In September 1987, to mark the tenth year of psychoanalytic work since its foundation in 1977, The Freudian School of Melbourne organized the First Australian Psychoanalytic Congress in Australia. The present volume contains the proceedings of this Congress.

If 1979 was the year of the first Freudian Lacanian Psychoanalytic publication in the English world, then 1987 has been the year for organizing a forum for psychoanalytic contributions from analysts and members of The Freudian School of Melbourne, as well as from people working in related fields of psychoanalysis. The pivotal idea of the Congress was based on the fact that the analyst has to provide the means to further the theory and practice of psychoanalysis.

The task of the School, on the other hand, is the transmission of psychoanalysis without concessions, thus differentiating the work of analysis from the politics of diffusion, if not dispersion. Freud and Lacan are witnesses to the history of the vicissitudes and the price that psychoanalysis always pays, when the analyst diverges from his task into the fashions of the powers in office. This is the reason for Freud's words: "I succeeded in creating the International Psychoanalytic Association, but the struggle is not yet over."

From the first issue of Papers of the Freudian School of Melbourne to the present one, one line of psychoanalytic work is being realised; the articulation of Freud and Lacan. But, as we already have said in the past, in this articulation there is neither a one-and-one-only reading, nor a revealed reading. Those who seek for such an abatement of anxiety avoid the challenge of the task. They confuse Lacan's aphorism: "The analyst authorizes from himself" with: "If I want I am able to"; asking to be authorized as university analysts, with the implicit belief that the Other exists, something to which the other lends himself gladly. Some suicide acts took place as a consequence of this belief.

What psychoanalytic discourse brings about instead is that the Other lacks, and not that it is missing. This is precisely what perversion tries to erase, and this is the disavowal of equating: "If I want I am able to" with: "If I am able to I ought to" under the guise of psychoanalysis. A return to the ideological discourse finds always a wandering mass that homogenizes
itself as soon as it can identify with the master on duty. This operation is carried out by placing the master, $S_1$, in the place of truth. Psychoanalysis, instead, teaches us to place knowledge, $S_2$, in the place of truth and not $S_1$. And this points to the heart of the matter ... psychoanalysis is not taught, it is transmitted. The fact that psychoanalysis cannot be taught is not of the order of prohibition but of what Freud called 'the impossible'. This order has produced a knowledge, $S_2$, whose characteristic consists of its location in the place of truth. This displacement of the truth is what constitutes the discourse of the analyst, an analyst for whom: "To be able to is to have to'.

This Eureka of truth is less simple to explain than the overflowing of the bath produced by the hygiene of Archimedes. This knowledge, $S_2$, which is in the place of and in relation to the truth, does not contain it; it only half says it. Here is where the consequences of the analytic work are measured.

The reason or the reasons since Freud, show that psychoanalysis does not fulfill the conditions of refutability so highly valued by the masterlogician. The unconscious responds to this refutability by the incessant existence of what is unable to be demonstrated.

Freud's and Lacan's theorization of this 'impossible' is the positivization of the real and not the truth. The truth is fiction, and the attempt of the discourse on the real, the point where the signifiers faint $S(A)$. It has been long known that the fact that the signifiers faint is not a contribution to dumbness. The real produces *Ecrits*, as Lacan pointed out.

Psychoanalysis lends its ear to this through the symptom, which is the implication of the speaking being in the conjunction and disjunction of knowledge, truth and the real.

Lastly, Papers of the Freudian School of Melbourne wishes to thank the reader who during these ten years has read us and accompanied us.

"The aberration consists in this idea of speaking so as to be understood by idiots. An idea that is ordinarily foreign to me, that could have only been suggested to me. Through friendship. Beware."

Reading is always an analytical exercise. He who knows how to read learns to practise an act that, although not qualifying, at least prepares for that particular reading which is the analytic listening — where nothing is pre-judged or pre-empted. This is the point of division between the discourse of religion, education and politics on one side, and the analytic discourse on the other. Sense is a condition necessary for the former and non-sense is constitutive of the latter. From this non-sense arises the meaning, yielding that unexpected encounter that Freud called *unconscious*.

What assembles us here — the unconscious — is not the same in Freud as in Lacan. This is what the School has been working from the very beginning. If Lacan without Freud is not only unlikely, but unthinkable, Freud without Lacan would have been reduced to the discourse of psychology. But this is already part of history.

Oscar Zentner,
Director,
The Freudian School of Melbourne.

Notes
1. LACAN.J. Television, October 40, p.7.
   A riddle for Lacanians-to-be: Who is the friend who suggested it? It may be that the answer not only would not be superfluous but of structural importance to understand the difference between transmission and diffusion of psychoanalysis.