these societies.

The idea that the maintenance of a similar regime is necessary to regulate the *gradus*, should be highlighted in terms of the discontent it brings about. This discontent is not sufficient to justify the maintenance of the idea. Still less its return in practice.

That there should be an order of *gradus* is implied in a School, even more certainly than in a society. For after all in a society, there is no need for that, when a society has only scientific interests.

But there is a real at stake in the very formation of the psychoanalyst. We hold that the existing societies are founded on this real.

We also start from the fact which all appearances confirm, that Freud wanted them as they are.

(16) The fact is no less patent – and for us conceivable – that this real provokes its own miscognition, indeed produces its systematic negation.

It is clear therefore that Freud took the risk of a certain standstill. Perhaps more: that he saw in them the only possible shelter to avoid the extinction of the experience.

That we confront the question thus posed, is not my preference. It is the very consequence, let us say it at least for the analysts of the School, of the choice that they have made of the School.

They find themselves concentrated in it for not having wanted to accept by a vote what it was taking away: the pure and simple survival of a teaching, that of Lacan.

Anyone elsewhere who still says that it was a question of the formation of analysts, has lied about it. For it was enough to vote along the lines the IPA wanted, to gain one's entry into it under full sail, with simply a purifying ablution received for a short time from the siglum *made in English* (we shall not forget the *French group*). Those analysed by me (*mes analysés*), as they say, were even particularly welcome in it, and still would be so if the result could be to shut me up.

It is recalled every day to anyone who is prepared to hear it.

It is therefore to a group to whom my teaching was precious enough, indeed essential enough, for each one deliberating to have indicated his preference for its maintenance over the advantage offered, – and this without seeing any further, just as without seeing any further, I interrupted my seminar following the said vote –, it was for this group searching for a way out that I offered the founding of the School.

By this choice, decisive for those who are here, the value of what is at stake is marked. There can be a stake, that for some is valued to the point of being essential for them, and it is my teaching.

If the said teaching is without rival for them, it is so for all, as is proved by those who rush to it without having paid its price, the question of the profit that remains permitted to them being suspended.

Without rival does not here mean a valuation, but a fact: no teaching speaks about what psychoanalysis is. Elsewhere, and in an acknowledged way, the only concern is that it should conform.

There is solidarity between the breakdown, indeed the deviations that psychoanalysis shows and the hierarchy that reigns in it, – and which I (17) designate, benevolently you will grant, as that of cooptation of the wise.

The reason for this is that this cooptation promotes a return to a status of prestige, combining narcissistic *pregnance* with competitive cunning. A return that restores with the reinforcements of the recidivist what didactic analysis aims to liquidate.

This is the effect that casts its shadow over the practice of psychoanalysis – whose termination, object and very goal prove to be inarticulatable after at least half a century of continuous experience.

Remedying this among ourselves must be done by acknowledging the shortcoming I have indicated, far from dreaming of veiling it.

But this is in order to grasp in this shortcoming, the articulation that is missing.

It only cross-checks with what will be found everywhere, and which has always been known, which is that the obviousness of a duty is not enough for it to be fulfilled. It is from the angle of its yawning gap, that it can be activated, and this happens whenever one finds the means to deal with it.

To introduce you to it, I will base myself on the two phases in the linkage between what I shall call respectively in this entertainment psychoanalysis in extension, i.e. everything that summarises the function of our School in as far as it makes psychoanalysis present to the world, and psychoanalysis in intension, i.e. didactic analysis, in as far as it does not only prepare operatives for it.

We forget in effect the reason for it being pregnant, which is to constitute psychoanalysis as an original experience, to push it to the point

that images its finitude so as to allow its after affect, an effect of time, as is known, that is radical for it.

This experience is essential to isolate it from therapeutics, which does not distort psychoanalysis only by relaxing its rigor.

I will note in effect that there is no possible definition of the therapeutic other than the reinstating of the first condition. A definition that is precisely impossible to pose in psychoanalysis.

As for the *primum non nocere*, let us not mention it, for it is changeable in not being able to be determined as *primum* at the start: what are we to choose not to harm! Just try. It is too easy in this condition to set to the credit of any treatment whatsoever the fact that it has not harmed something. This compulsory feature is of interest only because it depends on an undecidable logic.

We can find the time, now over (*révolu*), when what it was a matter (18) of not harming was the morbid entity. But the date of the doctor is more involved than is believed in this revolution, – in any case the exactingness become more delicate of what makes a teaching medical or not. I digress.

Our linking points, at which our organs of guarantee have to function, are known: they are the beginning and the end of psychoanalysis, as in chess. As luck will have it, these are the most exemplary for its structure. This luck must depend on what we call the encounter.

In the beginning of psychoanalysis is the transference. It is so by the grace of the one whom we will call, on the border of this proposal: the psychoanalysand¹. We do not have to account for what conditions it. At least here. It is at the start. But what is it?

I am astonished that no one has ever dreamt of putting to me, given certain terms of my doctrine, that transference just by itself raises an objection to intersubjectivity. I even regret it, seeing as nothing is more true: it refutes it, it is its stumbling block. Moreover it is to establish the background against which we can see its contrast, that I first promoted what the use of speech involves in terms of intersubjectivity. The term was therefore one way, a way like any other, I would say, if it had not been imposed on me, to circumscribe the import of the transference.

Thereupon, where people are required to justify their academic lot, they made off with the said term, supposed, no doubt because I used it, to be levitatory. But whoever reads me can see 'in reserve' with which I bring this reference into play for the conception of psychoanalysis. It forms part of the educative concessions I had to yield to given the context of fabulous ignorance in which I had to deliver my first seminars.

Is it now possible to doubt that in referring what the unconscious uncovers for us to the subject of the *cogito*, that in having defined the distinction between the imaginary other, familiarly called, small other, and the locus of the operation of language, posed as the big Other, I sufficiently indicate that no subject is supposable by another subject, – if this term must indeed be taken from Descartes' angle. That he required God or rather the (19) truth with which he credits him, for the subject to come and lodge itself under the same cloak that clothes deceptive human shadows - that Hegel in taking it up again poses the impossibility of the coexistence of consciousnesses, in as far as it concerns the subject destined for knowledge – is this not enough to sharpen the difficulty to which precisely our impasse, that of the subject of the unconscious, offers the solution –, to whoever knows how to form it.

It is true that here Jean-Paul Sartre, well able to perceive that the fight to the death is not this solution, since one could not destroy a subject, and since moreover in Hegel it is appointed at its birth, declares of it in camera (*huis-clos*) the phenomenological maxim; it is hell. But since this is false, and in a way that is justiciable from the structure, the phenomenon clearly showing that the coward, if he is not mad, is well able to accommodate himself to the look that fixes him, this maxim also proves that it is not only for love-feasts of the right that obscurantism has its place set.

The subject supposed to know is for us the pivot on which everything to do with the transference is articulated. Its effects escape, by making a pincers to grasp with them of the rather clumsy *pun* set up between the need for repetition to the repetition of need. Here the levitator of intersubjectivity will show his finesse by asking: subject supposed by whom, if not by another subject?

A memory of Aristotle, a drop of the categories, we pray, to scrape the subjective from this subject. A subject supposes nothing, it is supposed.

Supposed, I teach, by the signifier that represents it for another signifier.

Let us write in the proper way the supposed of this subject by putting knowledge in its place adjoining the supposition:

$$\begin{array}{c} S \xrightarrow{S^q} \\ \hline s (S^1, S^2, \dots S^n) \end{array}$$

We recognize on the first line the signifier S of the transference, namely of a subject, with its implication of a signifier that we will call any one whatever, namely, which supposes only particularity, in Aristotle's sense (always welcome), and thereby supposes yet other things. If it is (20) nameable by a proper noun, it is not because it is distinguished by knowledge, as we shall see.

Under the bar, but reduced to the span sup-posing the first signifier: the s represents the subject that results from it, implicating in the brackets the knowledge, supposed present, of the signifiers in the unconscious, a signification that takes the place of the still latent referent in this tertiary relationship which joins it to the signifier-signified couple.

We see that if psychoanalysis consists in maintaining an agreed-upon situation between two partners, who pose themselves there as psychoanalysand and psychoanalyst, it can only be developed at the price of the ternary constituent which is the signifier introduced into the discourse set up by it, the one that has a name: the subject supposed to know, a formation, for its part, not of artifice but of inspiration, as detached from the psychoanalysand.

We have to see what qualifies the psychoanalyst to respond to this situation which we can see does not envelope his person. Not only is the subject supposed to know not real in effect, but it is in no way necessary that the subject in action in the conjuncture, the psychoanalysand (at first the only one to speak), should impose it on him.

So little necessary is it that ordinarily it is not true: which is demonstrated in the first phases of the discourse, a way of assuring oneself

that the suit does not fit the psychoanalyst – an assurance against the fear that he will, as I might say, put his own creases in it too soon.

What matters for us here is the psychoanalyst, in his relation to the knowledge of the supposed subject, not second but direct.

It is clear that of the supposed knowledge, he knows nothing. The S^a of the first line has nothing to do with the enchainment of S's of the second and can only be found there by chance. Let us sharpen this fact to reduce by it the strangeness of the insistence that Freud puts in recommending us to tackle each new case as if we had acquired nothing from its first decipherings.

This in no way authorizes the psychoanalyst to have enough with knowing that he knows nothing, for what is at stake, is what he has to get to know about.

What he has to know about, can be traced out from the same relationship 'in reserve' according to which all logic worthy of the name operates. This does not mean anything in 'particular', but is articulated in (21) chains of letters so rigorous that provided not one of them is missed, the not-known is arranged as the framework of knowledge.

What is astonishing is that with this we find something – the transfinite numbers for example. What about them, before? I indicate here their relationship to the desire that gave them consistency. It is worth thinking about the adventure of a Cantor, an adventure that was not precisely cost free, to suggest the order, even if it, for its part, is not transfinite, in which the desire of the psychoanalyst is situated.

This situation accounts, inversely, for the apparent ease with which with which what must be called nonentities are installed in leading positions in existing societies. Understand me: what is important is not the way these nonentities adorn themselves (discourse on goodness?) for the outside, nor the discipline presupposed by the emptiness sustained within (it is not a matter of stupidity), it is that this nothingness (of knowledge) is recognized by everybody, an everyday object as one might say, for the subordinates and the common currency of their appreciation of Superiors.

The reason for it can be found in the confusion about zero, where people remain in a field where it is out of place Nobody in the *gradus* who

is concerned about teaching what distinguishes the void from the nothing, which nevertheless is not the same, – neither the reference trait for measurement, of the neutral element involved in the logical group, nor indeed that the nullity of incompetence, of the unheard naivety, from which things would fall into place.

It is to defend against this defect that I produced the internal eight and generally speaking the topology by which the subject is supported.

What must make a member of the School ready for such studies is the prevalence that you can grasp in the algorithm produced above, but which still remains even if it is ignored, the prevalence manifest everywhere: in psychoanalysis in extension as in that in intension, the prevalence of what I will call textual knowledge so as to oppose it to the referential notion that masks it.

It cannot be said that the psychoanalyst is an expert on all the objects that language not only proposes to knowledge, but has first given birth to in reality, the reality of interhuman exploitation. It would be worth more, but it is in fact rather limited.

Textual knowledge was not parasitical in having animated a logic from which to its surprise ours could learn a lesson (I am speaking of that of the Middle Ages) and it is not to its detriment that it was able to face up to (22) the relationship of the subject to Revelation.

It is not because the religious value of the latter has become indifferent to us, that its effect within the structure should be neglected. Psychoanalysis derives its consistency from Freud's texts – this is an irrefutable fact. We know what texts, from Shakespeare to Lewis Carroll, contribute to its genius and to its practitioners.

Here is the field in which it can be discerned who to admit to its study. It is the one from which the sophist and the Talmudist, the seller of tales and the *aede* have drawn the power, that at every instant we are more or less awkwardly salvaging for our use.

That a Levi-Strauss in his mythologies, gives it its scientific status, is something that facilitates us in making it a threshold for our selection.

Let us recall the guidance that my graph gives for analysis, and the articulation of desire in the agencies of the subject that can be extracted from it.

This to note the identity of the algorithm here specified, to what is connoted in the *Symposium* as *agalma*.

Where is it better said than Alcibiades does here, that the traps of transference love have no end but that of obtaining what he thinks Socrates is the ungrateful container of?

But who knows better than Socrates that he only holds the signification he engenders by retaining this nothing, which allows him to refer Alcibiades to the present addressee of his discourse, Agathon (as it happens): this to teach you that by being obsessed with what concerns you in the discourse of the psychoanalysand, you still have not got it.

But is that all, when here the psychoanalysand is identical to the *agalma*, the marvel that dazzles us, as third party in Alcibiades? Is this not the opportunity for us to see being isolated therein the pure aspect of the subject as free relationship to the signifier, the one from which the desire for knowledge as desire of the Other is to be isolated?

Like all these particular cases that make the Greek miracle, this one only presents us with the Pandora's box closed. Opened it is psychoanalysis, of which Alcibiades had no need of.

With what I have called here the endgame, we have – finally – come (23) to the core of our proposal this evening. The termination of psychoanalysis, superfluously called didactic, is in effect passage from psychoanalysand to psychoanalyst.

Our purpose is to pose an equation whose constant is the *agalma*. The psychoanalyst's desire is its enunciating which can operate only from the fact that it comes there in the position of the x:

of this very x whose solution delivers to the psychoanalysand his being and whose value is written (- phi), the gap that one designates as the function of the phallus to be separated out in the castration complex, or (o) for what obturates it with the object that is recognized in the approximated function of the pregenital relation. (It is this that the case of Alcibiades is

found to have cancelled out which it connoted by the mutilation of the Hermes.)

The structure thus abridged allows you to form an idea of what happens at the end of the transference relation, that is: when the desire that sustained the psychoanalysand in his operation is resolved, he no longer wants at the end to take up its option, that is the remainder which as the determinant of his division, makes it fall from his phantasy and destitutes him as subject.

Is this not the great secret that we psychoanalysts have to keep mum about, since we derive our self-sufficiency from it, when beatitude is being offered beyond by our forgetting it ourselves?

Would we not by announcing it, discourage those who might take it up? Subjective destitution is written on the entry ticket...? Is this not enough to provoke horror, indignation, panic, or even outrage, in any case to give a pretext for an objection in principle?

Simply to prohibit what is indispensable to our being, is to expose ourselves to a turn of fate that is a curse. What is refused in the symbolic, let us recall the Lacanian verdict on it, reappears in the real.

In the real of science which destitutes the subject very differently in our epoch, where only its most eminent supporters, Oppenheimer for example, are terrified by it.

This is where we give up on what makes us responsible, namely: the position in which I have fixed psychoanalysis in relation to science, that of extracting the truth that responds to it in terms whose quiet voice is allocated to us.

Under what pretext do we shelter this refusal, when it is well known (24) what insouciance protects both truth and subjects, and that promising the first to the second, is neither here nor there except for those who are already close to it. To speak of subjective destitution will never stop the innocent, whose only law is his desire.

We have no choice between confronting the truth or ridiculing our knowledge.

The dense shadow covering the linkage I am concerned with here, the one at which the psychoanalysand becomes a psychoanalyst, this is what our School can work at dissipating. I am no further advanced than you in this work that cannot be carried out alone, since psychoanalysis is the access to it.

I must restrict myself to a headline or two to precede it.

At the origin of psychoanalysis how can we not recall what one of our number, Mannoni, finally did, that the psychoanalyst is Fliess, namely the quack, the nose tickler, the man to whom the male-female principle is revealed in the numbers 21, 28, if you don't mind in short this knowledge, that the psychoanalysand, Freud the scientist, as the fastidious souls open to ecumenism put it, rejects with all the force of the oath that binds him to the programme of Helmholtz and his accomplices. The fact that this article was published in a review that barely allows the term: 'subject supposed to know' to appear otherwise than buried in the middle of a page, takes nothing from the price it can have for us.

In reminding us of the original analysis, he confronts us again with the dimension of mirage on which the position of the analyst is based and suggests to us that it is not certain that it will be reduced so long as a scientific critique has not been established in our discipline.

The title lends itself to the remark that the true original can only be the second, by constituting the repetition that makes the first into an act, for this is what introduces into it the after effect proper to logical time, which is marked by the fact that the psychoanalysand has become a psychoanalyst. (I mean Freud himself confirms there that he did not do a self-analysis.) I take the liberty moreover of reminding Mannoni that the scansion of logical time includes what I have called the moment of comprehending, precisely, (25) from the effect produced (let him take up again my sophism) by incomprehension, and that by dodging, in short, what constitutes the soul of his article he helps it to be comprehended inaccurately.

I remind you here that the run-of-the-mill people that we recruit on the basis of understanding their patients, are starting from a misunderstanding that in itself is not healthy.

A quick word now about where we are. With the hypomanic end of analysis, described by our friend Balint as the last word, make no mistake, of the psychoanalysand's identification to his guide, - we touch on the consequence of the refusal denounced above (a shady refusal: *Verleugnung?*), which no longer leaves anything but the refuge of the slogan, now adopted by the existing societies, of the alliance with the healthy part of the ego which resolves the passage to the analyst, by postulating in him at the outset this healthy part. What is the point then of his going through the experience?

Such is the position of the existing societies. It rejects our proposal as being beyond psychoanalysis.

The passage from psychoanalysand to psychoanalyst, has a door whose hinge is this remainder that constitutes their division, for this division is none other than that of the subject, of which this remainder is the cause.

In this change of tack where the subject sees capsizing the assurance he got from this phantasy in which each person's window onto the real is constituted, what is perceived, is that the grasp of desire is nothing but that of *désêtre* (lack of being).

In this *désêtre* the inessentiality of the subject supposed to know is unveiled, from which the psychoanalyst comes to dedicate himself to the *agalma* of the essence of desire, ready to pay for it by being reduced, himself and his name, to any signifier whatsoever.

For he has rejected the being that did not know the cause of his phantasy at the very moment at which he has finally become this supposed knowledge.

'Let him know from what I did not know about the being of desire, how things stand with him, having come to the being of knowledge, and let him efface himself.' *Sicut palea*, as St. Thomas said of his work at the end of his life, like manure.

In this way the being of desire rejoins the being of knowledge in (26) order to be reborn from it by their being knotted in a strip with a single edge on which a single lack is inscribed, the one that sustains the *agalma*.

Peace does not forthwith seal this metamorphosis in which the partner vanishes for being no more than vain knowledge of a being that slips away.

Here we touch upon the futility of the term liquidation for this hole in which alone the transference is resolved. Contrary to appearances, I see in it only the denegation of the analyst's desire.

For who, in perceiving the two partners operate like the two vanes of a rotating screen in my last lines, can fail to grasp that the transference has never been anything but the pivot of this alternation itself.

Thus from him who received the key to the world in the slit of the prepubescent, the psychoanalyst should no longer expect a look but sees himself become a voice.

And this other who, as a child, found his representative of representation in its irruption through the open newspaper behind which the dung heap of his progenitor's thoughts sheltered, refers to the psychoanalyst the anxiety effect when he tips over into his own excrement.

Thus the end of analysis contains in itself a naivety which raises the question of whether it should be taken as a guarantee in the passage to the desire to be a psychoanalyst.

From where then could a fair testimony on whoever goes through this *passé* to be expected, if not from another who, like him, still is in, this *passé*, namely in whom there is present at this moment the *désêtre* in which his psychoanalyst guards the essence of what has happened to him as a bereavement, knowing thereby, like any other in the function of didacticien, that for them too it will pass.

Who would be better able than this psychoanalysand in the *passé*, to authenticate therein what it has in terms of the depressive position? We are airing here nothing about which (if one is not in it) one can take on the air.

This is what I will shortly propose to you as the office to be entrusted for the demand to become an analyst of the School to some whom we will therein name '*passéurs*'.

Each one of them will have been chosen by an analyst of the School who can answer for the fact that they are in that *passé* or that they have

come back to it, in short still tied to the solution of their own personal experience.

It is to them that a psychoanalysand, in order to have himself (27) authorized as an analyst of the School, will talk about his analysis, and the testimony that they will be able to receive from the quick of their own past will be of a kind that no committee ever picks up. The decision of such a committee will therefore be illuminated by this, these witnesses of course not being judges.

No need to point out that this proposal implies an accumulation of experience, its compilation and elaboration, an organising of its varieties, a notation of its degrees.

That liberties can emerge from the closing of an experience, is due to the nature of after effect in *significance* [*signification+ jouissance?*] In any case this experience cannot be eluded. Its results must be communicated: first to the School for a critique, and correlatively made available to those societies which however excluded they have made us, are of no less concern to us.

The committee as it functions cannot therefore stand aloof from working on doctrine, over and above its function of selecting.

Before proposing to you a form for it, I want to indicate that in conformity with the topology of the projective plane, it is on the very horizon of psychoanalysis in extension, that there is knotted the internal circle that we trace out as the gap of psychoanalysis in intention.

I would like to centre this horizon, with three vanishing points of perspective, each one remarkable for belonging to one of the registers whose collusion in heterotopy constitutes our experience.

In the symbolic we have the oedipal myth.

Let us note in relation to the nucleus of the experience on which we have just insisted, what I shall technically call the facticity of this point. It stems in fact from a mythogeny, one of its constituents is as we know its redistribution. Now the Oedipus complex, because it is ectopic to it, (a characteristic emphasized by someone like Kroeber), poses a problem.

Opening it up would enable us to restore, even to relativise, its radicality in the experience.

I would like to illuminate the essential point simply by the fact that if you take away the Oedipus complex, psychoanalysis in extension, I might say, becomes entirely justiciable from president Schreber's delusion.

(28) Check out their correspondence point by point, which has certainly not been attenuated since Freud noted it in not rejecting the charge. But let us leave what my seminar on Schreber offered to those capable of hearing it.

There are other aspects of this point relative to our relationships to the outside, or more precisely with our extra-territoriality, an essential term in the *Ecrit*, that I hold to be a preface to this proposal.

Let us note the place that oedipal ideology holds in dispensing sociology in some way for a century, from taking sides as it should have done, on the value of the family of the existing family of the petit-bourgeois family in civilization, – that is in the society brought about by science. Do we benefit or not from what we unwittingly cover up there?

The second point is constituted by the existing type, whose facticity is this time obvious, of unit: a society of psychoanalysis, *qua* capped by an executive at the international level.

As we have said, this is how Freud wanted it, and the embarrassed smile by which he retracted the romanticism of the sort of clandestine Komintern to which he had initially given a free hand (cf Jones, quoted in my *Ecrit*) only underlines this all the more.

The nature of these societies and the methods to which they comply is illuminated by Freud's promotion of the Church and the Army as models of what he conceives as being the structure of the group. (It is by this term in fact that the *Masse* of *Massenpsychologie* should be translated today).

The effect induced by the structure privileged in this way is further illuminated by adding to it the function in the Church and in the Army of the subject supposed to know. A study for whoever would like to undertake it: it would go far.

Staying with the Freudian model, the favour that imaginary identifications receive from it appear in a striking manner, as does the reason that binds psychoanalysis in intension by limiting its consideration, even its import, to that. One of my best students has very clearly transposed its outline onto the Oedipus complex itself by defining the function of the ideal Father. This tendency, as they say, is responsible for relegating to the previously defined point on the horizon what can be qualified as Oedipal in the experience.

(29) The third facticity, real, all too real, real enough for the real to be more prudish than the tongue in promoting it, is what the term concentration camp renders speakable, about which it seems our thinkers, in wandering from humanism to terror, have not concentrated enough.

Let me abbreviate by saying that what we have seen emerge from this, to our horror, represents the reaction of precursors as compared with what will go on developing as the consequence of reshaping social groups by science, and especially of the universalisation it introduces into them.

Our future as common markets will be balanced by an increasingly hardline extension of judicial acts of segregation.

Is it necessary to attribute to Freud the wish, given his introduction from birth to the age-old model of this process, to secure in his group the privilege of universal buoyancy that the two above-named institutions benefit from? It is not unthinkable.

Be that as it may, this recourse does not make it any easier for the desire of the psychoanalyst to situate itself in this conjuncture. Let us recall that if the I.P.A. of Mitteleuropa demonstrated its pre-adaptation to this ordeal in not losing a single one of its members in the said camps, it owed to this feat of strength seeing there being produced after the war a rush, which was not without its underpinning of forcing (one hundred mediocre psychoanalysts, let us remember), of candidates in whose mind the motive of seeking shelter against the red tide, a phantasy of the time, was not absent.

Let 'co-existence', which might well be illuminated by a transference, not make us forget a phenomenon which is one of our

geographical co-ordinates, make no mistake and whose splutterings about racism rather mask its import.

The end of this document specifies the method in which there can be introduced what only tends in opening up an experiment, to finally make the assurances sought for genuine.

They are left here undivided in the hands of those who have gone through the mill.

Let us not forget however that they are the ones who have suffered the most from the ordeals undertaken in the debate with the existing organization.

What the style and the ends of this organization owe to the blackout imposed on the function of the didactic analysis, is obvious as soon as a look at them is allowed: hence the isolation with which it protects itself.

The objections that our proposal has encountered, does not stem in our School from such an organic fear.

The fact that they are expressed in a justifiable theme already mobilises self-criticism. The verification of ability, calling for fairer titles, is no longer ineffable. It is by such a trial that authority makes itself recognized.

Let the assembly of technicians know that it is not a question of contesting authority, but of removing it from fiction.

The *Ecole Freudienne* cannot fall into the humourless toughness of a psychoanalyst whom I met on my last trip to the U.S.A.: 'the reason why I never attack the established forms, he told me, is that they assure me without any problem of a routine I am comfortable with'.

J. L.