

Journées of the Ecole Freudienne de Paris
12/13 April 1975
Lettres de L'Ecole Freudienne de Paris, 18, 1976.

Plenary session Saturday afternoon

(The session opened at 17 hours with M. Martin as chair)

Pierre Martin: These study days on the cartels of the School were not uniquely designed to gather together the large numbers who are here; their project was also to allow and even to stimulate a debate on the function of cartels in the School as such.

It is in effect interesting, sometimes even a little bit disturbing, to note how these cartels are constituted most of the time.

The cartel, in the perspective of the Freudian school, is not a meeting of people who simply want to meet to exchange ideas, still less is it a locus for direct or magisterial teaching, in a small group.

What the cartel is concerned with is to be found very explicitly and in a very clear fashion in the founding act of the school in 1964 eleven years ago. What we want to encourage among you, is in some way to resurrect a text and its implications which remain, we have to admit, completely under a veil.

A cartel, says the text, is first of all the condition for admission to the School; it says so in the following terms:

‘Those who come to this School will commit themselves to fulfilling a task submitted to both internal and external supervision. In exchange they are assured that nothing will be spared so that everything valuable they do will have the repercussions it deserves, and in the appropriate place. For the execution of the work, we shall adopt the principle of an elaboration supported in a small group. Each of these (we have a name to designate these groups) will be composed of three people at least, of five at most, four is the right measure. ‘PLUS-ONE’ charged with the selection, with the discussion and with the outcome to be reserved to the work of each.’

I am reading here a passage that I will complete with 2 or 3 others; but why the devil should I have to read it for you?

Everyone is supposed to have the directory of the School; even if it dates from 1971 it includes the founding act. Now it’s a fact that it is not in this spirit, I believe, or rather in this form that most of the cartels that I know about are made up and work. The EFP – says Lacan – in his intention, represents :

‘a body where a work is to be accomplished – which, in the field Freud has opened up, restores the cutting ploughshare of its truth – which brings the original praxis that he instituted under the name of psychoanalysis back to the duty that that is incumbent on it in our world – which, by an assiduous criticism, exposes the deviations and compromises that deaden its progress by degrading its use

To these three perspectives there correspond in the act the creation of three sections one of pure psychoanalysis the other of applied psychoanalysis and the third of reviewing the Freudian field each one accompanied by directors of the section who are charged with collecting the work that has been done, and to look after the most effective ways to support the effects of their attraction and therefore to also assure exchanges between the cartels something which, I think everyone will agree is not very widespread.

Our meeting today to be sure has that as its initial goal, but then we must try to discuss how this can be done. And to end, before the debate opens and everyone can express themselves I want to say two things. The first is that tomorrow there will be another room opened next door to this one tomorrow morning where precisely those who want to have a discussion on the theme of what is a cartel and how it can function in the perspectives that are opened up by the founding act can meet.

The second is that after a lot of discussion with colleagues, people who are part of a cartel I decided to pose them, like that, the following question: What place have you given in the creation and the organisation of your working group to this little word: 'plus-one'? It is not a matter of *un en plus* (an extra one), of three 'plus-one' equals four, or four 'plus-one' equals five, it is: *plus une*; there is something here that was, I am convinced, put in that way to give rise to a whole problematic; it being understood, as is said in the text (I don't want to be boring you with readings from this text, all you have to do is to read it) it being understood that any fiefdom and any direction in the sense of a magisterial attitude of one of the elements of a cartel is excluded from the start.

This having been said, it would be a good thing now that some of you as many as possible should let us know what they understand by a cartel taking as a starting point of course what themselves have constituted, if they have constituted something, and that on the other hand, they do not forget to respond to this question of the 'plus-one'.

But don't expect that I will be able to give you in a clear cut way a definition of the 'plus-one'. This is precisely what is necessary to be a basis to support the discussion and your interventions.

Jacques Lacan: Martin was quite right to intervene on this point.

I mean that this 'plus-one' would have deserved a better fate since to the best of my knowledge it does not seem that this thing which truly, I don't want to be boasting about having anticipated in that something that I am trying to articulate in the form of the Borromean knot. One cannot fail to recognise in this 'plus-one' the something which I obviously did not tell you the last time because I do not always manage in a Seminar to say everything that I have contributed but anyway which is to be referred strictly to what I would write as $X+1$ it is very precisely what defined the Borromean knot, starting from the fact that it is by withdrawing this 1, which in the Borromean knot is any one whatsoever, that one obtains from it a complete individualisation, namely, that what remains – namely, in terms of the X question – there remains only the one by one.

The question that Martin in fact is posing, is to give an opinion on that which – I am not saying that you are really interested in it up to the moment but that is not a reason that we should not be able to get some response from you – how can we conceive this one, this one which is found to be always possible as knotting the whole individual chain?

To be sure I have said things about what Martin has just evoked, namely,, the '*un en plus*'. I had only tackled it at the time in the form of what constitutes properly speaking the subject, which is always a '*un en plus*'. I would like that anyone who wants would speak up since it is certain that I can't question each one and transform that into an obligatory response. At least let the people who want speak up on this theme, namely, in short what is evoked for him, what is suggested to him by this 'person' that I am careful in a way to isolate from the group, but which does not mean for all that that it cannot be just anyone whatsoever.

It is certain that the cartel is only making its way in the School little by little, people have made groups, seminars; what constitutes the proper life of a cartel has really the closest relationship with what I am trying to articulate at the moment in the seminar.

For my part, I know what I wanted to get in terms of a functioning of the cartels; if I gave it this limited range in saying that three to five which therefore gives a maximum of six; there must have been a reason for that. After all it is not a riddle.

That should normally suggest at least to some people, to those who are most experienced, a response, it is not at all the case that I am sure of it, but anyway there is something contained in this word: cartel, which already by itself evokes four, namely, three 'plus-one', it is all the same what I considered as allowing there to be elucidated its functioning, and that we can go as far as six, it is first of all necessary that the thing should be put to the test; I use the word cartel but in reality it is the word *Cardo* which is behind namely, the word hinge, I have put forward this word *Cardo*, but of course trusting each one to see what it meant. I finally prefer the word cartel because at the same time it was a specification and that the illustration that I gave of it just now by speaking about a minimum of three 'plus-one' might have allowed us to expect the more effective operation and to ensure not alone that there are more but that there are some who play their role not simply in one of the sections that I anticipated and which are also three, it would be worthwhile noticing that in making three sections that also implies a 'plus-one' namely, a fourth.

That means that the School has perhaps not really yet begun to function. We could say that why not?

So that now I am waiting that someone should declare if they would not mind I would be personally very grateful that someone should declare how, however little he has thought about it – after all, there are perhaps some people who have read the founding act – however little they have thought about it, this 'plus-one'

is for him, let us say interpretable. Can be interpreted, of course, in function of my teaching.

Colette Soler, you whom I heard speaking earlier and who gave me so much pleasure why have you never thought about this?

Colette Soler: I have thought about it.

Jacques Lacan: You have thought about it, so then tell us what you have thought.

Colette Soler: I say that I have thought about but that I haven't for all that very much to say about it because in the cartel that I worked we started as four. At the start I would have said that it was what you would call a group; we are now five, but the question that I have asked myself is whether in fact the 'plus-one' should be necessarily a person, on the one hand and then necessarily who is there in my opinion in our cartel the element which made the connection was perhaps the idea that we were attached to the School by means of the cartel or perhaps to your name, I don't know. But I don't see at the level of a person who had a role in the group there of the 'plus-one'.

Maurice Alfandari: What the 'plus-one' reminds me of as regards the cartel was a clinical cartel (I don't know what to call it exactly but that's what we called it). The 'plus-one' in effect I would agree with what has been said did not represent a person. But now that I am thinking about it again I have the impression that it represented a kind of empty space, a function that was interchangeable and which allowed something to happen, that in any case as far as I was concerned I was not able to do alone, it was impossible for me.....what I was trying to do was something I couldn't do alone.

I don't know what to call it but it is by this group (there are five of us I think) that I understand like that the 'plus something' is a place that is empty and which makes the functioning of the group possible and what is being elaborated in it, but without one necessarily being able to see or to pick out when this have been produced because there are alternations there commutations of things like that.

Jacques Lacan: What is it that fulfils this role according to you, in your group?

Maurice Alfandari: I don't know. I think it is because I don't know that it functions.

Jacques Lacan: Yeah... (laughter). Because you have pinpointed this group with the name of a clinical cartel....is it the clinic, is it for example your common experience that plays the knotting role there?

MA: Yes probably, but what I think, that is how I understand the 'plus-one' that you are talking about – the fact is that I and I think the others also in the elaboration of what we are doing, of what we are trying to do I think that it would be impossible if there was not someone (but that does not designate a person) who alternatively fulfils the function of the 'plus-one'. I would be inclined to say:

the function of the absent, a function fulfilled alternately by one or other person I think.

JL: Can the function of this absent be fulfilled by someone who, is absent that day for example?

MA: Yes I think so.

JL: So then what is the relationship, have you thought about this, what is the relationship of the one who is absent that day with what I evoked just now as a suggestion, a passing suggestion, what is the relationship of this absent person with what we could call here the object inasmuch as the clinic defines it?

MA: It is precisely perhaps because he is absent that something is possible.

JL: The suggestion, wherever it has come from, the suggestion of the function of the absent, it is in your statement that it has emerged, is that not so, the function of the absent that one can say is momentarily absent, absent from a meeting of the cartel, it is never in vain that someone is absent, one always tries to give some import to absence in analysis we're used to doing that. Think about it, is it a possible support for this "plus-one" person' of whom I indicated not the absence but precisely the presence, because there is no trace of a signal by absence in my "plus-one" of the text, but why not question oneself about this; there is perhaps a certain angle from which this person can be focussed in the absent person, your experience of a cartel may suggest some answer to you on this point. Let us leave the gentleman some time to think about it.

Pierre Kahn: The experience that I want to talk about is the following: the experience of a cartel that is not clinical but a so-called theoretical formation, namely, reading of texts. This cartel functioned from the point of view of number, in what was recalled by Martin and from the point of view of its way of working. I think that one of the things that dominated was the taking into consideration of something that you said in your seminar on the technical writings, namely, that to give a commentary on an analytic text is like doing an analysis, and even though the participants in this cartel had not agreed as regards the sense to be given to this formulation, it was present in their minds, each one in his own way, certainly. So then what does that mean with respect to the question posed by the 'plus-one'? I would like to point out right away that there was no 'plus-one' in the sense of an extra person.

There wasn't one there present but imaginarily there was one present. I don't want to speak in my colleagues' place, but as far as I was concerned, this extra person, was there in different ways, on different occasions, this could be – all honour to every Lord – yourself sometimes, that could be the analyst with whom I am in supervision, that could be my analyst, that could be one of my patients, I think that I can say that there was always imaginarily speaking a 'plus-one'.

JL: Was it a 'plus-one' that changed as one might say; I mean: Was it a different 'plus-one' in the declarations of each one? Namely, that, since it was a seminar that you yourself have pinpointed as theoretical formation, did the discourse of

each one bring about in turn the different 'plus-one'? A person describable as a 'plus-one' person different each time since you have evoked for example as regards your own experience, of which after all you can bear witness, since you, you knew the person that you had in your head, you enumerated a certain number of them, that there was from time to time Freud, since it was a matter of theoretical formation, you didn't name him, of course, I understand, your supervisor also or some other person, did you have the feeling that in the discourse of the others it was the same? I would say that the discourse of the others turned around a pivot that was not present, is it in this form that the 'plus-one' in question presented itself?

PK: Yes, I can say yes, perhaps hastily, because I am talking in their place, it seemed to me, evident in the structure that was set up. But what I would like to add is the following, that's why I am saying that it appeared obvious, it is because the people who were there, present, were striving for the following: the fact is that in this work of reading and of commentary in the sense that I recalled earlier, they strove to reach what one could call in taking up your expression a full word, and consequently it is quite evident that beyond the physically present interlocutors with whom they were discussing, they were addressing themselves to someone. This work therefore was carried out with something which it seems to me, was able to measure things on the one hand, the fact is that the people who were there, did not hide too much what was implied in their subjective position with respect to the text that they were studying. Whether it was one of your texts or a text of Freud since you named him earlier.

The question that I am posing after what Martin set out earlier is the following, this work which was satisfying for me, what difference would have been introduced into it if the 'plus-one' which was there imaginarily had been not an imaginary person but a real person. Without being able to advance very far on this I want simply to express my conviction that there would certainly have been an influence on the work if the person 'plus-one' had been something other than the imaginary person that each one put there, certainly. Different from the point of view of the close examination of what was the objective aimed at in this work and that I called in a useful way earlier to reach, with all the babbling that that involves a full word.

JL: Alfandari, tell me what does what Pierre Kahn has said suggest to you? Perhaps you have thought about the effective functioning of the cartel, that seems to me to be an absolutely key point to give what I might say an analytic style to the meetings of a cartel, because this 'plus-one' is always realised, there is always someone who in the group, at least for a moment, it's already a good thing when the ball is passed, that at least for a moment one holds the ball and in a group, especially group like that, habitually, make no mistake, it is a habitus, habitually it is always the same person and this is what people resolve on without measuring the consequences of it, I mean that everyone is very happy that there is one who acts as what we currently call the leader, the one who leads, the Fuhrer.

MA: What Kahn said evokes a little what I felt in the group. It seems to me that in a cartel there are two dangers: the one being not having enough things in

common for it to hold up and the other which is a kind of imaginary effect, of the group that blocks everything. But I am just saying that now, I had not really thought about it before, as it happens this group is a clinical group but the same persons of this clinical group met in another group that wasn't at all clinical, which was centred on the study of something else mathematics....

JL: You were what? You were already a group who knew something about mathematics as I might say? Because it's true, you have to have put your finger on it to know what it is, I mean to have at least a sketchy formation in mathematics. Mathematical formation is very special it's very specific.

MA: It's very difficult to answer about the degree of knowledge we had; I think that one of us was rather advanced, more than the rest of us; and then there was our teacher who was mile ahead, our teacher was someone who was able to lead us along this way, this group has lasted now for about 2 year. Therefore it was the same people more or less in this theoretical mathematical group and in this clinical group. The one that I am thinking about is the clinical group where I think the effects are not, they can't be located all that easily, but perhaps they can be situated by the fact that for me, for example it was not possible to bring things to a certain degree of elaboration outside this group. It would have been impossible for me, but I don't know at what moment: this is the function in effect of the group.

JL: When mathematicians get together, there is incontestably this 'plus-one'. Namely, that it is quite striking that the mathematicians, I could say, they don't know what they're talking about, but they know who they are talking about, they are talking about mathematics as if it were a person. One might say up to a certain point that what I might call my wish was the functioning of groups that would function like any group of mathematicians function.

Michel Fennetaux: I would like to give my opinion because I am working in the same group as the one Alfandari has been talking about. To tell the truth I have never asked myself a question about the 'plus-one' but I can say what that makes me think about since the question has come up.

JL: That makes you think of what?

MF: The 'plus-one' is on the one hand the effect of the group, namely, that, as Alfandari said earlier, the fact of a certain number of people meeting periodically allows, has allowed me, to deepen them or to be able formulate a certain number of things about my experience that I would never have done alone. The second sense that I now see for this 'plus-one' is that effectively I think that in this group one of us often assumes, probably because of his longer experience, this position of leader that was spoken about earlier. Finally there's a third sense; it would be rather to talk about '*moins une*' than a 'plus-one' that we should be talking about in the following way: we find ourselves with people who have sort of a trusting relationship with one another and who because of this can talk, as Kahn did earlier, by involving themselves pretty far in what is their relationship to their practice, this *moins une* is fundamentally the absence of the supervisor, namely, the absence of this dazzling effect which operates in the bigger groups

animated by people whose name is known in the School and in which the problem of recognition operates much more than in a small group. In a small group like a cartel the demand for recognition by the others is in large measure cancelled out. That is why the third sense of the 'plus-one' is rather the minus one that I would say.

Laurence Bataille: I worked in a lot of groups that were precisely not cartels, and I think that this person who has let us say a different status who is not altogether a fellow, is always incarnated in one of the people in the group, but I don't have the impression that it is a leader, I have the impression that there is one person of the group, that it's to that person that one addresses oneself, that it is to him that one bears witness of something and one expects effectively a type of approbation, that's true; but in fact that doesn't play the sort of role that it should play to produce, namely, that groups always end – I mean I say always... – one has the impression that that always finishes up like dishwater – then the *en plus* changes because one expects it from someone else. I also experience that faith, in a quiet obvious way and when I spoke in one of the groups because I had the impression that they too that they addressed themselves to one person in particular who was not the same for all, it seems that I was dreaming and imagined that they were always looking towards the same person when they were speaking. I should say that all of a sudden we're going to make a group and we have said we could make this *en plus* work but requiring at the end of each meeting people to write out what was the key point, even if it was only a sentence and that that would play perhaps the role as a witness as one might say and which would perhaps push things on so that the work advances and is not diluted in these kind of little ideas that have no consequence. I don't know whether this will play this role because we're supposed to meet next Monday for the first time.

JL: Thank you.

Sol Rabinovitch: What I wanted to say about the cartel in which I have worked is that there were 5 of us and that there were 5 who never missed. There was a sixth who missed very often and what is more who changed, that is that at the beginning it was one person and afterwards it was another person who was always missing. What I wanted to say especially is that this did not seem to be the function of *un en plus* but on the contrary the function of the 'plus-one' seemed to be sustained by precisely the people present and who never missed in this group in this cartel namely, like a function that would be like a blind point, a function of miscognition, there is always at a given moment someone, of course it is not always the same, it's always someone who is there who says, I understand nothing, this is of no use, we're not producing anything.....

JL: That's the 'plus-one'...? The one who doesn't understand anything? Why not (laughter).

SR: It's something like that but I specified that it's a perfectly interchangeable function; it's a role that is displaced. This has to be articulated to the fact that the work of a cartel is a work which is analytic therefore in which there is transference; that's all I wanted to say.

Alain Didier Weill: An idea has come to me about this 'plus-one', about this questioning: why have the different cartels in which I have participated not ended up with what we thought we had a right to expect at the beginning? Let us take for example a cartel where we're doing a commentary on a text: we could say that what unites us in such a case is that one is situated in a metonymical context and that in this context one has to support the word of an Other, Freud, Lacan. In this metonymical context what is going to happen to the speaking being? For the first time, it appears to me that perhaps the 'plus-one' would perhaps be someone who would have something to do with the passeur: the 'plus-one' could be the locus in which there is in schema L the \$ namely, the testimony of a possible breaking through of the o – o' axis, of a possible breakthrough that goes from o to the \$. In other words if the 'plus-one' occupies this place of the \$, it would certainly not be a subject who is supposed to know, but a subject who would bear witness that something has got through, that the message has got through, that there was some metaphorisation, that has been picked up, beyond what one receives as the acceptable (of these received ideas that Flaubert put into his dictionaries about smart ideas), the burning point from which this metonymical context has sprung from an inaugural metaphorical text.

Juan David Nasio: I will start from the experience of two cartels that I participated in, different experiences, but in any case, concerning the questions about the 'plus-one', this 'plus-one' is always present in both cases.

JL: He is always present but always unrecognised. And that is why I wanted to suggest by this little text; it is that the analysts can notice it; it is always unrecognised because it is all the same not the Other of the Other, this 'plus-one' is always present in some forms or other that can be absolutely incarnated, the case of the leader is manifest but analysts can notice that in a group there is always a 'plus-one' and adjust their attention to that.

JDN: I don't know whether you would agree with finding a support in one of the best known Lacanian formulae namely, that the desire of man is the desire of the Other. The 'plus-one', is the one who supports in the group the desire of the other. The support of desire which can be done in a thousand ways, by speaking, by remaining silent, by loaning one's house so that it can happen there, etc. There are a thousand ways of being this 'plus-one'. But there is another way to notice it. By reflecting on it I am thinking about the content the content of the cartel, namely, I think about the knowledge of the analyst. The knowledge of the analyst, if the hypothesis that this is what is in operation in a cartel is valid – I am talking about cartels of analysts – because we must not forget that there are also cartels where there are no analysts, the knowledge of the analyst is a shared knowledge but not a knowledge to be exchanged. I think that it is one of our formulae, this idea of sharing refers to the fact that there are not just analysts, that is how I would connect up – I don't know whether Alain Didier would agree – his idea of metonymy. I would prefer to speak about a serial sequence; with respect to an analyst there will always be another, a 'plus-one'. If there are two there will always be a third. At that point there would be four. In short there will always be someone who is present as an extra, and this presence there precisely I

would posit it as being that of the one who in the work of the group supports the desire, the desire of the other.

Jacques Donnefort: I would like to take as an example what has happened in a group that has been working for two years. At the start of the year this year an extra person came into the group and we proposed to tell him in some sort of way what had been elaborated in this group for the two previous years and we found ourselves very annoyed at this fact of having to give an account of it. Then a reflection of this kind came to us: 'It's perhaps just as difficult as if we were trying to talk there about our own analysis'. I'm saying that because effectively that made us think in a certain way about the pass, curiously it had as affect – this person who came as an extra, not at all that she was the 'plus-one' but anyway she took up this function because of what was happening at that time in the group – it had a remarkable effect, which is that little by little in the group in what was becoming a cartel it seems to me, people started talking about their analysis about their own analysis and taking, eventually to exemplify something but which was said on a more or less theoretical plane – it's a group which had come together about the drive, to exemplify in a certain way starting from what may have happened at the level of one's own analysis. It is in that sense that I connect up a little bit about what was said about the function of the passeur and in a certain way also about the presence of the analyst, that in this group we found ourselves in the position of analyser.

Colette Soler: I would like to say something else: basically I would make the hypothesis that if there is always a 'plus-one' it is perhaps important for him not to be incarnated in the group. Because when he is incarnated in the group effectively that functions in the form of having a leader with all the....

JL: It's not sure that it is always so simple...

CS: I thought about that starting from the cartel that I was in; I often asked myself the question as to who fundamentally in the group was the leader and I never succeeded in answering it. Namely, that I don't really believe that there was one person who held this position but on the contrary that there was a reference and I said earlier that it was placed in terms of your name; I said name precisely to indicate if you wish that that is why I believe it works because a name fundamentally does not reply, and that is what allows things to work.

George Botvinik: It's just to take up the reflections people are effectively opposing the 'plus-one' which would be incarnated with the problem of the leader; it seems to me that that is insisting as a difficulty for people, for me also. On the other hand the 'plus-one' that would be a name or I would even say a word namely, a common element of the discourse around which the group precisely gathers to work; in fact a group is formed around a word a theme finally it's a word that precisely does not reply; it will never reply it will never speak up 'I', the 'plus-one' that evokes for me something like that the surplus enjoying. There's a question that appears to me to be fundamental and which has not been posed, it is the question of work. I don't want to get into that problem. I heard the expression: 'We must produce'. It does not seem to me that in order to resolve this question of the *un en plus*, whatever it may be moreover whether it is

incarnated or not incarnated without interrogating oneself on the problem of work of why one is working with the relation that that has to desire and to enjoyment. These are just remarks.

Guy Laval: I would like to talk about a cartel that exists for a very short time which came from seminar by Clavreul, I mean which emerged from it which shows that there was a necessity starting from a certain moment. The seminar was being carried on like that and it was coming more and more apart it wasn't holding together and one could see finally at a certain moment there was a necessity to constitute something else; that got the name of cartel, and what concerns me personally. I would like to work in a cartel and the first necessity which was imposed on me is I would not call that the 'plus-one', but it seems to me that it is something of that order, the first necessity is to have in the cartel, a person on whom I can lean in order to speak. This was for me perhaps the first function of the 'plus-one' but Clavreul took the ground from under me by designating me as the person responsible for the cartel, the person responsible and not the leader, he was quite clear since it was a matter of a cartel on the preliminary conversations and that I had presented something on it. Having been designated all of a sudden I no longer had this support that I had need for in a cartel. But that does not mean that there is not a certain necessity which remains precisely and it seems to me that this necessity flowed from the malaise that we all experience before the unwinding one might say of the discourse lately in this seminar.

The first meetings of the cartel on the preliminary conversations continued this unravelling a little, moreover, it was as if there was a certain consequence of this necessity and the first name that one can give to this necessity is the necessity of formulation, I think. As it happens in a cartel people speak together because it's easier, there are fewer people, people begin to speak more easily but that can end up with nothing it can end up with the fact that it's a meeting of pals, that we like one another and we can talk together, but it seems that the first necessity and this also would perhaps be of the order of the 'plus-one' is a necessity of formulation, a formulation which can be written, a formulation which can be transmitted for example to a different cartel. Moreover we spoke about this, which can be transmitted to the big group which perhaps because of that can be reconstituted from time to time, and it seems to me that this goes a little further towards something that I don't know very well how to articulate, but that you have called the matheme. Namely, that it seems to me that it's very easy for a cartel to constitute a kind of little esoteric group finally which takes nothing into account, which doesn't have to render an account for anything. It seems to me that what you have articulated as the matheme may also account for this necessity of the 'plus-one' in a cartel.

Roudi Gerber: I'd like to bring an analogy that I take from mountain climbing: when you have three grips you can remain on these three grips in order finally to be worn out and die. The fourth grip allows you to pass and requires you to pass, namely, that once there is a fourth grip one is obliged to go beyond and I wonder if the 'plus-one' is not the one of whom the cartel demands the power to bear witness to this passage.

JL: I am here for a very precise function, it might be this thing that I wrote and which of course no one has yet noticed, because it is never anything more than a scribbling: to put it in some way onto what you represent in terms of a public square, and to get you interested in it as I might say. By that I mean that after all the idea may perhaps come to you already that it is a question. It is a question to be sure that I am only posing because I have the answer to it and I will try to tell you it in what comes subsequently; I mean as quickly as possible to be sure. I do not have all that number of seminars ahead of me this year; therefore I am going to try to do it but I don't think it's a bad thing that the question should be presented in the School because that can be considered as what I wanted to make of it by this text as something altogether nodal for the formation of a small group, the fact that it is small is altogether essential, it is essential for its functioning; if I said that it can't go beyond six, it's for the best of reasons, it is for theoretical reasons that are very profound. Taking on a very large group involves in itself such limitations, this is what I think at least, that there is not much to be expected from it in terms of the real progress on the effects of analysis. This is what inspired me when I produced this founding act and to which after all I have no reason for thinking that you should be in principle resisting, I absolutely cannot see what could justify this resistance, especially if what I was trying to get from a certain number that I all think as well, what I tried to get from a certain number: to put it on the agenda.

There will be another meeting tomorrow morning which will continue this one.

(The session closes).

Group meeting Sunday morning On the 'plus-one' (continued)

Jacques Lacan: I am very interested, interested more than anything by what was started yesterday around the function of the cartels and I would be grateful to anyone who would like to relaunch what we have been saying.

Juan David Nasio: My function today is limited to co-ordinating this group on the function of cartels. I will simply recall that the definition of the cartel, in the founding act, involves certain characteristics:

1. The cartel is the locus for engaging in the Freudian school;
2. The cartel should support a work of elaboration, a production, that as a critical work concerns in my opinion the knowledge of the analyst on the one hand and analytic experience itself;
3. Finally, the cartel has a well defined structure.

It was this final aspect that was particularly discussed yesterday. From this structure what was distinguished first of all is that the 'plus-one' person who composes the cartel is indeed a person present and unknown.

JL: We all the same suggested that this person, who is in a way a sort of an echo of the group exists in any functioning of the group, except that the person does not think about it, and that it would be appropriate for analysts not to overlook him, because it appears that that starts very early. *Tres faciunt ecclesiam* says the wisdom of the nations, and this takes us very far; why is there this emergence of the three?

What I would like is to have like yesterday some replies some responses which testify that all the same, there are some people who have thought about it. There is someone called Pierre Kahn, for example, who intervened yesterday and who was good enough to drive me home after this little session and who, in this short time, proved to me that he sees very clearly the relationship this has with analysis. That makes at least one person.

JDN: I prefer to allow you to speak.

Huguette Menard: These are some reflections since the meeting last night. To participate in a cartel is to be engaged in a work, a production after all a surplus value, why not an enjoyment, an ephemeral enjoyment? The time, we take as a witness as was said last night a person, the analyst, the supervisor, a pal who is supposed to know something more about psychoanalysis. He's put into the position of the leader, but before long we realise the illusion that we have to get over him. Nevertheless, to be engaged in a cartel is a moment, a pivot, a switching. For some time now a patient repeats to me: 'I must join a cartel', adding: 'But it is nicer to continue to dream about my life' I would add: the hard desire to sleep is sweet. The work in a cartel is a kind of maieutics, it continues a kind of after effect of the work of analysis first of all and then of practice. It is the

same dialectic process. How can you try to become an analyst without participating in a cartel? It is an implacable necessity. Moreover this is what is said and written in the founding act of the School. A work which for my part evokes that of the Danaïdes: trying to fill the void, the lack. So then a question on the 'plus-one'. Is it the absent presence of death which throws us into this linguistic incantation? But be careful! It is not enough to just say the words, to speak, as they say without rhyme or reason. A work can only be a production, that of a writing which one presents and in which one exposes oneself.

Jose Guey: I would first like to say what I wasn't able to say last night, it's not just an illusion in the air. I would add that as far as I am concerned at the congress of Montpellier I have prepared a paper on the question. At that time as regards the 'plus-one' person, I could say nothing, but what struck me in the founding act and what I was trying to articulate something about was what is written about the 'veritable work transference'. You wrote in this text that it is only along the paths of a work transference that there can be transmitted from one subject to another the teaching of psychoanalysis, and yesterday in the discussion, it seemed to me that we were turning on several occasions around what HM has just recalled, namely, this subject supposed to know.

I will refer to our cartel at Marseille, which is in fact more specifically a meeting of the cartels that had been started by Zlatine: I mention him because he was the one who organised it and it has to be said that at the start he's the one who appeared as the one who was supposed to know, who was supposed to know more about it than the others. There is a rule in this cartel, which is to produce a work, namely, that it is not a question as others have spoken about of an easy-going discussion, but which just as people in the School are engaged in a work, the members of this meeting of cartels, not all being moreover members of the school, accept this rule which is to produce a work. And this leads to the production of written work, which is certainly not unimportant. This rule which regulates our meetings ends up with the exchange of a certain number of texts. And indeed what is involved is a dialectical experience of discourse, starting from texts which have been agreed on in advance, namely, texts by Freud or by Lacan and commentaries which are therefore produced. One could say that following this work there is a progress. I would like to point out here that there are a succession of different statements as regards the stating subjects but also as regards the statements which have been put together for the last 5 years. That implies also resistance effects, and that is why I mentioned my work at Montpellier, a work that I had edited and communicated to the members of the cartel, but I did not communicate it to the School, because of the mistaken belief that it interested nobody, and on the other hand that my formulation of it was still inadequate.

Pierre Martin: In order simply to relaunch the discussion, I would like to recall what struck me personally in reading the founding act. It's the figure 3. Yesterday I put the stress on the 'plus-one' person. I want to underline today what I repeat has held my attention for some time it's the figure 3 in this founding act. In the second paragraph which proposes to mark one could say almost to hammer out the framework in which the work of the Freudian School is to be accomplished, the author makes three propositions. I quoted them for you yesterday. These

propositions are followed by the organisation of three sections. Each of these sections comprises three subsections. And I will say to conclude, to conclude what I want to say now, but in no way to conclude anything whatsoever about what these preoccupations give rise to, that at the centre of this figure 3 what holds my attention is the 'plus-one'.

Nicole Levy: There is something that makes me uncomfortable and that I would like to mention, like a kind of misuse, like a distortion when in talking about the *plus un* people now talk about it as a *plus une*. To be sure, this could indeed mean 'plus-one' person, but I ask myself if that is what was in question, whether it was a matter of a person, as one might say plus un member of the group, and I posed the question as to whether this plus un only function for us as a signifier. In this connection, I thought that in the seminar on the four fundamental concepts of psychoanalysis, Lacan, from the opening, introduced an other in the form of 'I do not seek, I find', which presides in a way at the establishment of the four fundamental concepts. And what he named there as a discovery, what he refers to there, could it not be understood in the same register as this 'plus-one', namely, as something of the order of a signifier? One might say a signifier which founds desire, in the same way as one could recall that this 'plus-one' is written ever since and in the founding act.

Gennie Lemoine: I would like to bear witness to the work which has been done in our seminar since the meeting at Montpellier. We found quite naturally the path which led to Martin's 3. When this seminar was announced there was a crowd and we tried in it to do analytic work. The first intervention was to make a smaller group by moving it so that only the people concerned could come there. It was the Tuesday group, in which there was finally constituted after three years of work, what might begin to look like a cartel.

Right away, in one of the four person cartels, it was said that each person came to talk about his analysis and that therefore this work could not be brought to the plenary session. But it was also said that it was precisely the work of the cartel to arrive at the point that no one exposed himself any more or no longer had this feeling of risking his life each time he spoke about his own analysis, because he reaches a certain level of theory which becomes precisely this third terms which means that the cartel work allows each one to pass to the other side, or perhaps one might say to confront castration without risking death. This is the analytic work of our cartels, to manage to take a certain step and to do analytic work. So that this third term appears to me to be quite simply an analyst. Our work had been to transform these groups into cartels. We spent more than three years at it. For the moment....out of perhaps 40 or 50 people there are perhaps two little groups that are like cartels, one in which there are four people and another five. And it was one of these little groups which posed the question precisely of the fact that a subject should expose himself by speaking. I take up Mrs Menard's term. The problem is precisely that he no longer exposes himself he no longer exposes himself because he speaks about a third, or the place of a third, which is a different degree which is a degree of theorisation.

Nicole Pepin: In the work of the cartel, since it's question of psychoanalytic work, what is important is to rediscover the same structure as in any other

psychoanalytic work, namely, that the structure of the unconscious should be maintained. As regards the number of participants, the minimum number obligatory will be three. The 'plus-one' seems to me to be very important, but if there are five or six in my opinion is no longer important unless in the three extra there is the one who can hold the role of the *un en plus*. What is this role of the *un en plus*? In other words what use is this person added to the three? For me, when I think of this number three, it's always the symbolic the real and the imaginary, which have to work there in a relation of Oedipal triangulation. The important thing in a cartel is located not simply around the choice of the work theme, but also and perhaps more, at the level of the choice of participants. Because in order for there to be psychoanalytic work it is necessary that the people chosen cannot just be anybody whatsoever. I don't think that just anyone can hold precisely this place which is going to allow there to be elaborated the psychoanalytic discourse, since what is at stake is indeed a psychoanalytic discourse. One can notice this when people are imposed on you, as was the case situated yesterday by one of the participants who said that he had been named as being responsible for a sub-group. He specified that in his opinion in that case nothing could happen.

What is still not too clear for me, is the exact role that would be played by the additional person. As I have experienced it up to now in the experiences that I have of cartels – and they have been rather fleeting! (in the measure that up to now, I did not have the impression that what represented for me the necessary conditions for the functioning of a cartel were respected – I think that this additional person is the one who is going to allow the search of the thing, who is going to allow this articulation, and is going to ensure that there will always be the desire to find the thing will be maintained in the group.

Mme X.: I did not understand why yesterday people were making a difference between the big groups and the smaller groups. If the groups of mathematicians gave an idea of the style of functioning possible in cartels, how can one imagine that the logical rules that would function for cartels are not applicable or expendable to groups involving more people than a number limited to six persons?

GL: For the reason that I think I have explained: it is because you go from the work of analysis properly speaking of which one can speak in a small group and with the feeling of exposing oneself at a level where there is no longer any risk or one can go to the big group if you wish, and then I don't see any interests in it. This happens in one form or another. But at the start it is this passage that must be guaranteed and it cannot be done unless you start from a small group of three or four. One cannot immediately begin to talk about one's own analysis in a crowd.

Mme X: I had the impression that it was the rules of logic did not govern the structuring of a limited group that in that case it was valid for a small group and that it no longer was for a larger group, and what does this difference between the two types of groups the difference that even it feels like social psychology which is interested in groups does not absolutely recognise what does it have to

do at that point we no longer had a critical means or even a way of elaborating or constructing a large group.

GL: Why would you want to construct a large group?

Stephane di Vittorio: That's the question: why must a large group be constructed? If I can bring a number of reflections that came to me since yesterday, the thing that opened up a certain light for me on the cartel as I see it, is this evocation of the group of mathematicians. Lacan told us yesterday that if we were to take them as an example, they indeed had this notion that there was *un en plus*. Supervision is not for its part either the situation in which it is a matter of talking about one's analysis or exposing one's analysis. In the situation of supervision, what one speaks about is in a certain way limited, changed in into a relation a little special and which happens between the patient and the analyst. Is the cartel not also something that implies a very limited subject, which is the sharing in common of a knowhow? There are a whole series of questions that I pose. The first that I have not been able to answer is that of the upper limit which is being debated at present. I see that the other question which also comes along in this circuit is the following: one cannot form a cartel with just anybody. I presume it's because one cannot do so with people who are too close to you and that one cannot do it with people who are too distant from you. Because what's involved is to share things in common, it is this necessary production of a discourse and I had the impression that in a cartel there is someone who is too close to you, then you can't share this knowledge that one does not wish to communicate to others for example.

That's the reason Lemoine's expression: to present oneself and to present one's analysis do you present your analysis in supervision? One only presents it perhaps so far as this relates in an incidental fashion to what happens between one or other patient and a particular analyst. But a supervision has never been identified to an analysis and I think it is in the same vein for example when it was said at Rome one of the great things, broadly speaking and as far as one could see what was said was: supervision has taken on in the Ecole Freudienne a dimension that it didn't have before, or that did not exist elsewhere. I think that it is along this line that the cartel is also registered. The cartel is a specific invention of the Freudian School. It is along the line of this broadening of supervision, but brought to bear on something else, namely, finally on scientific discourse.

Why do mathematicians have such an obvious impression that there is someone extra? Because they are convinced that the mathematical discourse is necessary, that it is there and that each person brings what he has been able to see of it. Does the cartel not also consist in giving rise to a necessary discourse starting from the fact that the people who meet on several occasions namely, successively, they don't meet just one time and say: here is what we know about the question. They live and since they have chosen themselves in a certain way, this way is not very illuminating now since GL said that one cannot make a cartel with just anybody. They have chosen themselves to make a cartel, namely, that they share this knowledge which is developing on a subject, and as if there was a certain kind of filiation there at least in time, this perhaps doesn't mean much, but analysis has come after some other thing, which we call perhaps the hysterical

discourse. Supervision historically came later. The question that I asked myself is: is there something appropriate after the cartels?

JDN: In the text of the directory the cartel is neither a locus for supervision or of the analytic discourse namely, it's not an analytic practice. Nor is it what could be called a basic locus. The cartel has a very proper specificity, and I would even say it constitutes the specificities of the Freudian School, because the first thing that leaps to one's eye is that the first psychoanalytic society which functions with the structure that is called the structure of cartels, well this activity remains to be verified. In any case the Freudian School and its structural unit, the cartels, is a new experience. In the founding act the word to underline is the word **act**. I would say that in the founding act the cartel is established as an act namely, as something new in the real of psychoanalytic societies. On this point I think the cartel is not far from what is going, as something real, to support a society of psychoanalysis.

Edmond Sanquer: For the past seven years we have been working on psychosis-institution with six of us: these six were co-opted they knew one another perfectly well and they had obviously the same form of work. Because I think that in a cartel, what functions, is a work at the level of passion, passionate and emotional, namely, that the 'plus-one' is often the one who is the subject of the hatred of the rest of the group, or the one who is the subject of the love of the group. But often that's only noticed subsequently. In the moment of the functioning of the cartel: that never appears at first sight.

Hugo Freda: Starting from the remarks of Mr Martin about the three in the text I immediately thought that three 'plus-one' is in fact the very structure of the whole psychoanalytic discourse I think the degree to which by the way of working, the way in which we pass in a work from a cartel, what determines the cartel itself I think that it is above all the structuring of three 'plus-one' and that in fact it is the structuring of the analytic discourse that Freud created. The fact is that three 'plus-one' is almost the structuring in the concept, in the number of the Oedipal structure. I think that behind all possible functioning that if there is something new it is that there is a very precise concordance between the way of writing the foundation acts of the School three 'plus-one' and a very structuring of the analytic discourse. That's one thing. I then thought by association of a word that Lacan uses in the seminar on the formations of the unconscious where he talks of 'without signs'; the point of which this formulation in the founding act of the School this type of writing, (something that is written is really very important) functions like an insignia, something to which the formation of the analyst makes a reference. That means that to refer to something written is very important in the same analytic theory. I think that to try to find what one is referring to when one speaks of three 'plus-one' is really to refer directly to the analytic discourse itself in its own internal problematic.

Rene Ebtinger: In the founding act, if I have understood correctly, Jacques Lacan proposes a structure which ought to have a function: work. I am going to take up a distinction to which I already alluded a few years ago here in the *Maison de la Chimie*, but that appear necessary to recall: work and production, very often these terms are used indiscriminately or there is a relationship of subordination:

to produce one must work. If we take three terms, work, production, 'plus-one', we can perhaps formulate a question: is the cartel a locus of work, it is I think something obvious that comes from the definition of the act itself that constitutes these cartels, but is it necessary that they should produce, or that production could be considered as something that would eventually come as superfluous?

Like something else in analysis: superfluous at the level of a written work, of a publication, but the work as I conceive of it is that it works in the sense of *Leistung*, which is untranslatable, which one can take up at the most as a performance and that, for my part, I would understand in the sense of the functioning of the psychical apparatus. And in order that something should be attested that something is functioning on the mode of the psychical apparatus the person 'plus-one' is perhaps necessary to bear witness to it, to be the witness (*testis*), otherwise there is a risk of slipping into the imaginary and that the 'plus-one' is all the same present but in an entirely imaginary form, leaving open all the deviations that Lacan one day – I hope I believe that I'm not misquoting him – qualified in their obscene functioning.

Jean-Pierre Dreyfuss: I would like to come back to the word work, which is used in Freudian doctrine particularly in two places, when it is a matter of dream work and when it is a case of the work of mourning. Therefore it is not a notion which ought to completely surprise us. There is another term that I recall, it is the word to expose oneself, this led me to come back to what one can call the clinic of the cartel. We constituted three or four years ago a work group; up to the most recent time particularly up to last night, I was not too sure that despite the modifications that affected this group that this group had transformed itself into a cartel notably because I thought that the 'plus-one' was incarnated in a determined person definitively throughout the duration of the group. Let us come back on that a little having listened to what was said last night. What I would like to report about this group is the following: the group became reduced, we were about 10 at the start and now we are 6; I have the impression that the elimination, I would almost say the auto elimination of a certain number of participants who were there at the beginning was accompanied by a certain elimination precisely of group affects, namely, what emerged from teaching in its traditional forms in other words of self-display. Precisely what had become possible in this group that now I believe had been transformed into a cartel has been precisely to expose to oneself – not necessarily to talk about one's analysis – but to expose oneself namely, precisely by taking risks; it is at that moment that risks were really taken in the sense where I would say that to expose oneself is not the same thing as to exhibit oneself.

Jean-Jacques Moscovitz: I would like to say a word about this situation that we are at, namely, that people want to make a precept, a concept. Namely, from the precept to fabricate a cartel one is going to try to find how that functions, how in a certain way to erect it into a concept. Effectively there is supposed this 'plus-one' in such a way that to me this 'plus-one' would be a little thing detachable from the all, this something that would define the rest but which also would define or would allow at a given moment to define, the idea of the finitude of the cartel. This something that would ensure for example at a certain moment the

participants of the cartel would decide that it is no longer a cartel, that they have to stop, or stop at least calling it cartel.

There is here a quite particular problem one that can only be put in a small number, to the degree that when this cartel is fabricated something happens which is a code between the participants with its own history inside the cartel. At a given moment probably something will happen which will mean that this will end up will be terminated. It is necessary perhaps to manage to define the minimal conditions to manage to divert to a cartel and perhaps also to delimit the final extreme conditions which would mean that it would no longer at that moment be a cartel. I think that one of the most complicated aspects then is to define what is meant by consent between the participants of the cartel. This refers to this extreme schema of hypnosis namely, of submission in a way to the knowledge of the other, and to accept to undergo this for the time that is necessary in order at a given moment to give an account of this reception of this welcome of this knowledge.

In that sense I think that the 'plus-one' can be defined in the following way: knowing that it is the one who at a given moment is a little bit more of a psychoanalyst than all the others. At that moment he has been sufficiently situated to be astonished at what happens and to ask himself the question of what he is doing there; to the fact that he can perhaps leave or be absent the next time; to ensure that perhaps that it is he who is the question but perhaps without knowing it himself. There is something which effectively works, namely, if what is involved in the cartel is really defined with respect to the 'plus-one' and whether one can make a concept of it. I would like to specify before letting others speak two things: first of all yesterday people debated for an hour and a half to clearly specify that the 'plus-one' was always present and whether it was a question of a person whom I believe one cannot specify by anything other than what is at stake, namely, to stimulate to provoke to incite the desire of the other, meaning by that the cartel.

Now you know we are analysts, this stimulation, to make of desire the desire of the other, to support it, this can be done in anyway whatsoever, precisely it is the capacity of the signifier. This is a point that seems very important to me that yesterday we had ended up by saying that it was not a question of someone who is absent, nor someone who is an analyst anymore than anybody else, that it was rather a matter of an element a play in the cartel that was effectively carried by a subject, but it also seems to me that there is another important thing to lead the discussion – this is also a reminder of the text – which is that the cartel is not a creation ex nihilo, the cartel forms part of the structures of the Freudian School; namely, that the cartel is situated – I said this earlier – as a structural unit of the School. This is a point that it would also be important to debate. There is here in the text a reference on several occasions that the School can be considered as an inaugural experience; can we say 11 years later that we are able to maintain this inaugural experience.

Nicole Pepin: I would like to continue a little what I was saying earlier; in the figure of three 'plus-one' persons the important thing for that to function, is the extra person and therefore one must not make a mistake in choosing this person.

Otherwise it won't work. If I have a reason for thinking that this extra person will be able to maintain, in order to secure a theoretical work, the search for the thing. I think that the work of the cartel is a going beyond; a first step towards theoretic elaboration, beyond personal analysis. I don't think it's a matter of exposing one's personal analysis in the cartel work, it is situated beyond that. To specify the importance of the choice of the extra person; it is only subsequently in a second phase that we will abandon the cartel work in order to find ourselves working in twos or even in a group of four, five or six.

For the elaboration of a theoretical psychoanalytic work, it is obligatory that an analyst should have someone to echo his word, another analyst, otherwise I think that a psychoanalytic theoretical elaboration is not possible. There again the choice of the person – we find ourselves perhaps in the situation of supervision – will have the greatest importance – because not everyone can hold this position; it is quite obvious that not every analyst can hold this role for any other analyst, I would say that this person, in addition, should be the all in one that this person by herself ought to be able to solicit the unconscious desire, this search, this research, which would allow after a certain lapse of time a theoretical elaboration.

Nicole Guillet: I would like to summarise two or three things that I think I have understood for a long time about cartels. It is just the function of the 'plus-one' that interests me particularly today and it seems that that was very important in '64 when this foundation took place, and I think it has perhaps not been discussed enough in the School. It is something, this kind of formation of the cartel which avoids the dangers that the political groups among us have encountered and still encounter. It seems to me that it is necessary first of all for a cartel for a certain number of people to have a desire to work in common, the number will be decided on later, there must obviously be common interests theoretical research; it's a way of waking people up together, to want to find together there's an effect of stimulation etc.

Secondly, there obviously has to be transference namely, that one cannot work with people who are not peers, that one has chosen as such, similar, one that can talk with them without declaring war, one can write whatever, learn to write they are there because like me they are interested in it, they have decided to support, to support me etc. we have chosen one another.

Thirdly there is something analytic, that is there are rules, first there is a work rhythm, regular, no cartel can function without a kind of rhythm it's important if one misses out it is important if one does not respect this rhythm. There are rules among other the rules of number is extremely important this range of three to six seems to me to be extremely important it's what I would call the proper subjective consistency. Namely, that at three obviously it's the family it's two against one etc. and beyond that it's the mass namely, that beyond anyone can go to sleep can dream can become a flowerpot anyway all the sorts of resistances are possible while at six I'm not experienced enough seems to me that in the little groups that were often done at La Borde, the UTB, etc this was always respected without knowing why. I experience this number was always found we went as far as seven but that was something different.

Fourthly, it seems to me that a 'plus-one' is necessary namely, that this is what assures that the cartel is not going to become a cartel of cosmonauts or something or other namely, that it creates an opening an opening to what? Onto the outside the outside of the cartel the cartels of the Freudian School, are the Freudian School, namely, for example today one can say that what we are in the process of doing is a 'plus-one' with respect to all the cartels whose participants are speaking today. For example it seems to me that the work that was explained yesterday by Madame Soler was interesting because of the fact that they had to give an account of the work functioned in their cartel as a 'plus-one', it seems to me that that's it. It seems to me that otherwise cartels just drone on; even at six there's a possibility of droning, of functioning like that in a closed way, that there is nothing exhaustive – I don't really like that word production productive, I would prefer openness – and marked, distinguished by our belonging to the Freudian School.

In the little groups that were practiced in La Borde, it seems to me that the danger of boredom was avoided because the mad man was able to function or the fact of being there to look after the mad was able to function as Lacan said yesterday as mathematics. In other words that constituted the 'plus-one', we were obliged to find there something because there was the requirement of the symptoms of the mad man which upset things. But we were obliged to create a group that was called the group of groups, which had as a function uniquely, to highlight the cartels, to see what the cartel has done, does that not become effectively a cartel of cosmonauts which was there to do something other than to work.

Madame G: I simply wanted to say that we formed a cartel with at the start the goal of working but also to go against what one could call an acute form of seminaritis. In certain areas everyone does his seminar, and we get sick precisely of this seminar it is a little to go against this tendency that we formed ourselves into a cartel experiencing the need at the start to refer to the text, in the founding act. I think that when more or less a month afterwards the meeting of the cartels was announced that really gave us great pleasure.

Philippe Girard: Is the cartel not a way to avoid two types of groupings or of regroupings, let us say a totalitarian type with a phenomena of identification etc and a type which is present currently that of liberalism. In other words the 'plus-one' functions as an instrument to avoid what one could call mass psychology with all the effects that one knows, and on the other hand not to sink into a republic of egos which is obviously equally fictitious. Under what conditions can we escape from these two modes of social institution of social bond? If we had to define the function of cartels, it would be with respect to this; by taking into consideration the dominant forms of the past like the army the church, more recently the party, than the new ideology. For the moment I have no experience of a cartel or very little but what happens around it get around these difficulties is not really convincing. We haven't as far as I know at the moment got out of these difficulties. I think that this is what the Freudian School is trying to resolve, not simply with respect to a political register, but also in what concerns the analytic institution. The mathematicians – you said yesterday if I understood you that they managed to resolve these difficulties those of the 'and me and me and me'

of liberal groups and that of the other who are of the object in a bundle on which, through which, in which, there is the identification and the constitution of us. Can the cartels engage the school outside the paths of self-sufficiency of tacit communion and conformism and constituted by that a means of formation and another type of social bond.

Annick Dreyfuss: I have a little experience of the cartels and I would like simply to add a few words to what Jean-Pierre Dreyfuss said earlier because I'm part of the same cartel and I was able to notice this auto-elimination. At the start as he said people are there are 10 of us there's a sort of fascination in the sense of showing off and by auto-elimination there was constituted a sort of cartel with there being this famous 'plus-one' specifically. Namely, that we found ourselves in the position of analyser, that's how it appears to me) and at the same time analyst. The 'plus-one' seemed to find itself in the position of the analyst of the cartel but at the limit without knowing it, without it being specifically one.

That appears essential to me and that appears now – as this appears to be after all what is said – after the way Nasio cleared the way it's a unique experience. It is something unique it is neither the base the basis nor supervision nor the analytic situation. But it deserves all the same a certain clarification because we have then two analysts two analysers and an analyst but not an extra like that specifically and analyst with the analysers: one is in turn, one is at the same time an analyser and an analyst. The figures three to six in this sense seem to me to be essential; beyond six we have noticed that it doesn't work there is always one too many or two too many etc. between three and six it's perfect. Where there are still questions is precisely in what concerns the explanation of how it works that seems to me to be mysterious.

JDN: I would like to respond by reading for you a quotation from the founding act precisely; 'plus-one' – I continue the quotation that Mr Martin gave last night – charged with the selection the discussion and issue to be reserved for the work of each one 'after a certain time the functioning of these elements of the group will be permuted into another'

Namely, that there is a work, a movement of permutation not simply intercartels but also within each cartel; there is still something else to be added: 'this charge of direction will not constitute a fiefdom etc.'

Pierre Bastin: What I heard yesterday evening about the experience of a certain number of groups is that that ended up with something like anything at all, it was a matter of pals who discussed this thing and the other. In short it wasn't working. And then someone made an allusion like that without going any further to the schema L, to the o-o' axis that leads me to pose this question : is the function of the person *en plus* first of all to create an objection to intersubjectivity, namely, to a group of pals or anything that can function without an extra person can very easily set up a purely imaginary relationship, therefore produce a purely linear discourse and that in this perspective of schema L which has been evoked, this extra person was found on the other axis, the axis of transference: S-O, which gives to this group the possibility of producing, of metaphorising, so that something different can emerge. The other affections like:

three 'plus-one', that gives four, and in the schema L, there are four terms, in the four discourses: of the academic, of the analyst, of the hysteric, of the master, is also an interplay of four terms which are interchanged producing different discourses. I can't say any more but anyway I see that there too there are four terms. To respond to something that was said a little while ago it is that the extra person is not a chief, is not an equal, but fulfils a certain function in the structure of this cartel. Now how is this extra person going to fulfil this function? And as regards the choice, I think that it is also said in the founding act that it is a matter of people who have agreed mutually that they have a desire to do something together; starting from there I do not think you don't need particular qualities to be the extra person, unless it is to have been chosen like that by the three others, by mutual consent so that afterwards the thing will work.

Maria Velissaropoulos: I would simply like to remark that people have spoken about four discourses; I think that effectively the cartel is something that allows there to be articulated something about the functioning of the School to the four discourses, but I don't think that the 'plus-one' is the fourth term of four discourses. I think it is what allows the passage into metaphor, what allows metaphorisation. Earlier I was rather surprised that people spoke about a person, about the choice of a person, I don't know whether it is really that that is at stake, I think that for example if the 'plus-one' could be understood in the definition of the signifier: 'The signifier is what represents a subject for another signifier'. It is at the level of the four that this 'plus-one' is to be found.

Dominique Poissonier: I would like to follow a little what Bastin said earlier in this sense that two remarks to me seem to be important in the way that we perceive this 'plus-one'. It is at once a matter of a 'plus-one' that is to always present whether we want it or not, and this makes me think of the fact that in an analysis of course, there are not just two persons, we are not working on an imaginary axis, and that it is a matter there of locating this 'plus-one'. The locating being perhaps still more important, the locating consisting above all in giving him his place and allowing something to be said at this level.

On the other hand, what Nasio recalled just now there is specifically a person who is said to be the 'plus-one' to whom there are confided certain tasks, certain servitudes, this evokes for me the function of the *passé-seuil*; is the constitution of the 'plus-one' with respect to the group not analogous to the situation organised in the *passé* where one or two *passeurs* are put in such a position such that what the passer says will be lost elsewhere; this links up with the notion of opening a production, of for another signifier, of something that is done for the School, in a way there too to get out of a discourse that would be closed, that would remain between the 'me me me', at imaginary levels.

Jose Guey: On the one hand, this question of the *une en plus* turns around a place occupied by a different person. It seems to me that what has been said here is that in a cartel, chosen or not, it is not obvious that it is always the same person who, inside the cartel occupies this place. There's a person who occupies this place, to whom one addresses oneself, but that later, sooner or later, the passage of the work ought to be done vis a vis the other persons of the School and finally, why not, outside the School; that is how it functions it seems to me.

There was also a question of supervision and of this internal and external criticism. On the other hand – and I link up with the example of the mathematicians, who speak about mathematics as if it were a person – it seems to me that here we have to note that what causes these cartels and finally the School is psychoanalysis.

As regards the big groups it seems to me that beyond a certain number we're in a structure of spectacle and no longer in a structure of discourse. Moreover if we rule out a cartel having just two people it is because then we are dealing with two discourses which confront one another and which do not open out or have enormous difficulty in opening out onto a third.

JDN: I would like simply to recall that yesterday we made a distinction between the 'plus-one' and the *un en plus*. The *un en plus* was considered as being what has been produced, the subject, speaking in the terms proper to analytic doctrine, and that the 'plus-one' is not something which comes to close a structure but which comes while being at the limit of the structure to make it consistent and open it out to other structures. This 'plus-one' is precisely what allows the connection with the rest of the structures of the School, this seems to me to be important to insist on as a difference. As regards internal-external supervision, there is this sentence: *'Those who come to this School will commit themselves to fulfilling a task submitted to both internal and external supervision.'*

Christiane Bardet-Giraudom: Would it be too much to pose the problem of ambivalence with respect to the cartel and the problem of the effects of the cartel on each one of the participants and his work? Namely, does this cartel-effect end up automatically with a collective work? Or are there not also moments where the cartel effect can force someone to write or rediscover a determination to write but which is not perhaps oriented at that moment towards the cartel, but perhaps elsewhere? Is there not an indetermination, if really it is a matter of production and of work, perhaps not in the goal but let us say in the orientations of the work? At that moment perhaps the eventually burdensome or risk of monotony or of becoming bored in the cartel – if there are a few people, after all it's not simply a positive factor in the measure that we know one another that one has perhaps more freedom to speak, that can also be a limit of information. Perhaps one cannot always control the fact that people have grouped themselves like that and not otherwise because my question was finally: if it is a matter of production, why not pose the question of the determinations to write? Is it uniquely because of its sympathy for someone else in the case of a cartel or may it not also be a feeling of fury or something else? In the determination to write there can be an ambiguity about the motives.

JDN: I would translate that as follows – I don't know if it's possible: we have spoken about productions in the cartel, is the cartel not simply a form of structure which allows reproduction, I think quite simply about the growth of the School as an institution, whether it is or not an institution is another question to be asked.

Nicole Guillet: I think that it's the most important question, but it seems to me in this case that there must be a cartel which will help to guarantee the function of

the *en plus* in the cartel namely, that it is quite obvious that one must establish all kinds of rules including the rules for the rotation of cartels and the rotation of this function of the *un en plus* in the cartel it has to be really like a kind....there are a whole lot of words that come and that one does not like not for nothing it's like switch points to give an account to the School, I think of the functions of the secretary, the functions earlier were described as that of a *commisaire* etc. that evokes all sorts of things that are very complex; that is why Girard is pessimistic. When I said for example that in the small groups that are called words groups or psychotherapy groups where there were one or two mad people, structures that functioned like cartels, at La Borde, the fact that there was a mad person or two or three could avoid a sort of boredom in the group. But in fact we can also say that this function of the *un en plus* if one waited for it to be done by the mad person who could play, obviously very easily become it, or the Fuhrer, or the destruction of the group, one could also see that that could become a group of mad people, madness guaranteed to this symbolic function. Therefore everything failed, which was what often happened. It is therefore a matter of a very important function and how to assure it, how to make it live?

Pierre Martin: Following Nasio's remarks which remind us and which articulate for us certain remarks that are so interesting, I would simply like to bring in the second last sentence of the founding act before the author beings the description of the three sections; this second last sentence is the following: *'This – namely, what precisely concerns the structural organisation of the cartel - in no way implies an inverted hierarchy, but a circular organisation whose functioning, easy to program, will be firmed up with experience.*

Philippe Girard: In a reply to the arrangements that Nicole Guillet advised, I would say that the rotations never prevented anything. The commissars became 'of the people' and the secretaries became 'general'. I don't think it is by modalities of this kind that one will manage, let us say, to ward off two styles of the collective that I am designating. As regards the denegation of authority and of the hierarchy, which is now so popular, this has never prevented them from functioning, even at the demand of those who reject them. These questions are all the more complex, that what is called the new ideology in order to differentiate it from bourgeois ideology tries to be invisible by functioning in the between ourselves style with regard to familiarity to belonging. And there is nothing to guarantee that it is going to be different from the totalitarianism that it is trying to get rid of.

Nicole Pepin: I would like to continue what I was saying and link up with what I have heard a little while ago at the level of the limit of theoretical work in the cartel and of the aggressivity that can be unleashed. It seems to me that obligatorily a theoretical work in a cartel can only be limited, I will not talk about aggressivity but I will talk about the dimension of hatred. In the measure that there are multiple, parasitic interventions in the group that is too big, there is a limitation which occurs all the more that one cannot between work comrades work otherwise than by taking into account a particular dimension of the functioning that I would call social semblance. I mean that being linked by bonds of comradeship or of love, at whatever degree there will always be something to preserve which in my opinion would put up an obstacle to the extra person

completely holding his role. The role of the extra person is situated as I said earlier at the level of the search for the thing. She is going to push this quest in the sense of a provocation which will go here I'm weighing my words – because it seems to me that the extra person will have to maintain the dimension of death in order that the theoretical discourse or the theoretical elaboration may be able to happen. If I spoke earlier about a beyond of the cartel situation, in order to get to the control situation by saying that one risked ensuring that the extra person should be the all in one it is because that it is not only in this situation that the analyst, who tries to realise a theoretical elaboration, is maintained in the being for death: it is only in these conditions that a theoretical elaboration is possible.

Jacques Crepin: I would like to talk about what I would not call a cartel but a group: the so called Amiens-St-Quentin group I would like to talk about it to say that it seems to me that starting from these study days some questions are going to be asked; in effect, we are in a process of discovering for example that when we have reflected a little on the number of people that can constitute a cartel, these reflections have never got very far. Currently and from the beginning there are nine of us; I must admit that it is only since yesterday evening and since this morning that we have begun to pose the question about the three and six. I would also say that we had not reflected on the question of the 'plus-one' probably moreover because at the time we set up the cartel we hadn't really read the founding act of the aforesaid cartels. I would simply like to indicate that we asked ourselves very few questions and the proof of this is it seems to me that this emerged once or twice here, the question that we never asked ourselves is that in our group, an underlying question but one that's always there is that in this group there are two couples and this question is a question which after all is perhaps not exclusive to our group, I would like to point out – by way of anecdote – that the only time that there was someone absent from this group it was because the 9th person had gone off to get married. I am telling this as a sort of episode in the questions that we are surely going to have to ask ourselves when we go home.

JDN: Could I ask you what precisely are the things that you intend or have thought about discussing after what happened last night?

JC: We did not meet except as individuals we're not all here there's something that I would like to say also that comes back to me as I speak it is that the constitution of the cartel what struck us subsequently that the reasons why we are not a cartel in any case is that finally the theme chosen to give a name to give an insignia to our cartel was something which became very quickly a sort of formality; hearing myself saying that today I realise that this formality doesn't work by itself either. I would go so far as to say that the *un en plus* to formulate it like that, manifests itself in our group in the form of two leaders, and as by chance these two leaders are the two people who agreed to chose the theme which was subsequently very rapidly accepted by the seven other participants without it ever being questioned. The theme was the first Rome discourse.

Colette van de Poorter: You have spoken about mathematics as if it were a person and you have said that it was certain and curious that when mathematicians met there was always an understood person present. It is

curious and it is worth underlining that the sciences are represented by a woman, this person *une en plus* can be the woman; and as not existing and being situated between presence and absence. Now in mathematics, the truth is placed and understood in advance and the game is to go towards it or to deny it. I ask myself this question: what is the relationship of this additional person with the truth?

Annick Dreyfuss: I simply wanted to add that the cartel experience has nothing to do with what could be called group dynamics; this seemed to me to be essential to highlight.

Nicole Guillet: It seems to me that the subjects, the themes for work, are not very important; the choice of subjects to work on – at the limit one could imagine that from time to time when the School needs it one could distribute these subjects for work; for my part I always loved practising on the piano, namely, obligatory things but finally one can say: such and such a cartel it would be interesting for it to work on this, even to work on a cartel about science fiction and this has to do with the Freudian School namely, with psychoanalysis. What seems to me to be more interesting is the choice of place; at least one should talk about it because perhaps the function of the *un en plus* is sometime assured by the fact of meeting in the locale of the School, and that inversely the fact of meeting in one person's house always the same and not the others that can be important in the group I think it's important that this should be taken into account a person's house forms part of his body etc. that is not to say either that the function of the *un en plus* would be guaranteed precisely because you are in the locale of the School but in any case, it seems to me that all of these things should be highlighted.

Nicole Pepin: I spoke earlier about the social semblance as being able to form an obstacle for the theoretical work of a cartel I want to specify what I mean by social semblance. The social semblance, is the fact that people can live in society with their mode of adapting to society, to others, to the small others that surround them. I locate the social semblance at the level of the imaginary; an imaginary relation with an incursion into the symbolic sometimes. Another thing that's important in the obstacles that can occur in the elaboration of a theoretical work in the cartels, is what I would call, to draw a parallel the psychoanalytic semblance. The psychoanalytic semblance which not only sets up an obstacle to the elaboration of a theoretical work in the cartel but is much more dangerous than the social semblance. Why? Because it's not situated at the same level; the psychoanalytic semblance can only be used by people who know psychoanalysis and the functioning of the unconscious. What they will set in movement will be not simply the imaginary and the symbolic but also they risk mobilising something which is also at the level of the real. And that can provoke very dramatic reactions we have noted the effects in different work groups. They were important and they should be noted. I situate here the obstacles to the functioning of the cartels when people are imposed on it; by a third person or by themselves; when someone is designated to be the additional person.

Francois Hanafi: I was thinking of three 'plus-one', a triangular relationship: this absent or present person can be eventually the functioning of the School since Lacan said last night: has the School functioned up to now? I was going to put

some little drawings on the board starting from the triangular one can put here the father the mother and the child and here what is lacking and what is lacking for us would be what eventually it would be the references to the texts of Freud or of Lacan. In such a way that when we make three rings one in the other namely, for the three rings to exist for a cartel to exist there must be a 'plus-one' namely, the union of that.

That there is someone who is capable at the centre of taking care of it. I equally thought something at the level of three 'plus-one' in speaking about the six what you were saying, namely, the famous triangle linking them up like that. That forms a triangle but if you associate them that gives you six points and if one looks at the level of the assembling of that that gives four. Which comes down eventually to saying for the functioning of a cartel there are three persons there is eventually the analyser the analyst and the product the object; for that to be able to function there must be an outside namely, the meeting of these three. There is something else that I saw in the functioning of the School, the founder of the School the School itself us or me, and for the School to be able to function for there to be a fourth something is lacking here the cartel in the I belong to the cartel and we are able to meet and eventually make a circle instead of a square but the fourth I see enormous number of references in the text but also in the person who wrote texts like Freud and Lacan who were in my opinion for the moment always alongside like that this fourth.

Jacques Lacan: Safouan, you weren't there yesterday at 5 o'clock, at least when I opened the session. You would not have something to say about what yesterday gave me the possibility, today I abstain, in terms of a dialogue with many of the people who spoke. I would be happy if you would say what you think here of this 'plus-one' person that every cartel literally evokes, has evoked in any case for me and about which I regret that I did not punctuate it earlier; earlier Philippe Girard very well noted what is the objective of it, to get out of the necessity which is crystallised by the function of any group.

Mustafa Safouan: Is there going to be a meeting this afternoon or not? I'd prefer to wait for the afternoon.

JL: OK. There are things that you have heard this morning, I heard others yesterday that were extremely suggestive.

MS: In any case what I heard this morning it was above all the 'plus-one' because it is a function that has no social equivalent to which one can refer. As has been said on the social plain it can only be defined by inversion.

JL: There are obviously two points, there is on the one side organisation, the life as one might say of the cartel as such, and then what some people including Nasio insisted on, namely, the production.

MS: But it is not each to grasp either in a subjective topology what this function corresponds to. And then the question is enlarged: I see the novelty, the unusual character of the idea of even organising like that a collaboration among several people in a work.

JL: It seems to me that there is something specific in analysis which poses this question which is always more or less stifled when all is said and done. It seems to me difficult that for the analyst not to ask what their work means analytically insofar as it is a work in common; should analysts remain isolated, why not? In practice that's what happens. It is all the same something of a kind that makes us ask the question: why does this happen? It is already a minimum. If you wouldn't mind reflecting on something for this afternoon.....

Charles Melman: What can hold analysts together in a work group? It seems to me that it is the locating of the real that convokes them: *en plus*. This would intersect moreover with the necessity of producing in such a group a discourse in addition to those that a study in common inevitably gives rise to: master, academic, hysteric.

JL: Aubry, you have all the same something to say coming from your own great experience.

Mme Aubry: My experience has been that every time I try to put in place something in the order of a cartel I was put in the position of a boss in such a way that it was no longer tolerable. We say that when something happens, both have to take the blame but I have the impression that it was not the case. What I can say is that before the foundation of the School, when I was in Paris, I could all the same do something where everyone was able to go his own way, which seemed to me to correspond to the aim of the cartel, if not its functioning. Namely, that everyone went his own way in the sense of what was involved in his analysis but his personal journey is relatively solitary, while at the same time being part of something which had the value of a signifier, I am thinking about *Enfants Malades*. And then I tried to participate in a cartel in Paris but I must say that when I come it's very rare, it's an awful rush, so I gave up on the idea that something was possible there.

I have not been able to function in a cartel, except perhaps something which was close to it in *EM*, at least had the aim, because it think all the same the aim of a cartel is a production, in effect, but what is collective is that each one can argue with the other in a sort of a circular way, but that everyone makes his own original and personal path and I think that the diversity of people who worked formally at *EM* and who are all productive, and not all the same, will bear witness to it.

I can't see what I can contribute; it must also be said that in the region of Aix when I arrived that, there was an extraordinary demand which was resolved by everyone going on his own way to do something. There were certainly in these groups or what could be described as such, which certainly weren't cartels, an elaboration of what might be an analytic work, a taking up again for a lot of people something of analysis in the way the questions were asked without me naturally responding directly.

MS: What I have just heard makes me ask the question: what is the 'plus-one' about why is it necessary? And your question: Can an analyst work in isolation also touched on something. My feeling is that it is a matter of a function which

consists in a second sight, that a logical second sight on the discourse in its logical consequences, not in its meaning but one can signal to a subject his contradictions for example or the secondary consequences that he himself has not paid attention to. In that sense I would go so far to say that it is a function like the Socratic maieutics. But then it's true, because we know that in a dialogue there are a lot of feints, it's the typical example, one refuses knowledge in order to pretend that one has give birth to it subsequently. But there can be a place for a function which is a really Socratic function and it is in that sense that it appears to me that there can be a place for the 'plus-one'. Personally I have never had any difficulty with anyone, I mean that when it we wasn't working, we parted, that's all.

JL: Which proves if not your intervention at least your consent. Who still wants to speak?

Radmila Zygouris: I don't know since I arrived late if you've already asked the question: When one does the work that one is doing first of all can that be called work and then this strange thing that one is doing when one is an analyst can one talk about it with two, three or four persons at the same time? And what becomes of the thing that one is speaking about, what type of discourse is at stake? I have the impression that even before the cartel is really constituted when one had a desire to talk about what one was doing as an analyst, you picked up the phone but you never talked to more than a few people. Then when you're asked to do some work to participate in the congress as it happens that's a different type of discourse; what's to be done when people are always shouting in the congress it's not bad. It's not bad that's academic. Can the analyst escape the analytic discourse when he's talking to a crowd, when he is writing? The question that I wanted to ask is the difference between the written and the not written, is it not because one speaks that it is not a writing, every time we get together when we work there is another aspect, it is 'It doesn't work with two you're in a relation of identification', 'how you do it and how I do it'. We're in knowhow uniquely you need something a common reference and what status has the common reference?

JL: I am ending the session.

III

Group Session Sunday afternoon**The 'plus-one' and mathematics**

JDN: I do not intend to give a resume of what was said this morning. Only I would like to highlight some references that I have retained from the discussion. We have therefore considered on the subject of the cartels two registers that Lacan summarised by separating on the one hand the structure, the life of the cartel, and then the work that is executed, the production. Concerning its organisation the problem of the 'plus-one' remains to be developed. We noted the difference between the *un en plus* and the 'plus-one' without yet managing to give it a definitive consistency.

This 'plus-one' was situated at the very joint of the articulation of the cartel with the rest of the structure of the School. On this point I now add that this 'plus-one', as a link with the School, echoes the formula of there is no Other of the Other in the measure that it stops a certain infinite relation. This poses the 'plus-one' as the cut which also makes the passage between the cartel and the School.

Besides it was put forward – by Girard, especially – that such an organisation could avoid the risks of a certain totalitarianism, either of the fictitious equality of liberalism. He let us know his uncertainty about the effectiveness of the cartels to go, as a social bond, beyond a grouping commanded by the figure of a chief, all ruled by the reinforcement of egos. The second aspect, that of content, that of production, was the subject of different interventions. In particular, the analytic notion of work served as a reference. The cartel appeared as a locus of a work in common, to be sure, but can one say that the analytic community finds in these units the point of its realisation? Let us recall that no analytic society is organised on this basis. From this point of view we have a term to render an account of this novel character of cartels, that of act.

JL: I'm very grateful to you for having made this effort at a summary. It seemed to me finally that I didn't find in this morning's session the interest of last evening's, the one that Martin presided over, without of course you having done anything else than to collect what resulted from it. I hope that Safouan is going to be able to contribute something. I would be happy for you to speak.

MS: I had time to read the founding act. I noticed that I had forgotten this text.

JL: You're not the only one!

MS: The impression which emerges concerning the origin of the cartels, the current impression is that it is a matter in a way of an arrangement that we could say is dictated by the concern of not founding the collaboration or the common work on a type of fiefdom. There I believe that there is no organisation that can eliminate the fiefdom in a collectivity. This is something that I would be ready to defend. If I am asked I will do so but anyway I would willingly propose the following: that society in its very principle starting from the basic cell called the

family is founded on repression. But if one cannot eliminate these fiefdoms at the very least one can avoid founding on them a regime of work that can still be called honest.

So then it's an arrangement, an arrangement and one might well have imagined others. Which means that people ask a certain number of questions about the choice of the number, example three or four or five. This seems to be a judicious suggestion, but judicious in a sense that empirically in effect within these limits, the work proves to have a character which is at once both confidential and frank and at the same time more serious in other conditions. I myself for example have tried to do some work in terms of a lexicon. As long as the door was open to all nothing serious was done. We had to limit the number and starting from then the work began to be done. This is an empirical finding.

I am telling you that to get to the 'plus-one', I don't know why I had made such an exaggerated idea of it that I went so far as to talk about Socrates, because the thing seemed to be so important when others were talking about it. But as I can glimpse it here I see the function that would be completely comparable to the function of tutor in an English college; I want to stress everything that relates not to a theoretical direction but an arrangement which has an empirical character; I repeat the style appears to me to be that of a tutor in Cambridge or Oxford charged with the selection the discussion and the outcome to be reserved for the work of each individual.

There are questions which can be asked. For example has it happened effectively after a certain time of functioning that the elements of a group are permuted into another? Has that been done? Because it seems to me to be quite coherent with the rest, and that precisely without this permutation, the rest has no value. In the measure that it is a matter precisely of dissipating as far as possible the effects of the fiefdom, permutation is necessary. But has that been done?

JL: That has never been done.

MS: Even though precisely it is something that would be worthwhile doing because as we can see it's very coherent with the rest. Then effectively is everybody in a cartel? Am I in a cartel? Does everybody work effectively in a cartel? For my part I can't say that I work in a cartel.

JL: Absolutely not. There is no kind of veritable realisation of a cartel.

MS: That's it. But my feeling is that that is a great lacuna in the application and that if effectively one is asking everyone to work in a cartel and that one applies the principle of permutation this tests the narcissism of all. And that is something quite essential to apply. Those are the sort of things that immediately come to me others will come to me and I will speak as time goes on.

Pierre Martin: I called attention yesterday to the 'plus-one' and this morning to the three. I wonder if there is anyone who could also in the this audience pose himself the problem of the word cartel itself. In the text it is referred to *cardo*,

the hinge, the opening and many other things. The word in the French tongue has many other implications. But it seems that it would be worthwhile dwelling on it.

Robert Mund: Precisely, I asked myself a lot of questions about this word cartel. Six years ago when I entered the Freudian School I wanted to know what was the rule. I obviously read the statutes. It was at the start of praxis which was not yet analytic at that time; I worked at *EM*; as it happened we had formed a group to study the Rome discourse. I had done a bit of linguistics before functioning as an analyst and I was interested in reading the Rome discourse. It was lacking structure. I went to look in the statutes what the cartel was. I saw 'we have a name for...' I said to myself: therefore this name pre-exists its use. I thought about the different meanings that the word cartel could have. I thought that it was a political cartel. And I also got the idea that the word cartel contains also what one did when one provoked someone to a duel. There is there a provocation in the sense that one delimits a field and a rule according to whether people want to stab one another or not. Because all the same there is a fight to the death in a duel. There can be one. Death is present.

And this word cartel in any case also had a resonance for me with what was current in the last century when people fought duels people spoke about cartels. Now this provocation to speak is precisely the thing which seems to us to be the great difficulty in meetings of four persons, who imaginarily are grouped in fours, but who have a lot of difficulty in accepting this bar, namely, this separation of signifier from the signified. The 'plus-one' being the one who acts as a guarantee that things happen above the bar, namely, are sufficiently metaphorised to be communicated – I'm putting this word in quotes – namely, understandable by someone who is not in this dual relationship (in analysis for example) who is not in a relationship of identification. I think that the 'plus-one' operates in the cartel with the same role more or less as the analyst in a treatment, namely, to be there to allow that speech should be pronounced with castration, namely, that the signifier referring to all the other signifiers, separated by the bar of the signified. This distinction seems to me to be quite primordial in any theoretical elaboration given that a theory is something which should be communicated, and that the start of the communication, is that it should be understandable who is not in on the secret.

I even thought then (four or five years ago) that this 'plus-one' could be paid, which would presentify the debt for access to the symbolic. I am not saying that we ever applied it!

MS: It's intolerable what you're saying there! Everyone takes his own responsibilities, to pay the 'plus-one'! That seems to me to be...

RM: I didn't say that we had acted this out, I said that I had thought about it as a fantasy six years ago. I think that in any case it is not the fact in the real of paying that counts but there is already something that is to be looked at about the symbolic debt in the 'plus-one', this extra person or this something is what makes possible a retroaction of speech. And that is why he is an actor, namely, an organiser of a possibility of work in a cartel, because that makes an act, this extra person who is a listener. These are some ideas. I could tell you about all the

difficulties that I have met up with in the different cartels in which we have worked. And it was almost always that it was a question of the barr, namely, to quit the imaginary, and of course underlying this there is the possibility of leaving it. There must be something of the imaginary in order for it to be left. The difficulty of leaving the imaginary, this is what created most of the time an obstruction for work in the cartel.

Gennie Lemoine: It is the word empirical that struck me in Safouan. I do not think that we put ourselves in threes and fours because it is not possible to work with 20 if there is not another reason for this number I believe that if we work in threes or fours or sixes that signifies that it is the unfolding of the analytic situation which effectively happens between two people but perhaps between four poles. It is the unfolding of it at the social level. And bit by bit we may in this way arrive not at an institution surely not but at an analytic society, which is still to be discovered. That was a first question, 10 years ago: what is an analytic society?

MS: before I forget it, I have a question to pose precisely to Lacan: Why is the term 'plus-one' underlined? It is even the only term that is underlined in the text. Why were you concerned to underline this term?

JL: First of all so that people would notice it which in fact has only happened lately. In reality, the very fact that I expressed myself like that should have been enough for this 'plus-one' to be noticed, all the same because it's hard to see otherwise why I would have detached from a group this 'plus-one' which becomes a riddle. But anyway I thought I should underline it so that people would dwell on it, simply.

MS: The response that I found for my part to this question is that in the enumeration of these functions the essential function is the one that is indicated by the term of discussion; 'charged with the selection, with the discussion...etc'. It is the term discussion in the sense that the subject, the analyst is not linked to the 'plus-one', he is linked to himself. But in the relationship that I believe I have to what I have to say or may have to say, it's a relationship that can become loose, and how!

JL: Yes, to be sure.

MS: It is not the function in a way to knot the relation between him and the other members of the cartel, but to support the relationship that each one may have in his work to what he has to say. That seems to me to constitute the essential of the function.

JL: That's exactly what I wanted, that you should speak. Sibony.

Daniel Sibony: I heard some words like 'repression' and 'putting to death'. That encourages me to give as testimony some reflections that came to me since yesterday's meeting, independently of course of any experience of the cartel since, even though I have functioned in different groups I have never found myself in a group that was called a cartel.

This troubled me so much that I finally said to myself that there is no other problem than that of the 'plus-one' in a group. I mean that the function of the one or the *une en plus, en plus*, finally there is nothing but that. So then I am going to try to explain what I mean.

If one starts from an amalgam, from a set of speaking beings, the question of what makes it hold together as such this set, therefore what makes live or decompose this meeting of beings that a priori are separate, this question is necessarily present, of course. But I would say that it is the way in which repetition works on the set that decides. Repetition can be purely numerical: $1 + 1 + 1$ etc... in which case the elements count and intervene in it in terms of 1 by 1. It's not sure that such a set is going to be tenable for a long time since precisely it ignores time; it knows nothing of rhythm and punctuation. And these elements can only hold together in it as dead. It is a too perfect narcissistic level or again it is what one could call a trivial set. I will tell you later that what suggests this denomination is that one of the other names of the Borromean knot or of the Borromean knots, with n elements, these are called quasi-trivial knots. That means that they have the minimum that is necessary to be not completely trivial. But in fact there it's a very naive point of view, because by reason of the effects of speech, human sets however small they may be, know both the sensible determinations of their manifest finitude – there is no infinite meeting of individuals - and, in addition to this manifest finitude, the paradoxes of what one could call their latent infinitude which comes there as an extra imposition, which comes to overdetermine in a crushing and plural way the individuals who are present.

Thus the effect by which such a set flees the fact that there are leaks....

JL: Latent infinitude, that is precisely what the 'plus-one' is.

DS: Precisely, that was what I was trying to articulate. Therefore the effects by which such a set closes, opens, that of its pulsations finally, is the effect by which there is traced its frontiers and its limits and there is no need to be astonished that this effect is contaminated by the invention of the minimal trace by means of negation, following repression and rejection; in short this trace is compromised with the multiple and exuberant forms of negation.

And since from the outset we come on traces, and that by means of writing, I would say that a set of speaking beings only holds together if it is affiliated to a writing in progress, to the impossibilities of a writing, or again if it has the pretension to be already accomplished, to the necessity of preserving it, of transmitting it, and subsequently to chew over it ruminates it consumes it.

Thus the family set abuts onto what remains, the child, as a witness and a support of an impossibility to write the sexual relationship. Who will deny that it consumes it? Another example: the people of the Book (those that are called that) who undo by a reading the preceding reading and makes it incomplete each time by its complementary commentaries.

And coming to something that is very sensitive for me, what you have evoked last night and speaking about a group of mathematicians. Such a group – since as it happens it's something that's very familiar to me – refers itself to a being which is only sustained by a pure writing, mathematics. It is a group whose heart beats to the rhythm of this being to whom testimonies are proposed in the form of demonstrations, to this being which trembles and is nourished by their written – I said written - embellishments. When it is written, it is good, I don't mean when that is denoted in mathematical language there are people who confuse writing and the fact of leaving coherent traces. They avoid the whole question of the function of writing. Therefore this being, of this complement-theory, comes as we might say to exalt its incompleteness, and it transmits it to the beings who are reunited under its sign. If there is an *en plus* in this group it's the *en plus* of an imminent theorem, I mean the one that is not yet written but which is on the point of being so. The imminent theorem which is there being constructed, in the progress of the work is important namely, this thing that in a moment, if you're lucky, is going to complete an errant speech, punctuate free and curious associations that are waiting. One waits for this *en plus* this supplying unity which by joining itself to the writing is going to vivify the scar of this great gaping body.

And when this impatient, active, exasperated waiting culminates at a type of big 'catch' I asked myself yesterday why one sometimes says in such a group that this theorem that has just been written for the first time therefore, one says that one has killed it. It is not dead for all that, and even we are going to be able make use of it to do lots of things. But in the same instant, a fleeting instant, it has been made to arrive at the same time at the *en plus* at a place of death. A death has passed by it, by this *un-en-plus*. Or rather this writing has passed, the moment of a flash at the place where the lack slides and comes itself to be missing.

It's a very well known idea that whoever adds a knowledge adds a pain. And it is really true in this case: this 'plus-one', this plus-one unit of knowledge, makes a hole, a void and brings with it an extra one as a less, as an insistent absence that torments you. That already means that this *en-plus* makes death function in a very ambiguous way. It is not the place of death that is presentified, because by being designated this place fills itself. Perhaps it is a trace of death, in a process of all-out decomposition, living. Perhaps a piece of the stubborn mother, the *res*, the mother thing. Because it's important that this plus should appear as iridescent with femininity. What a group has in common – I obviously find this to be a very bad expression – is that they support together the weight, the signifying weight, the literal stain of this *en-plus*, which is also the minimal excess for it to hold together. As I said earlier: the Borromean knot is such that it has, not at the level of the number of its circles, three or four or thirty six, but in its structure, in the effusion of this *un-en-plus* on all the elements, it has the minimum necessary for it not to be trivial. That means that every strict sub-knot is trivial. A sub-knot, namely, a knot that one gets by abstracting one element. A trivial knot means that the rings of string wander in the air without any attachment among them.

It is therefore then this unknown without which it doesn't hold together. But because of the fact that it holds together this unknown has as it were dissolved. It is compromised with all the others, united to all the others. It is a presence that has become potential by having been at least once effective. There is there

something of the order of almost and the proximity of almost, of the almost nothing, of its proximity to the function of death.

JL: Of the almost nothing or the almost all?

DS: Therefore this presence that has become potential by having been at least once effective, that there exists of it at least an extra trace, means that potentially any one of its traces can animate this excessive function, this function of excess. There is here a slippage from the 'it exists' to 'whatever may be'. What is important is that once it begins to function, this *une-en-plus* is already lost as such, it has become the evanescence, ungraspable *o*. If in the Borromean knot, by some really tyrannical unreal decision only one of the rings can be cut to render manifest the quasi-trivial character, if therefore only one ring supported the Borromean character, if therefore one determined element saves the group from its triviality, this element becoming thus predicated, then the knot would no longer be quasi-trivial, nor its writing minimal. It would be referred to a sort of chit-chat of writing. In short this *une-en-plus* depends on the object of desire, and at the same time on the One that is at least in the sense where you say there is something of the One.

But everything depends on which One this group is dealing with. The absurd hypothesis that I made just now about the knot where a single element will have the privilege against all real necessity of saving the group from its triviality, you can see its meaning in the fact that an element of the group might imagine that it's his presence or absence supports the decision.

JL: Nevertheless that's what's at stake.

DS: Yes, while it is all the more paradoxical that someone, perhaps you on this occasion, has knotted that with respect to something really quasi-trivial, and that then an element is imagined (there is a necessity that one should 'imagine' such things) that its presence or absence renders the group decidable. Therefore it will imagine itself to be the element of the support of absolute love or absolute hate. I am saying therefore that it all depends on the One that this group is dealing with. Therefore I would say that this 'plus-one' (we would have to ask ourselves what is meant by 'plus' here but that would take too long) is a scrap of writing. We can understand that its place is rather risky, all the more risky, I have just insisted on it, in that one and another imagined it to be predicable, even if they are analysts. They would then be (this is one of the points that should be gone into) in this 'plus-one', curiously the function of remainder. The One that would be a remainder, or laid up, a remainder namely, closest to the point by which the real is going to be insinuated into the group.

JL: That when all is said and done is what is at stake. What is at stake is that each one imagines himself to be responsible for the group, to have to answer for it as such, as himself.

DS: We can add that the remainder, outside the One which is imagined, can also be imagined – there have been in history enough sacrificial orgies for that...

JL: He is not mistaken to imagine himself *en plus*, since in fact, what makes the Borromean knot is subject to this condition that each one is effectively, and not simply imaginarily, what holds together the whole group.

So then what it is a matter of showing is not the point up to which it is true but the point up to which it is real, namely, what forms of knot are capable of effectively supporting this real which holds together, which depends on this, that the fact that breaking one, is enough to liberate the others. That has all the same limits that should be explored, because there are things that can give the appearance of a Borromean knot and all the same not exist as such, namely, where the rupture of a loop does not involve the dissolution of all the rest, the detachment of all the rest one by one. And that, there is a way of illustrating it, as one might say this question of course of illustration posing just by itself a question as to whether: is it enough to illustrate a knot – and it is only illustrated when it is flattened out – in order that that should be a demonstration? A showing, certainly, but a demonstration where does that reside? Is it the true support of the showing?

DS: On that point I will make some remarks. First of all, I refer to the function of writing, and on this occasion what you have called the impossibility of writing the sexual relationship; I would even say, even if the formula is a bit abrupt, that to say that there is always something of a 'plus-one', or of a 'plus-one' rather something of a *plus-une* in a group, or to say rather 'there is racism' is the equivalent, the two propositions being both in a certain way being equivalent to a third which is yours: that there is no sexual relationship. This is a first point it is not worth the trouble to say any more about it.

By contrast, on the knot effect, what I tried to highlight earlier, is that the knot can be a good knot, let us say a quasi-trivial knot, that would have the minimum necessary not to become undone, to become decomposed. And nevertheless, a little by the language and the tongue that it sustains, here we have one of the rings becoming privileged by the imaginary that it has before it, that its presence and its absence are decisive, or support the decision. That makes me think of something which is of the order of demonstration and not of showing, on the side of the mental knot.

JL: There is no knot except a mental one.

DS: The fact is that in a certain way the importance of a knot is that it makes itself represented by a tongue, or a scrap of tongue, or a language, in an approximate way. And what there is, is that a knot involves, but at the level in this case of demonstration, namely, of the necessity in writing, of literal necessity, it comprises an undecidable an impossibility of decision, not by ignorance but in an intrinsic way. To remain with the mathematical metaphor, if you attach a letter to each ring and you follow what is called the group or what is called the presentation of group associated with this knot, there are posed what is called in English 'the word problem' or word problems. There is posed for example the question as to whether, given their fundamental identities, when a word can be reduced to one of these identities, by means of an algorithm? That is the perfect ideal and deceptive decision. Unfortunately, and in a certain fashion happily, it is

demonstrated that it is impossible, not that one cannot do it, but that one manages to demonstrate that it is impossible. This may interest you in the measure that perhaps it would be the effect of demonstration; it is this necessity by which a certain language is led to crash precisely before the impossibility of this algorithm. That is what the demonstration is.

JL: The impossibility of affirming anything whatsoever demonstrable concerning a certain proposition.

DS: No the demonstration of the impossibility of an algorithm. But it is demonstrated. In other words there is an algorithm to demonstrate that it is not. This impossibility, demonstrated, is the maximal effect of demonstration.

Jacques Nassif: For all sorts of reasons, I cannot place myself at the level of rigour and exactitude of Sibony. What Sibony has put forward I found agreeable and even comforting but I would locate myself rather on the side of an experience which was what it was but which it seems to me I can only talk about now, many years afterwards – perhaps I am situating myself at the level of intuition on what was and which is not always perhaps accessible to me – I think that I came to it in a little group that we formed, to formulated something which may sign the end, and which was: ‘Let no one enter here who wants to do the work of an author’. Namely, that there is not necessarily simply filiation to a way of writing or a scrap of writing, (perhaps once again I am understanding things in a fashion that is quite common in what I heard) but perhaps there is also at a certain moment a desire to proceed to a demonstration, precisely, an irrepressible desire to situate oneself as an author, therefore to go at a book or a writing, a writing which holds together, namely, which the subject leaps and submits this writing to circulation. Perhaps it is precisely the stumbling point of this type of group, the point starting from which precisely the ‘plus-one’ tries to incarnate itself elsewhere, elsewhere than in the group precisely.

JL: What do you think, Sibony, of the formula that I put forward yesterday and is obviously founded on Bertrand Russell theme namely, that in mathematics one does not know what one is talking about. By substituting for this ‘what’ a ‘who’ namely, precisely something of the order of the person, of the order of the subject can one say that, for a mathematician, it is tolerable? In other words can one say that in order to make mathematics something transmissible, it is of the order of a ‘who’? That mathematics is a subject? It is the *une-en-plus* of everything that is mathematician. Except for the fact that the whole mathematical community breaks down if there is not this *une-en-plus*, mathematics, and mathematics as subject. Bertrand Russell did not raise this because he was, which is curious for a mathematician, centred on the object, on an object which is pure dream. There is no mathematical objectivity. He affirmed it. Which is rather curious for a mathematician. So then if it’s not an object, what is it?

DS: I am tempted to respond: it is no longer a subject; you say: one does not know what one is talking about but one knows about whom; that was what I was trying to get you to sense in the pulsation by which, once the *en-plus* is acquired, it is already lost, namely, that once it enters into function it is obsolete.

JL: It is obsolete and it is nevertheless acquired.

DS: It is acquired in such a way that apart from some important narcissistic satisfactions, because we are in the process of talking about what is imagined, but we no longer talk about it, namely, that on the one hand we no longer talk about it but as regards who we are talking about, I have the impression – I talked about the stubborn mother or about the thing, but in a certain way it is because we no longer know who we are talking about, unless we repeat the attempt or the temptation. It is evident that there is a subject-effect. The proof is that one can talk about it in threes or fours and produce something of the *en-plus*, therefore make a supposition of it. If that was of interest we would have to end up with a statement like the following, but I do not see what one could make of it, which is that a group of analysts would be a set of people with *en-plus* psychoanalysis, or the object of psychoanalysis. Namely, that it would be a group of psychoanalysts in which each one would call himself a psychoanalyst or function as such.

MS: As regards this formula, I wasn't there yesterday, but I would say that there is a perplexity which is not unique in its genre, namely, that in a sense, in effect, there are no mathematicians without mathematics but there is no mathematics without mathematicians. But when we propose the modification of the formula that you have just now said, you still have to explain the who. It's mathematics. But the problem arises again. The mathematics which for its part is supposed to be the 'plus-one', is it a subject? What gives it its specificity with regard to the mathematician, without whom there is no mathematics possible?

JL: It is about that that I would question a mathematician: a mathematician, in mathematics, is dealing with a person.

DS: On that we can agree.

JL: This indeed is why all these people – it is not for nothing that in *Ornicar?* we were shown a face, rather ape-like, of grammar, it is because one imagines that there are others besides mathematics. For grammar it is just as problematic as for analysis. For mathematics it is certain that it is a person. The very fact that you would agree with me, we can say has the value of a testimony.

DS: Simply I would formulate it as that (moreover I think that's how you understand it): one speaks of it as of a person.

JL: A mathematician has very clearly the sentiment of what works or what does not work. With what or with whom? It is not the mathematical community which is the demiurge. The proof is when Cantor put forward his whole machine, there were some mathematicians who spat in his face, and at the same time he was able to have the feeling that he was mad. But all the same he held on and he continued. He was dealing with mathematics. It is not at all the same thing for analysis because analysis is to be created.

JDN: But I would say without being a mathematician: is this person not in relationship with the fact that there is no mathematics without writing? Namely, that it is in the writing itself that the subject comes to be installed to be produced understanding writing as this written trace. The community of mathematicians is made on paper. We would have to find analogies and differences with the analyst. The analyst writes also. He writes and he speaks, namely, that he is in relationship to two material singularities: the stroke and the voice.

JL: Mathematicians believe in mathematics in the sense that I give to this term. And nothing can be done about it. They believe in it!

Christiane Bardet-Giraudon: Yes they believe in it. There is a mathematical consensus. There is no analytic consensus, and there ought not to be an analytic complicity. And I think that it is here precisely that the functioning of the cartel is inscribed, in the measure that the cartel is perhaps in effect something original that can introduce an analytic dimension into a research to prevent it becoming either mathematical or academic. Namely, that in the cartel, or at least what we understand of it, and even what we read about it, one might think that the difficulty is the same as in the analytic contract, namely, that one must sustain this type of paradoxical thing which is the encounter with a desire, namely, the desire to do something together, to create something as subjects, and on the other hand a certain number of rules which are rigid rules. And if you wish, it seems to me that what is properly analytic about the cartel, is precisely this repetition of the same basic data, namely, on the one hand the confrontation of a research and of a research of the subject who to protect its authenticity ought not to veer towards complicity.

What is proper to mathematics, the mathematical person (I'm not at all a mathematician) has all the same to deal with the truth, and a truth which is not contestable once one is a mathematician. Cantor had no chance of becoming mad, because either one could follow his reasoning if one were a mathematician or again if one were not so one could not embark either on its refutation nor on its denial.

AS regards the position of the analyst, in my sense it is quite different. So then the cartel, I think would have to undergo for its part also a certain modification. There are people who think, rightly or wrongly I don't know I haven't used the cartel very much, that it is the one who has chosen the theme of the cartel who is, as one might say, the master. I don't think it's that at all. I think that in the cartel we have to reintroduce in the same way as one has employed the term analyser two terms which would be: cartellised and cartelliser and that a cartel can only function in the measure in which it is only made up of cartellisers. And perhaps in effect to maintain this function there must be a 'plus-one' somewhere, this 'plus-one' being not a person, not a mask which is the expression of the person, perhaps death as someone said this morning, may in any case certainly a function, namely, something labile, and something where a certain circulation is produced.

JL: (To DS) Tell me what was expressed in your smile when I said that mathematicians believe in it (*y croient*), in mathematics. Tell me what you think of it, because all the same, it is the only thing of which one can say that one

believes in it with reason, and which rests entirely on this formula: to believe in it (*y croire*). All of those whom I know as mathematicians distinguish very clearly between what is mathematics and what is not such. And the only thing, not that they believe, but in which they believe, is mathematics. That is what defines a mathematician. Does the formula *y croire* seem to have a weight for you?

DS: If you employ it, it is because you are well aware of its other usages, especially believe in God (*croire en Dieu*).

JL: That's what I find annoying! There is all the same the *en*. It is not the same thing as the *à*. One believes in effect in God (*en Dieu*) namely, within this mythical being, if it is even the case that the word being is appropriate. To say 'I believe in God', is perfectly adequate. I mean that one is enveloped in this belief. But *y croire*, is not the same. That is why I said all the same that in the symptom, one believes in it (*on y croit*), in such a way that I would be rather inclined to think that mathematics is a symptom, just like a woman. That is why I am not dissatisfied that it ends up by being supported in the form of 'plus-one' (*plus-une*). Tell me because I do not consider myself to be a mathematician; if I believe in it, in something, I am not a mathematician. But I know a certain number of them, apart from you, they believe it. Poincaré *y croyait*.

DS: Perhaps that defines the mathematician. That is perhaps the reason why in a certain way even though....

JL: The mathematician has mathematics as a symptom.

DS: Yes that is perhaps why to produce mathematics does not define you as a mathematician, contrary to what Descartes said. You have to believe in it. But then what might this being, mathematics, be, if it is only sustained by a writing? What would a subject be that is only sustained by a writing?

JL: Is it not sustained only by a writing? We put our finger on the fact that it is always supported by a writing. But when all is said and done I am interrogating you about something for which for the moment I have no response, the difference between showing and demonstration; that is what is at stake, when all is said and done.

MS: Is an analysed mathematician cured of his belief?

JL: This is really a question. Is the mathematical symptom curable?

DS: I would like simply to make a remark, but not an answer to your question...

JL: What about you, are you cured of mathematics? (*Laughter*).

DS: That is the whole ambiguity of believing in it, the fact is that in the very measure that it is also something of a game, one can play at believing in it. Or rather one can allow oneself to be supposed to believe in it, by the writing which works, and once this (the writing I mean) is complete, be supposed to have

believed in it. But the incurable mathematician, a little as my neighbour has suggested to me, *y croit* but would not be free not to *y croire*.

JL: He is incontestably not free not to *y croire*.

DS: But all the same it's a rather strange belief because finally it is the whole function of the subject of this writing, because it may surprise him but it cannot deceive him.

JL: That's true.

DS: It can surprise him to the point of being a catastrophe, but not deceive him as far as the slightest anxiety. In other words it might be a symptom without anxiety.

JL: There are a whole lot of symptoms without anxiety. This indeed is why I distinguish anxiety from the symptom, as Freud does. Anyway I believe that all the same I have, in accordance with the wishes of Faladé, avowed what is behind this tentative proposition that the cartel represents. That would perhaps all the same mean that people might get to know a little bit more about what I mean at least.

So will we end this session? (The session is ended at 1600 hours).

PS By D Sibony

I would add the following remark which for me may dissipate what is nebulous in the question: the 'plus-one' is an additional presence of the One. There are religions where when three of the faithful are together, there is a presence of the One that they invoke, which is dispersed when they disperse. This *une-en-plus* has therefore no need to be incarnated in order to function; and this effect is not shown but is demonstrated.

Closing Session

Solange Faladé: The time has then come to conclude. If our study days had functioned like a congress, we would now have to listen to the accounts of the work of different groups. That will not happen. We will have the acts of these study days.

This closing session must not put a final full stop to this exchange between the different cartels of the School. It's a matter of an inaugural session. Which means that other meetings are now foreseen. What is more if it is true that up to now cartels in the sense that Dr Lacan understands them have been rare in the School, starting from what has been contributed during these days, a re-launch of this form of work is to be foreseen.

As one of us underlined this morning, the structure that Lacan wanted for these cartels in the school should allow us to avoid two dangers: totalitarianism and liberalism. In the course of these discussions on the cartels, if these points are now clearer for us – many forgotten points of the founding act – there nevertheless remains a point which for many of us remains obscure, it is the necessity of this 'plus-one' person, its function in the life of the cartel. Perhaps Dr Lacan will accept to clarify it for us a little.

JL: I said – I regret that my dear Solange wasn't there, but she can't be everywhere at once; nevertheless this is what she usually does! – I said certain things; I'm going to repeat them for her; I said certain things the essence of which referred to mathematics and, to say the word, I started, because it is the law of speech that one should refer to previous speech, I started from Bertrand Russell, who is not a newcomer in mathematics, far from that, since it was he who, in the *Principia*, that you know, I suspect, whose title at least you have in your head, it is he who went as far as to state that the mathematicians did not know what they were talking about; I proposed a modification of this formula to someone who happens to have some mathematical formation, and I obtained the approbation of someone else whom I don't know, a young woman who presented herself to me afterwards as a mathematician; for her (I don't know whether for the mathematician that I am talking about what I said makes sense), this seemed to bring some satisfaction, that I substituted for 'they don't know what they are talking about' a 'on the contrary they know very well who they are talking about'.

It is obviously there that I will limit myself for the moment, since this 'about whom' in question which can be supported by a name, by a reference, to call it mathematics is to give to mathematics, as was pointed out to me, the value of a person. The question can be asked. Many objections have been made to it. It can already be sustained that a person, being able to be considered essentially as what is a substance for thought, namely, which is a substance that one calls thinking, it is not excluded that one can push things as far as to identify mathematics to a person.

But if I found myself present in this place where the function of the cartel was being discussed, it is indeed because I was particularly keen to do so. I was particularly keen that what I put forward in my propositions for the functioning of the School, following these days, should receive (that's how it can be expressed) a crack of the whip. I would like that these cartels whose practice I imagined should be installed in a more stable fashion in the school.

The central point for what justifies the indication of the term cartel I cannot say from now on, because I do not see why I would make a break; up to now each one has only presented his candidature to be a member of the School as an individual, it has to be said; that is how it happens; it is judged at the level of a body that is called the directorate, whether yes or no we are going to admit someone to the title of member of the School. It is quite understood, well positioned at the beginning of what is the rule for admission into the School, that it is in no way obligatory for all that to be an analyst and that on the contrary, the school has to learn from whoever, formed to a completely different discipline to analysis, can contribute by what is commonly called their knowledge to be contributed to the dossier of what is undoubtedly for us analysts and which is only too well proved, we are lacking, to contribute to us some material which we can in short make a support for our practice. It is even on this that there rests the idea that we must all the same advance a term, and as it happens I chose this year the term consistency to designate precisely what resists, what has some chance of becoming part of a real.

So then what is to be explained in my advance, my enunciation, my proposition that one should enter the School not as an individual but in a cartel, the fact is that it would obviously be desirable to see this being realised in future, and that which, I repeat, cannot be defined as being henceforth the condition, but it would be desirable that people should get it into their head that one comes into it with several heads together and in the name, by way of a cartel.

There is a second aspect in this notion of cartel: that is why and how I propose (since because some of it is still there) as constituted by a number which does not go very far, by a minimum number; why this minimal number, I enunciated it as four, since I said three 'plus-one' person, and I did not dare to go further than five, which with the addition of a person makes six, why did I consider it to be desirable that the cartel should be from four to six, that is what has to be justified and what I hope to sufficiently articulate perhaps already in my next seminar, given that now I think that there are no more than two before the end of the year, the amphitheatre that I occupy and where you find yourselves in great number – too numerous for my taste – being mobilised by the function of examinations starting from a certain time in May which remains to be determined.

Therefore it is there, in those two last seminars that I hope to justify, I mean to justify for you, for your understanding, why this minimum number is required, I mean that it remains only among the very first, why is there in short a necessity that it should not go beyond this number.

There are for that reasons that I hope I can make you sense, that are linked to the very structure, which all the same does not lower this number below a certain

rate and which specifically considers the two or even the three to be too few. This I will have to justify, because obviously the three, I insisted enough on it in order for it to appear that it's desirable. Why the four from the outset, is, I repeat, what remains to be well situated.

There are nevertheless things which ought to encourage us to be less prudent, let us say, it's a lesser prudence which will be also less rigorous. It is all the same an experience which is patent which is that communities exist, that are called, not for nothing, religious, which for them have never seen, and have never seen without reticence this limitation of the number. It seems that there is no limit to what the religious community may represent. This is certainly not without reason. And these are reasons which, I repeat, I hope to make you sense. The anonymity that presides over a religious community is something that ought already to make you have a presentiment that in this little number, there is a link with the fact that each one carries, in this little group, his name.

It is certain that we do not have the same object as the one that dominates the reality of a religious community, that what interests us in our practice is not what interests a religious community. When I call it religious, it is a way of speaking. I mean that I am not putting all religions in the same sack; I already specified the one that dominates in what could be called our countries, namely, Christianity, which has not emerged from nothing, which has emerged from the Jewish and which still carries it in a quite singular fashion (the relations between the Jewish community and the Christian community are marked by something of which I hope the term let us say of survival to designate the fashion in which the Jewish continues to be carried by the Christian does not seem to be exaggerated – it is a way of connoting it, there may be other ways of indicating it, ways to which perhaps I will come back later). The religious community has as a foundation what can all the same not designate in a too inadequate fashion by myth, the myth which designates this God, which is far from being simple, it is even complex, and even so complex that the Christian community found it necessary to have its hand forced and to articulate it as Trinitarian; I already said on the occasion of my seminar what I thought of it; it is not just the Christian community which saw that there was no tenable God that was not triple.

What is curious, is that obviously people have spoken a lot people have written a lot about this trinity, but that it has never been given any justification, of course, and that I believe myself, rightly or wrongly, to have the privilege, by my triple knot, to have given a form to what one might call its real.

Someone told me that he had seen – I am pointing it out to you because it is something I welcomed with a lot of interest – at the *Bibliothèque Nationale*, in an exposition of miniatures, something which is supposed to be found currently (the person took note of this) in the community library of Chartres; someone therefore (I am waiting to see it because after all it is something to be tested) is supposed to have seen a Borromean knot with the enunciation alongside of 'trinitas'; he is supposed to have seen the three little lines by which as you know I eventually symbolise it, this Borromean knot, these three little lines which cross over one another in a certain way, in the way in which one makes bundles with guns, you put three guns together and they hold up, they lean upon one another in a circle

one against the other, and it is the same – I didn't tell you this at the seminar because this did not seem to me to be something that needed to be said, but everyone knows that in something that serves as a symbol for a certain Gaelic, and even a Brittany that is in the process of waking up, the triskel is something that realises these three little bits in the way that I usually draw them on the board as a starting point, and that to this triskel reduced therefore, which is just as much a Borromean knot as the complete form, to this triskel there is supposed to be added the written indication of 'trinitas'.

What is it in all of that that creates our relation? Our relation is limited to the fact that if I define something that could be said as being analysis, I would call it not the religion of some supreme being, as all the same many people among us have never been able to detach themselves from; I already said that I am not even sure of not being caught red-handed in deism, and you are perhaps going to see it right away: if I talk about a religion of desire, that does seem all the same to be that, especially if desire, seems to me to be linked not alone to a notion of a hole, and of a hole where many things whirl around in a way to become stuck together, but already to join to it this notion of whirlwind, it is obviously to make this hole multiple, I mean by that to make it at least a conjunction; in order to draw a whirlwind for you remember my knot in question, and you must have at least three for that to make a whirling hole. If there is no hole, I do not see very well what we are doing as analysts, and if this hole is not at least triple, I do not see how we could support our technique which refers essentially to something which is triple, and which suggests a triple hole.

In any case it is quite sure that as regards the symbolic, there is something tangible that creates a hole. It is not simply probably, but manifest that everything that is referred to the imaginary, namely, to the corporeal, is what first emerged, there not simply does it make a hole, but analysis thinks about everything that refers to the body in these terms, and the whole question is to know in what way the incidence of language, the incidence of the symbolic is necessary to think about that which around the body, in analysis was thought of as linked let us say to different holes. There is no need here to underline the degree to which the oral, the anal, without counting the others that I believed I should join there to account for what is involved in the drive, no need to underline that the function of orifices in the body is indeed there to designate that this term hole, it is not a simple equivocation to transport it from the symbolic to the imaginary.

On the subject of the real, it is clear that I try, to make this real function starting from this simple remark that to define it as universe, is to impose it as cyclical, as circular, that introduces the One, for it is the notion of the universe, it is by making it encompassing with regard to the body that it inhabits, is to make it world. I am not sure that the real makes a world, and that is why I try to articulate something which expresses, which dares for the first time to advance that it is not sure that the real makes an all. It is obviously difficult to see what physics could be established, if it is not to be admitted that at least portions of this universe are isolatable, are closable. It is on this that there reposes, as you know I think, the very notion of energy, the idea that energy is constant and the very principle and the basis on which in physics one could say that the notion of

law itself reposes, and the idea that there is an all is something without which one cannot even see how science could be supported.

But after all, it is all the same curious that we no longer have any graspable idea about the confines of this universe and that and what in short I am putting forward, what I am daring to put forward, is something which in principle is the following, it is that for us analysts nothing obliges us to make of the real something which would be the universe, which would be closed. The idea that this universe is simply consistency, the consistency of a thread which holds up is not enough to make it cyclical, but it is already a lot as a hypothesis, and for us this can be enough, I mean that with two cycles and a straight line to infinity, which is already to advance a lot for the real, we can make a knot, a Borromean knot which completely holds up, which really makes a knot.

So that we can for our part support the idea that the real is not all, it is already a reassurance which is perhaps also not without interest for physicists, and a physicist will indeed become accustomed to the idea that one can perhaps think of the real without putting into it a constant, the constant called energy, and it is indeed here that there begins the idea that the constant is not consistency. To reduce the constant to consistency is perhaps something tenable for physicists.

But anyway, it is not in a physics to come that I want to engage you here; for us, our business, is to notice the fact which is striking in all our historical experience and which is essential for us and which is the following: it is that there are names. And there should be names, it seems indeed that this is an altogether nodal fact, I mean that as long as human memory goes, one has always given names to things, you can find that even in Freud, it is indeed something to retain our attention. It is not for nothing, I recall, that when I wrote the Freudian thing, around me there were a whole lot of people who pouted: 'Why is he calling it that, the thing, it's disgusting, everything that we are trying, is precisely to oppose ourselves to reification'; for my part I was never of this opinion; I never thought that when a break happened, that of '53, it was because we diverged on the fact of reifying or not reifying what was at stake in practice; it was to reify in the right way. If I called something the thing and specifically the Freudian thing, it is obviously to indicate that there is something of Freud in the thing that he named; what he named, is the unconscious, and the term Freudian has not at all the function of a predicate, it is not something that subsequently has the property of being Freudian, it is quite certain that it is because Freud stated it that there is a thing, and as I suggested to somebody recently, to speak about the unconscious as something that did not exist before Freud is not a bad way of expressing things for a good reason, it is because after all a thing does not ex-sist, does not begin to operate, until the moment when it has been well and truly named by someone.

So then I am trying to manage to reduce this nameable of our experience because all the same one can allow oneself like that to button all sorts of thing with names, this has always been done and it has been done without rhyme or reason, I tried to reduce myself to only name what I call with Freud the *Urverdrängt*, which can be summarised in short as naming the hole. It is starting from the idea of the hole namely, not *fiat lux* but *fiat trou*, and think that Freud in advancing the idea of the unconscious did no more. He said very early on that there is

something that creates a hole, that it is around this that there is shared out the unconscious and that this unconscious has the property of only being aspirated by this hole, aspirated so well that one does not have the habit, make no mistake of retaining even a little bit, it disappears completely into this hole. To talk about the Freudian Thing as constituted essentially by this hole, this hole which has a site, a site in the symbolic, that is to say something which at the very least, I proved it in any case, can be sustained for a certain time, and since this time begins to date and that during this time there had not been many contradictions that are worth anything, I mean to what I enunciated, it begins already to at least be supported because it has lasted for so long.

That I identify this hole to topology, I made an allusion to that in my last seminar; topology, I think that I indicated it, at least made it felt by some, this cannot be conceived without this knot which as I said earlier, in another grouping, is not simply something, even though it is there that it has its appearance of knot, it is in the real but what is interesting is that it is in the mental, it is in the first time that one has seen something which conjoins the mental and the real at this point, the fact is that the mental also makes a knot; it is truly at once impossible not to put the knot into the mental and at the same time to see that the mental is very ill adapted to it, namely, that this knot, it is thought with such difficulty that we cannot not see in it something that would give us in a way what I called at my last seminar something like a presentiment, as one might say of what might well be when all is said and done the hole in question.

All of that of course is a precipitation why not say it, after the straying, everyone knows that I have boasted about dialectic, and that I used the term before coming to this whirlwind; it is well worthwhile noticing that anyone who talks about dialectic always evokes a substance. Dialectic is essentially predicative, it constitutes an antinomy, and no predicate which of itself does not support a substance: it is very, very, difficult to speak about \circ substantively, especially that we imagine everyone to be a substance. It is very difficult obviously to get that out of your heads, even though everything shows that you are nothing at the most except a little hole, certainly a complete and whirling hole, but that it is really very, very, difficult to think about you as a substance, if not as this substance having this property to be thinking, and that that again becomes really hopeless to think the point at which your thought is manifestly impotent. It seems that it is all the same more solid to refer to other categories and to see for example that one can enunciate without absurdity propositions like the following, put them forward with some chance of hitting the spot, and if there is something of the undecidable (I evoked that earlier) it is an undecidable which is only supported from the following: that we not hit, that there is something of the undecidable but that the idea of it only comes to us from this assurance taken from mathematics precisely that there is no non-knot, as I might say because it is the only definition in short that is possible of the real, and that to tighten the knots, even if it were only in order not to be definitively sliding, this is what we spend our time at in analysis.

Because what is analysis when all is said and done? It is all the same this thing which is distinguished by the following: the fact is that we have allowed ourselves a sort of irruption of the private into the public. The private, that evokes the wall,

everyone's little affairs. Everyone's little affairs, that has a perfectly characteristic kernel, which is that they are sexual affairs. It is the kernel of the private. It is all the same funny that this public into which we make this private emerge, that public has an altogether manifest link, for etymologists with *publis*, namely, that what is public, is what emerges from what is shameful, for how distinguish the private from what we are ashamed of.

It is clear that the indecency of all of that, the indecency of what happens in an analysis, this indecency, as I might say, thanks to castration the dimension of which analysis is well designed to evoke ever since Freud, thanks to castration this indecency disappears. The whole question is therefore the following: to draw an enjoyment from castration, is that what surplus enjoying is? In any case it is all that is permitted for the moment, to whatever person, if it is the case that the word person designates no one. It designates a thinking substance no doubt, but what we strive for, even when our preoccupations are not at all substantial, nor substantophore, what we strive for, is all the same to make that enter, that notion of thinking substance, into a real. So then it's not self-evident of course, because there are a lot of things that we are burdened with. We are burdened for example with the idea of life. It is an idea like that, it is rather curious that despite everything Freud put forward the notion of Eros but that he did not dare to completely identify it to the idea of life and that he all the same distinguished the life of the body and life insofar as it is carried by the body in the germen.

Life, as one might say, despite the use that Freud made of it, has something with which that has nothing to do with, it is with what passes for being its antinomy, it's with death.

Death, whatever one thinks, is purely imaginary. If there were no body, if there were no corpse, what would make us make a link between life and death? Naturally this idea of the *poireau*, of the bunch of corpses, we agree to knot that, it is even our principle preoccupation. If there was that, if there were not statues, the raging aspect of these so-called human beings to fabricate their own statues, namely, things which have absolutely nothing to do with the body but which all the same resemble it, is enough to make you bless religions who forbade this obscenity; in any case it's horrible to look at! What is more horrible to see than a human being, I ask you! A human being, a human form. It is curious that...in any case we really had to have the religion described as Catholic to find pleasure in that. It is obviously because it has something to gain in this yoke, it is patent, we can see the mechanism clearly; it plays on the beautiful; moreover what is all this unbelievable story of the gospel, make no mistake, if it is not the exaltation of the beautiful. I will show you that another time.

Anyway *perinde ac cadaver*, that means that castration all the same, the castration that we ourselves have glimpsed, is an enjoyment, why is it an enjoyment? We can see it very well, it is because it delivers us from anxiety. But then what is this anxiety?

It is all the same curious that we had not all the same drawn a little the moral of Freud's little Hans. Anxiety, is very precisely localised at a point of the evolution of this human vermin, it is the moment where the little man or the little future

woman notices what? Notices that he is married to his prick. You will excuse me for calling it that, it is what is generally called a penis or *pine*, and that people are proud to notice that there is nothing better to make the phallus, which is obviously a complication, a complication linked to the fact of the knot, to the existence, make no mistake of the knot. But if there is something which is done in the five case histories to show us the relationship between anxiety and the discovery of the little wee-wee, let us call it like that also, it is all the same clear it is certain and it is altogether conceivable that for the little girl, as they say it is more obvious that is why she is happier; it is more spread out because she has to spend a certain time before realising that she does not have this little wee-wee; that makes her anxious also, but it is all the same an anxiety with reference, with reference to the one who is afflicted by it; I say afflicted, it is because I spoke about marriage that I speak about that; everything that allows to escape from this marriage is obviously welcome, hence the success of drugs for example there is no other definition of a drug than the following: it is what allows the marriage to this little wee-wee to be broken.

But anyway let's leave that to one side and let's come to serious matters, namely, that it would not be a bad way of envisaging what is called life to consider it as a parasite. To say that it is a parasite on death would be exaggerated, that would create too tight a link for what I have just said, namely, that there is not the least relationship except this business of the body that is thrown into a hole. It is precisely that that tells us perhaps what life is, the fact is that it is the parasite of something which cannot be conceived except as a hole, it is even around that that the real acts as cyclic, which means that people want it to be in this little 'houseen' that life parasites. From which of course everything flows. I cannot say that Freud went that far, but all the same he said quite a few things; that the germen should be when all is said and done a parasite, this is what seems to me to emerge from beyond the pleasure principle. Obviously, he did not say that clearly, but it would have created less of a scandal, said at that time, than perhaps I am creating now by saying it. But that would also have lightened things a lot; that would have allowed him to call differently the reality principle which is simply a principle of collective fantasy; I said it last night to the admissions committee. What are your criteria? That I am asked, as regard the admissions committee, to name someone AME. I'm going to tell you: it's what is called common sense. It is the thing that is most widespread in the world. Common sense is that: 'We can trust him', nothing more. There are absolutely no other criteria. There are people who are proposed for the title of AME and if the people who are there and who were incontestably chosen by vote, because one has confidence in them in terms of their common sense, not to guarantee just anybody, is a principle of pure phantasy, of collective phantasy no doubt; is that what it means, the reality principle? It is absolutely certain. With use one sees that all the little private phantasies join up, join in a bunch, as I said earlier which of course is not astonishing as regards the relationship of the thing with death, since that is what I evoked there in connection with common sense that's it: broadly speaking, steps that are too dangerous; that is what is called the reality principle, and insofar as it is opposed to the pleasure principle, is opposed very seriously, because the pleasure principle has strictly only one possible definition, it's that of the least enjoyment; that's what that means. The less one enjoys, the better it is.

In such a way that that leads us to pose a certain number of couples as regards what is involved in the real the imaginary and the symbolic.

The real is very obviously for us with use, what is antinomical to sense, what opposes sense as the 0 opposes the 1. The real is strictly what has no sense. That is why our interpretation is something which only deals with the real insofar as we measure it out. We measure it out and limit it to the reduction of the symptom. There are symptoms that are not reduced. It is absolutely certain, and specifically, among others, psychoanalysis. Psychoanalysis is a symptom, a social symptom, and that is how its existence should be connoted. If psychoanalysis is not a symptom, I absolutely cannot see why it appeared so late. It appeared so late in the measure that it is really necessary that something should be preserved (no doubt because it is in danger), in terms of a certain relationship to substance, to the substance of the human being.

So then let us try to pose together something which situates the imaginary with respect to something else.

The imaginary has no kind of other support than the fact that there is the body, and it is insofar as this body is unknotted from phallic enjoyment that the imaginary has consistency. It is very precisely insofar as phallic enjoyment passed elsewhere, and it is a matter of history to note how it was evaded, it is in the measure that the idea of world was born. This opposition not of a zero and one but of a minus one to a plus. It is in the measure that castration works, where there is less phallus, that the imaginary subsists, everyone knows it since that is why we call pre-genital the states which constitute the most ordinary support of all the behaviours that called human.

And the symbolic then? The symbolic is simple. To the symbolic there is no opposition; there is the hole, the original hole. The symbolic only has a fake partner. It is in the measure that there is no Other of the Other, namely, that being and its negation are exactly the same thing, as everyone knows, the dialecticians tell you right away: non-being exists because you talk about it, that proves clearly the degree to which non-being is exactly the equivalent; it is thanks to that that precisely the discovery of analysis, is: even though being and non-being are the same thing, there must be a hole which makes the set hold together and that in short all of that can be summarised as follows: that there is only creation; every time that we advance a word, we make emerge from nothingness *ex nihilo* a thing, it is our fate as human beings, that is the reason why we do not fuck, unless exceptionally, with a woman from time to time, but that we fuck with the Thing.

And women then, what do they create? I heard a lot about it earlier, there is someone who has really pleased me (this is not to say that what Michèle Montrelay said before did not please me also) but there is someone Anne Colot who pointed out to me that all the same, the woman, is not completely made, and what she said was rather pertinent. She did not, thank God, employ the word creativity. She spoke about the creation as something which ensures that it is scarcely, fundamentally, that a woman knows who her baby is; the baby is like life, it is patent in the human being that it is a parasite; a parasite, is something

that only begins to exist if you precisely give it a name; as long as it does not have a name what is it? So then creativity...someone has interviewed me on the creativity of the woman. I must say that I'm too hot about it; it is not at all necessary that a woman should be creative to be interesting; it is enough that she counts; that is what has its weight.

So let us summarise. A symptom, what is it? It is something which has all the same the strongest relationship (this is what is seen in practice) with the unconscious. So then what I would wish, is that psychoanalysis, as I said earlier, should hold together, should hold together for the time that is necessary, not for a minute longer of course, as symptom, because all the same it is a reassuring symptom. (*Applause*).

(The session closed at 18.45)

Why does he take a group of mathematicians as an ideal why not a group of scientists who are working in a laboratory and also have an objective science to refer to?

To say the 'plus-one' should not be a real person is a bit like saying the analyst doesn't have to be a real person just as mathematical terms don't have to be real it seems that at this point Lacan has lost interest in explaining any further what he had clearly explained in the founding act.