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I have designed and painted the cover, inspired after learning
about Psychoanalysis — Freud and Lacan. The cover is a
tribute to that knowledge and to my teacher Oscar Zentner.
The front cover stands alone to be appreciated aesthetically;
the face of Freud, it needs no interpretation as it is a symbol of
Psychoanalysis.
The back cover carries meaning; it interprets; a message is
received by Lacan from the writings of Freud, and he becomes
disciple and heir.
Open the back cover and you join hands with Lacan, accom-
panying him in the direction pointed to by Freud — as
The Freudian School of Melbourne has.

Gayle Paull
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INTRODUCTION

These papers constitute the result of the first Homage to Freud in Australia on the fortieth anniversary of his death, and this first volume should be made known by an introduction which in the form of a "pro-logos" situates the position of the School.

It was on the sixth of December 1896 that Freud mentioned in a letter the advice of old Candide "travailer sans raisoner . . . ." while giving the formula of the Unbewusst.

After eighty four years of psychoanalytic history, on the fifth of January in nineteen eighty, Lacan applied the same advice, in a letter to the members of L'Ecole Freudienne de Paris. In the intervening eighty four years, there are the efforts of two men, trying to maintain the discovery of the Unbewusst at the height of its original level.

The first of these two letters bears a formula which, until Lacan's work, nobody dared to point out as the true formula of the psychic apparatus which Freud resumed later in 1925 in the 'mystic' "Wunderblock". This is where we find the first hypothesis of the apparatus in conjunction with chapter seven of the "Traumdeutung". In that 'mystic', Freud stated:

"All the forms of auxiliary apparatus which we have invented for the improvement or intensification of our sensory functions are built on the same model as the sense organs themselves or portions of them: for instance, spectacles, photographic cameras, ear-trumpets. Measured by this standard, devices to aid our memory seem particularly imperfect, since our mental apparatus accomplishes precisely what they cannot: it has an unlimited receptive capacity for new perceptions and nevertheless lays down permanent — even though not unalterable — memory-traces of them. As long ago as 1900 I gave expression in The Interpretation of Dreams to a suspicion that this unusual capacity was to be divided between two different systems (or organs of the mental apparatus). According to this view, we possess a system Pcpt.-Cs., which receives perceptions but retains no permanent trace of them, so that it can react like a clean sheet to every new perception; while the per-
manent traces of the excitations which have been
received are preserved in 'mnemonic systems' lying
behind the perceptual system. Later, in Beyond
the Pleasure Principle (1920), I added a remark
to the effect that the inexplicable phenomenon of
consciousness arises in the perceptual system in-
stead of the permanent traces."

Freud's letter started with the following passage (which the Standard
Edition of Strachey had suppressed).

"Because I feel dead tired but mentally fresh after
having fulfilled for once the measure of work and
income (10 hours, 100 florins) that I need for my
welfare, I will try to explain with simplicity my
most recent bit of speculation."

It is this "bit of speculation" summarized in the formula, which The
Freudian School of Melbourne has chosen as its seal. A seal that as such
is symbolic and indicates for us that if psychoanalysis wants to be at the
height of its founder it would only be possible if this formula could be
read against the malformation of a "Weltanschauung" of the ego. The
School stressed the "Unbewusst — sein", that one which allowed
which stresses the same "Unbewusst" when it is Freudian.

If the hand of Lacan on the cover of this book has received the super
imposition of that formula, it is because from the beginning, his work has
had the clear purpose of maintaining the originality of the Freudian
discovery. Even if for that purpose he not only suffered "ex-
communication" in the past but; like Spinoza, before him, as Lacan
himself called it, "the Chammata, which consists of appending the
clause of no return" to the kherem. Lacan fulfills for this reason the func-
tion of an hallucination in the official psychoanalytic circles, where his
discourse per-severes — because since Freud we know that the fate of
the Verwerft is to reappear from the 'real'.

Lacan dis-solved his own School when it became a resistance to the
psychoanalytic discourse. It is the Freudian "Unbewusst" which always
situates the true analyst in the 'impossible' task of speaking "without the
slightest hope — notably of being listened to".

Here is the complete text of Lacan's letter:

"I speak without the slightest hope — notably of
being listened to.

I know what I am doing — allowing for that which
is unconscious. This is my advantage over the
man who thinks and does not notice that he
speaks first — an advantage that I only owe to
my experience.

For in the interval between the word which he
misunderstands and the one which he believes he
makes himself think is where man stumbles —
which does not encourage him.

So that man thinks feebly, more feebly the
angrier he becomes... precisely because he
stumbles.

There is a problem of the school. This isn't an
enigma. I am also paying attention to it, not
prematurely.

This problem shows itself as such by having a
solution: this is the dis-solution.

I mean the association which gives this school its
legal status.

It would be sufficient for one to flee to give
freedom to all, in my knot this is true of each of
us, it must be so for me in my school.

I have resolved to do this because, if I did not op-
pose it, it would function against the purpose for
which I founded it.

So be it for a labour, I have said, which in the
field opened by Freud, restores the cutting edge
of its truth — which brings back the original
praxis which he instituted in the name of
psychoanalysis in the duty which belongs to him
in this world — which by an assiduous critique
denounces its deviations and compromises
which impede its progress by degrading its use. I
maintain this objective.

This is why I dissolve. And I am not complaining
of the said "members of the freudian school" —
rather I thank them for having taught me where I
have failed — that is to say where I am falling
down.
This lesson is precious to me. I shall put it to good use. I persevere.

In other words, I persevere.

And I call on those who wish to continue, this January 1980, with Lacan to assemble immediately.

Let them make themselves known to me by written application. Within ten days, to cut short the prevailing debility, I will publish the first adherents accepted by me as commitment to the “assiduous critique” of those “deviations and compromises” which the Ecole Freudienne de Paris has nourished.

Demonstrating by action that it is not by their deed that my school would become an institution, the product of a consolidated group, at the expense of the effect of the discourse expected from experience — when that experience is freudian. We know the price which Freud had to pay for allowing the psychoanalytic group to dominate the discourse, thus becoming a Church.

The International, for that is its name, reduces itself to a symptom which Freud expected it to be. But it is not the International which counts. It is the Church, the true one which supports marxism by giving it new blood in a renewed sense. Why not psychoanalysis when it changes direction?

I am not saying this for idle banter. The stability of religion stems from the fact that the sense is always religious.

From whence my obstinacy in my course of mathemes — which excludes nothing but demonstrates that the analyst should adhere to his function.

If I persevere (père-sèvre), it is because experience acquired demands counter experience which compensates.
Part I

HOMAGE TO FREUD
THE WORD OF FREUD

"I started my professional activity as a neurologist trying to bring some relief to my neurotic patients. Under the influence of an older friend and by my own efforts, I discovered some important new facts about the unconscious in psychic life, the role of essential urges, and so on. Out of these findings grew a new science, psychoanalysis, a part of psychology, and a new method of treatment of the neuroses. I had to pay heavily for this bit of good luck. People did not believe in my facts and thought my theories unsavoury. Resistance was strong and unremitting. In the end I succeeded in acquiring pupils and building up an International Psychoanalytic Association. But the struggle is not yet over."

Sigmund Freud

This is the only tape recording of Freud, it was taken from an interview in England at the end of 1938.

PRESENTATION OF THE SCHOOL

Oscar Zentner

Und wenn es uns glückt,
Und wenn es sich schikt,
So sind es Gedanken.

And if we are lucky,
And if the circumstances are given,
Then there are thoughts.

Goethe

Quoted by Lacan at the beginning of "The Seminar on 'The Purloined Letter'."

a) To My Mistaken Teachers, those who allowed me to understand by their errors that the way was another. To name them; Dr. Enrique Pichon Rivière — psychoanalyst — teacher of a whole generation, to Dr. José Bleger — psychoanalyst — his most direct son. These teachers — to name the most outstanding ones — were the result of a mixture of
creativity, Kleinism à la lettre plus a line of contemporary French thought that not for being mistaken lacked value, mainly Georges Politzer with his "Fundamental Principles of Concrete Psychology" together with a Merleau Ponty to the psychoanalytic neo-behaviourism of a Daniel Lagache. To León Rozitchner — philosophy graduate of La Sorbonne — who in the years 1964-1965 gave the seminars on "Feticism in Freud and Marx" shaking the university discourse and whose no smaller merit was the translation of a book of inestimable value for the time "Après Freud" by Pontalis.

b) To the Error of a Group of which I was a Member, a group that confronted teachers and disciples in an already mythical discussion panel (composed of the above mentioned Pichon Rivière, Blegé, Rozitchner, among others) in the year 1965 and that was the burial with all the honors to the mistaken teachers. The topic of the panel was the final expression of that current of thought. The title in question was "On Concrete Psychology". This originated both the hope and death of an epoch.

Then the years adrift in search for less concrete and less consoling truths. And it was on the carrion of the mistaken teachers that we, the carrion crows of knowledge, swooped, and from the bits and pieces of a fantastic reality called totality, took its parts to enrich—each one according to the possibilities—our own way of access to he who knew how to keep for the truth its title of impossible; that is to say, unconscious. Freud, who knew how to let us know his words, pronounced his discourse—repressed by his disciples. But as we know in psychoanalysis, nothing is more indestructible than that which is repressed remaining unconscious.

It is upon the parricide of the mistaken teachers that another discourse is born. A discourse that endeavours to return the psychoanalytic originality following—against the current—the teachings of a true black sheep of psychoanalysis: Jacques Lacan.

Two other important teachers for me, Dr. Ricardo Avenburg—psychoanalyst— with whom I read Freud by Freud for long years on Wednesday afternoons, and Oscar Masotta, founder of the Freudian School of Buenos Aires who introduced Lacan’s ideas as early as 1964 in Buenos Aires and with whom I studied Lacan.

c) Of the School, of the Psychoanalyst and his Crime, a School is a place that appeals to the truth. In this sense it implies at least two slopes: psychoanalysis, and the limits of its transmission. That is why every act of foundation signifies a beginning which, to avoid any regression to infinity commences with no other justification than the acts that create it. That is why every foundation ceases to be a continuation in order to become a rupture whose only credit must lean on a work whose rigour should be able to be examined under the light of day.

If everything is founded with work it is because our beginning in the symbolic is a rupture with the heritage which is nothing until we make it ours. It is ‘de facto’ that we put light to a legality that is then ours. It is in this work that the psychoanalyst authorises himself, then yes, to the legitimate of his being.

The founder was an orphan, and it is not enough to name him to create descendants. We have said that the psychoanalyst authorises himself, but it will be his peers who will legitimate him. This is the first truth that The School will allow him to verify, because the science that engages him—irrespective of how completed it is—will make him repeat in orphanhood an involuntary way that will make his learning didactic.

The School will ask of its members the only exclusivity of fully dedicating themselves to enrich its objectives with their contributions. Every subject though, will have to count with sufficient strength as to sustain his desire.

This introduction—although condensed—intends to speak of the origins of our original debt. Our being psychoanalysts is irrevocably linked to crime; or isn’t the discovery of the fact that we owe a death, that which awakens our psychoanalytic vocation? This debt reminds us of the parallel that Freud understood to clarify while talking on antisemitism, opposing it to Christianity as a religion, that, being more modern in a radical sense, allowed in a way the recognition of parricide, displaced onto the death of the son, swinging less repulsion than Judaism which, disavowing that death, increased the feeling of repulsion.

Freud taught us to distinguish that symbolic castration originates in the father, and showed that Jewish religion while persisting in disavowing the death of the father, created, as a deficiency, the return of the repressed. The mutilation of circumcision is the attempt in the Jewish religion to accede to the symbolic function. This is precisely the difference with Christianity. Christianity accepts the crime and accedes to universality not only by the incorporation of classic Greek thought but also by the arrival to the symbolic function.

This reference is not external to psychoanalysis. I will let Freud talk here to say that only religion could aspire to compete with psychoanalysis. Freud—who liked to repeat that the whale and the
polar bear did not compete because they occupied different territories — subtly points out in this way that here the territory seems to be the same.

This parallel is not an analogy but a metaphor, that shows that the psychoanalyst must be formed on a double debt. A double debt in his case if he discovers that, in order to become a psychoanalyst, it is on the epistemologic death that he gives birth to his being. This is why we are here today, in the here and now (hic et nunc), directed to the anamnesis that our Homage implies. And if we are here and now, it is to repeat with Lacan that nowadays the psychoanalysts are on one side and psychoanalysis is in another revealing that it is psychoanalysis itself which does not leave survivors. This is why our Homage is on the death of him who could again answer the Sphinx; Sphinx that only permits the entrance to secrets obtaining a death.

A foundation is a sad act when one does not have any illusions in the future.¹

FOOTNOTES

¹ The author of this presentation ignored that a cancer put a final end to the life of Oscar Masotta on September 12th, 1979 in Barcelona, Spain, in the same moment in which the words 'a foundation is a sad act when one does not have any illusions in the future' were written.

² This paper has been read on September 1979. In January 1980 Dr. Jacques Lacan announces the dissolution of the École Freudienne de Paris. He starts the letter sent to the members of the École in this way: "Je parle sans la moindre espoir — de me faire entendre notamment . . . ."

A REFERENCE TO FREUD AND LACAN

María Inés Rotmiller de Zentner

"... psychoanalysis came to be the whole content of my life and rightly assumes that no personal experiences of mine are of any interest in comparison to my relations with that science . . ."

Sigmund Freud

Sigmund Freud was born on the 6th. May 1856 in Freiberg, Moravia, and died on the 23rd. September 1939 in Maresfield Gardens, London. This happened only 40 years ago.

We are here today to render our respect to Freud, to salute this giant who has, knowingly, unsettled the coherent dreams of rationality so well put together by the centuries that gave him birth. The moralists of the Victorian era would not sleep in peace any more.

We are here today to do a homage to Freud because we understand that the discovery of the unconscious is that element that will make every thought question itself until the last consequences.
We are here today to make Freud the central figure of a tiresome effort called psychoanalysis. Nothing is better than remembering his last words heard in the recorded tape earlier this morning: “I have built an International Psychoanalytic Association, but the struggle is not yet over.” The struggle is not yet over inside the mentioned Association, as the subject of the sentence is precisely the International Psychoanalytic Association and, unfortunately enough, not a struggle of ideas but a struggle of power.

The exercise of psychoanalysis is a hard task that requires all the time verification with the source. The experience of psychoanalysis starts with a return to Freud, not to follow him but to accompany him. It means to see again with Freud the Freudian discovery of psychoanalysis.

It is from there that Jacques Lacan — his most legitimate heir — would have built his writings appealing to all the theoretical framework of psychoanalysis drawn by Freud in his works. History of science, philosophy, cultural anthropology, structuralism and epistemology have been sources of inspiration as well for Lacan. It is common to find topological notions in his work which, far from being foreign to it, are part of it. If linguistics has been so relevant to his theories we might as well remember that what he took from this science he reformulated in the light of the interests of psychoanalysis. The linguistics of which Freud talks by the mouth of Lacan is the ‘linguisterie’. It is a new discovery. The roads of linguistics and psychoanalysis run parallel up to a certain extent. This place will show the new value that the concept acquires in each particular science. It would be enough to put the word ‘T’ to demonstrate here that where the linguist places the origin of the discourse the psychoanalyst will see its effects. In the first case the ‘T’ is the cause, in the second it is the effect. It is not that Saussure or Jacobson will be in the psychoanalytic field; it is their work which has been reinterpreted according to the Freudian discovery. But the reading of Lacan will discourage those who want to have two or twenty concepts to govern the theory.

Psychoanalysis is difficult, and, as Lacan reminds us, if Freud’s discourse has so long lived it only is because many of his ideas remained ignored. And if so much confusion exists and so many abridged manuals of psychoanalysis, it is because nobody before had ventured on the Freudian path. The price that Lacan has paid for it is today a part of philosophy, cultural anthropology, structuralism and epistemology have been sources of inspiration as well for Lacan. It is common to find topological notions in his work which, far from being foreign to it, are part of it. If linguistics has been so relevant to his theories we might as well remember that what he took from this science he reformulated in the light of the interests of psychoanalysis. The linguistics of which Freud talks by the mouth of Lacan is the ‘linguisterie’. It is a new discovery. The roads of linguistics and psychoanalysis run parallel up to a certain extent. This place will show the new value that the concept acquires in each particular science. It would be enough to put the word ‘T’ to demonstrate here that where the linguist places the origin of the discourse the psychoanalyst will see its effects. In the first case the ‘T’ is the cause, in the second it is the effect. It is not that Saussure or Jacobson will be in the psychoanalytic field; it is their work which has been reinterpreted according to the Freudian discovery. But the reading of Lacan will discourage those who want to have two or twenty concepts to govern the theory.

Psychoanalysis is difficult, and, as Lacan reminds us, if Freud’s discourse has so long lived it only is because many of his ideas remained ignored. And if so much confusion exists and so many abridged manuals of psychoanalysis, it is because nobody before had ventured on the Freudian path. The price that Lacan has paid for it is today a part of history. An institution expels the member who questions it, and that in the case of the International Psychoanalytic Association repeats — by way of beyond the pleasure principle — what the medical institution of the time had done with Freud. The exile of Lacan, like the exile of Freud, shows how an institution becomes empty of knowledge when its members professionalise the power.

It is in 1938 that Freud writes “The Splitting of the Ego in the Process of Defence” but this paper will remain unfinished, its suspension points leaving us the benefit of the doubt. Why did Freud not finish this paper? If the ego is no longer the mediator for the subject, if the equilibrium, good health and maturity can no longer be defined according to the successful behaviour of the ego, if a deal between internal reality and external reality, or if a deal between the pleasure principle and the reality principle do not give an account of that integrity of the ego . . . wouldn’t that be enough to justify another approach to the psychic apparatus?

Many professionals of psychoanalysis don’t see in this paper more than the seat for the Kleinian theory, whereas, what it teaches us is the death of the synthetic nature of the ego. Psychoanalysis today pretends to inscribe its efforts in the rails of a reinforcement of the ego. This is a total countersense of the means by which Freud made in his theory the entry of the ego; namely, through narcissism and to denounce in it the sum of the imaginary identifications of the subject. This ego will then be a function of unknowingness (mécroconnaisance), and Freud will show that there is no coincidence between normality and health. On the contrary, he will approximate the normal ego to the ego of the perverse and the psychotic ego to the neurotic ego. The ego will then be a constellation of frozen identifications, and as such, it will be other.

The suggestion that an analysis should be terminated partly supports itself in this. An analysis is by definition intemminable, therefore, it has to be terminated. Its prolongation has nothing to do with the intention of assimilating analysis with ego development . . . . If we ought to talk of an advance in the process of analysis, it would always be towards the slope of castration that does not heal no matter how resigned or mature the personality is. The powerful strength of the death Trieb is the ultimate pillar of Freud’s pessimism to consider psychoanalysis as a therapeutic method. In “The Question of Lay Analysis” Freud dreaded that psychoanalysis should be:

“swallowed up by medicine and to find its last resting place in a textbook of psychiatry under the heading of ‘Methods of Treatment’ . . . .” I only want to feel assured that the therapy will not destroy the science”.

Is the psychoanalyst — for the fact of exercising his profession — less exposed to resistance than the subject who accommodates his neurotic complexes on a couch? This is a false alternative because it is an
imaginary play that divides knowings on one side and resistances on the other. But the patient knows nothing and the analyst will have to exercise his hearing in order to work rather towards the reconstruction of the history of the patient.

Psychoanalysis has fallen, by an effect of scientific inertia, into cliche interpretations where every word has its object, or why not, its significance. This has been an effect of repression because, what does that analyst do when he meets with a patient who resists so much that he already knows what his analyst is going to tell him?, a question asked by Lacan. That analyst will find as an outlet to talk of the affects, he will say — according to Jones — that the patient 'intellectualises everything'. Freud repeats a scientist who said that the analyst, when exposing his interpretations to the patient, acts according to the famous principle of "Heads I win, tails you loose'.

If as psychoanalysts we are not able to explain why something has not happened, we should at least be able to explain why it has happened. Constructions are more proper to psychoanalysis than interpretations, the danger being — according to Lacan — that if the analyst is very concerned in dating the external reality of the history of the patient; he can help the patient on his way to psychosis. The materiality and the reality of the matter in question is that of the signifier which is intangible but not immaterial.

If Freud's ear has learnt to hear it has not been the result of a training but of somebody choosing it as the place of transference. Cries that an analytic ear will put into words after hearing — half 'dummy', half alert, with evenly suspended attention — the discourse of the patient. Only from the place of the other can the analyst receive the investment of the transference that enables him to perform his legitimate place in the unconscious of the subject and to take from there the word in interventions adequate to a dialectic whose essential particularity is defined by its private nature. Any other place for the analyst carries him to a dual relation that has no other outcome than the dialectic of a narcissistic rivalry which belongs to the ego.

Psychoanalysis was born in an ex-resplendant cultured, enlightened, cultivated capital of central Europe, Vienna allowed explorations and developments proper to a golden decadence. Romanticism and rationalism take possession and influence in a young investigator who — with great responsibility — puts his not knowing as the starting point to be able then to put his ear to listen always to the pieces that in privileged times; dreams, parapraxes, jokes, etc., appear in the discourse of the subject. These, on their way towards the unconscious, will show the big blank that the conscious discourse left always closed, obstructing any way foreign to the awareness of a middle aged conscience.

Psychoanalysis nowadays, malformed and developed, has aged in a professional practice that keeps from its beginnings little more than an empty ritual that obsessionally considers its legality counting the number of sessions. Obsessional neurosis has been the result of a vicious training that has ordered in a straight line norms and rules that prevent any surprise for the trainee. If everything is like that, normal, ruled and organised, little space will be left for hearing or thought, everything will then be resumed within the lines of a predictable future that will slowly but surely, destroy any creativity. We should remember Freud saying that obsessional neurosis leaves scars in thought hence, its non-possibility for creative work.

Not in vain Freud has spoken of the relationships between religion and obsessional neurosis where, if the former saves from falling into the category of illness it only is because it is socially shared. The psychoanalytic institution — like the church of Justinian, has jealously known how to keep among its disciples the dogmas, that having no life any more, repeat themselves in a dead language. I am talking of the identification of the patient with the subject of the analyst, of the identification that will trim, or better say, cut to size, psychoanalysts like those paper figures that children enjoy so much doing. What the child enjoys is the pleasure in the repetition of the same figure, appearing endlessly while the paper unfolds. The problem is that, while this provides pleasure to the child, we well know that repetition has another connotation; namely, the heavy load of being beyond the pleasure principle and carrying therefore death with it.

The place of the analyst is to know that he does not know. Occupying another place — the place of the one who knows — will stimulate the identification with his ideal ego, repressive instance par excellence that will make of the analysis a pseudo analysis, a place of graduation, and where the place of transference will be replaced by that of comprehension. Therefore, if the institution provides for its disciples a model for identification in obsessional neurosis, if the analyst erects himself as an immediate model for identification, this will explicate the sterile intentions of many post Freudians. Even the choice of a same lifestyle or the preference for a certain car, or that rigidity while walking which sometimes makes me dread a fall, or, why not? that way in which the eyes slowly but surely start to avoid the look of the other while the ears block and the mouth cautiously pronounces the minimum possible
amount of words to avoid, perhaps, the voids that obsessional neurosis produces.

All this is to remind us that the major prohibition founded in the roots of psychoanalysis is that the psychoanalyst must prevent the unpleasant consequence of erecting himself as a model for the analysand. If this happens, the consequence is the idealization of an ego which, instead of being 'dummy' in order to allow the display of fantasies, will only expect to heal the symptoms by quickly re-integrating them to a mature ego, which will syntonically (symphonically?) open its wings to cover the shame of the family; that is to say, the 'faus pas' of the apparatus, the interruptions of unconscious 'mistakes'. Cure is only an extraordinary benefit of the analysis. Freud distributed 7 rings in his Wednesday's meetings, one for each of its members. Did he do so because he wanted a guarantee for the maintenance of his discovery wrapped in his Austrian mysticism? Does a ring guarantee anything, anyway? Wasn't it perhaps the origin of the present mysticism — so close to sorcery — with which psychoanalysts are surrounded?

Lacan formulates that a psychoanalyst is he who gives an analysis. There will be no graduation for a psychoanalyst. His task occurs in the confines where academic knowledge has ended. We said before that the analyst occupied the place of not knowing in the analysis; that place privileged by the patient as the place of the subject who-is-supposed-to-know. This is why the discourse of the analyst stands opposite to any discourse that will pretend to be a university discourse.

And if we are talking of the place of the analyst characterised by his not knowing, shouldn't we here quote Lacan saying how much does psychoanalysis owe to the discourse of the hysteric? The original name of 'talking cure' should today be rescued. This 'talking cure' was the extraordinary benefit of the investigation. It would afterwards be called the method of 'free association', an irony that teaches us Freud's excellent use of language.

Language organizes Law and the association is never free, language is never without cause, it always is overdetermined. This is to say that there is no motivation by which the 'thing' exerts a relation of consequence upon the word that nomimates it. At the same time, no word is said without determination, which does not mean that every word bears — as Lacan explains it — the imprint of the unconscious. Not every word is 'full'; the 'empty word' abounds as well. Remember for it the concept of 'idle talk'. 'Empty word' that, like the rituals of salutation, remind us of the charlatany of many. The resistance is expressed by the side of the 'empty word', as the unconscious always speaks. 'It' speaks always.

"The full word, in fact, is defined by its identity to that of which it speaks" (Lacan). Not every word is said to receive an interpretation. This is a straightforward difference between psychoanalysis and conversation.

The evenly suspended attention is definitely not eager tension. It talks of the hard — or, are we not on the way to saying practically impossible task? — of shutting one ear to silence his own discourse to be able to leave the other ear open to the discourse of the patient. The analyst operates with the discourse of the patient, a humble discourse that wants to unveil the formations of the unconscious. Lacan assimilates the metaphorical and metonymic processes of language to condensation and displacement respectively, the two mechanisms characteristic of the working of the unconscious in its formations.

"Psychoanalysis puts forward the whole set of phenomena which deserve the title of psychoanalytic semantics: dreams, slips of the tongue, absentmindedness, disorders of recollection, the capsrices of free association", (Lacan).

The causality of the unconscious in the course of free association occurs in the biggest of hazards... but it has its mathematical laws.

There is no naive use of language in psychoanalysis, there is no thought without language. And if Freud said that the story of the dream was more important than its contents, Lacan will draw his conclusions in "Encore" saying that the unconscious is language, that language precedes the unconscious. Wording it in another way, the universe of language antecedes the moment of primal repression, primordial, founding moment of the psychic apparatus, moment of the constitution of the unconscious. This makes us insist on the determination of language in the formation of the subject.

We should not forget in the end that the most interesting patient that Freud had was he himself. This was written to Fliess. And it was in the course of his so-called autoanalysis that his desire remained always unsatisfied. It was Fliess, occupying the place of the one-who-is-supposed-to-know, that allowed Freud to find his own message in an inverted way. That Fliess did not understand Freud is absolutely irrelevant today. We will rescue from there that it was his so-called autoanalysis that allowed him to recognize the desire of killing the father. It is this desire that will make him write, not long before his death, about the relationships of religion with the dead father.

Lacan brought back to light the Freudian line and if the reading of Lacan is today difficult to undertake, it only is because his readings imply a profound study of Freud, readings that imply the subversion of
the subject, the splitting of the subject from its origin; a narcissistic wound difficult to bear, always. The illumination of the past is not always well seen, and sometimes a quick advance towards integration and maturity is preferred. Nothing is more foreign than this to the Freudian experience. Everything in the Freudian experience is a phenomenon of discourse, discourse which anticipates the subject, discourse that gives birth to the subject.

In his paper “Fonction et champ de la parole et du language en psychanalyse”, Lacan writes the following:

“When the Devas, the men, and the Asuras were ending their novitiate with Prajapati, so we read in the second Brâhmana of the fifth lesson of the Bhâradvârânyaka Upanishad, they addressed to him this prayer: “Speak to us”.

“Da”, said Prajapati, god of thunder. “Have you understood me?” And the Devas answered and said: “Thou hast said to us: Damyata master yourselves” — the sacred text meaning that the powers above subject to the law of the Word.

“Da”, said Prajapati, god of thunder. “Have you understood me?” And the men answered and said: “Thou hast said to us: Datta, give” — the sacred text meaning that men recognize each other by the gift of the Word.

“Da”, said Prajapati, god of thunder. “Have you understood me?” And the Asuras answered and said: “Thou hast said to us: Dayadhvam, be merciful” — the sacred text meaning that the powers below resound to the invocation of the Word.

That, continues the text, is what the divine voice caused to be heard in the thunder: Submission, gift, grace. Da da da. For Prajapati replies to all: “You have understood me”.

BIBLIOGRAPHY


Freud began his 1914 paper “On the History of the Psychoanalytic Movement” by quoting the motto of the coat of arms of the city of Paris. This coat of arms represents a ship and the device may be translated “it is tossed by the waves, but it does not sink”.1

In the third chapter of the same work, describing the second Congress of Psychoanalysis in 1910 at Nuremberg, at which the International Association was formed, Freud states:

“I considered it necessary to form an official association because I feared the abuses to which psychoanalysis would be subjected as soon as it became popular. There should be some headquarters whose business it would be to declare: ‘All this nonsense is nothing to do with analysis, this is not psychoanalysis’.”2
After a brief discussion of the desirability of "friendly communication" and "mutual support" between local societies charged with giving instruction as to how psychoanalysis was to be conducted and "doctors should be trained", (according to the Standard Edition — doctors should find their Ausbildung which literally translates as cultivation, development or as Lacan would call it formation) and "... whose activities would then receive a kind of guarantee".

Freud then goes on to say:

"This and nothing else was what I hoped to achieve by founding the International Psychoanalytic Association. It was probably more than could be attained. Just as my opponents were to discover that it was not possible to stem the tide of the new movement, so I was to find that it would not proceed in the direction which I wished to mark out for it."

This then, is an account of how the frail barque 'Psychoanalysis' ventured into stormy southern seas on the long voyage to the unknown great south land and was beached on the shores of the Pacific.

I choose to begin this story in the closing decades of the last century. At that time the profession of psychiatrist as we know it today did not exist. The insane were incarcerated in asylums, the first of which had been founded by Governor Macquarie at Castle Hill in 1811 or not uncommonly in prisons, while those suffering minor nervous afflications were treated by physicians, occasionally by neurologists or by the multitude of quacks or charlatans that contemporary accounts tell us abounded in those times.

Professional attention to the use of specifically psychological modes of treatment was not generally found until the 1880's, when suggestion and hypnosis began to find a place with diet, purging and other physical remedies for nervous ailments. I would like to mention two of the important Australian pioneers of hypnosis.

The first is John Mildred Creed, who was born in 1842, became apprenticed to a London surgeon and came out to a Riverina sheep station in 1861. He returned to England to gain his medical diplomas and in 1866 returned to practice in Melbourne and Sydney. Explorer, politician and medical journalist, he became the editor of the Australasian Medical Gazette and Honorary Surgeon to Sydney Hospital. He was a strong campaigner for the need to pay attention to the role of emotion in physical disease and the use of psychological modes of treatment — mostly suggestion and hypnosis. In the 1880's he published many articles in the Gazette on the treatment of various conditions by hypnosis; including asthma, hemiplegia, vomiting and in particular, chronic alcoholism. His views were highly influential and lead in 1903 to the government setting up a commission on the Treatment of Inebriates to investigate Creed's methods.

In Melbourne, at about the same time an acknowledged leader in this field was Dr. J.W. Springthorpe. This year is the centenary of his graduation from Melbourne University. He then became a medical officer at the Beechworth Asylum at the time of the last days of the Kelly gang in that district. After post graduate work in England he returned to Melbourne, obtained his doctorate and practised as a physician in Collins Street. Springthorpe's enlightened and revolutionary ideas are preserved in a series of papers like the one read to the Victorian branch of the B.M.A. in September 1884, entitled "The Psychological Aspect of the Sexual Appetite". He states:

"Life, physiologically speaking may provisionally be defined as the sum of the reactions and interactions of our nervous mechanism upon its environment,...and it is the first object of this paper to show that towards that very complex sum, the sexual appetite makes a substantial addition."

He related the phenomena of crime, hysteria and insanity to the disturbance of expression of sexual instinct, gave his ideas on masturbation, sexual continence and the role of the demi-monde in society and his suggestions for the enlightened sexual education of children. This was the year before Freud went to Paris to study with Charcot. The debate which followed this paper foretold that mixture of acceptance and rejection that was to greet Freud's theories on hysteria in Australia a decade later.

Springthorpe wrote many papers particularly on the relation of suggestion to the cause and treatment of hysteria. He became a lecturer at Melbourne University and published two volumes on therapeutics in 1913. He became President of the A.M.A., the Editor of the Gazette after Creed, an official visitor to the hospitals for the insane, Dean of the Faculty of Dentistry, interested Lady Talbot in founding the epileptic colony and interested in child health and education and a founder of the Tweedle (Truby King) Babies Home. He was one of the first supporters of Freud's ideas in Australia.

Freud and Breur's "Studies on Hysteria" was published in 1895 and a portion was translated into English by Brill in 1909. The Three Con-
tributions to the Sexual Theory” appeared in Brill’s translation in 1910.

In 1909 Freud received a letter from Sydney telling him that there was a small group there eagerly studying his works. Its leader Dr. Donald Fraser had lectured many times on psychoanalysis before various societies. Before acquiring his medical qualification he had been a minister of the Presbyterian Church but had to resign his position on account of his Freudian views.

In 1911 Dr. Andrew Davidson the secretary of the Section of Psychological Medicine and Neurology invited Freud, Jung and Havelock Ellis to read papers before the Australasian Medical Congress. They all sent papers but did not attend.15-17 The President of the Section was W. Beattie-Smith. Other papers presented mostly concerned the revolutionary concept of voluntary treatment for the mentally ill, which parliament legalised, under pressure from Jones in 1914.

Freud’s short paper, “On Psychoanalysis” outlines his researches on hysteria and his opposition to Janet’s views. He explains the concept of repression and the hysterical symptom as a reminiscence of an experience removed from consciousness. He describes the advantages of abandoning hypnosis, the use of free association, his concepts of infantile sexuality and sublimation and the use of the psychoanalytic method in analysing dreams. The paper includes the maxim “A dream is a disguised fulfilment of a repressed wish”.

Freud concludes by referring to the resistance to his theories.

"There is often a tendency in medical and especially in psychiatric circles to contradict the theories of psychoanalysis without any real study or practical application of them. This is due not only to the striking novelty of these theories and the contrast they present to the views hitherto held by psychiatrists, but also to the fact that the premises and technique of psychoanalysis are much more nearly related to the field of psychology than to that of medicine,” and “the progress of psychoanalysis is further retarded by the dread felt by the average observer of seeing himself in his own mirror. Men of science tend to meet emotional resistances with arguments, and thus satisfy themselves to their own satisfaction. Whoever wishes not to ignore a truth will do well to distrust his antipathies, . . . . .”18

He then gives a list of references which reminds us that the “Interpretation of Dreams” was not yet translated into English. Freud’s paper was read again at the Medical Congress of 1955 in Sydney. It was the only paper on psychoanalysis.

At the Congress of 1914, Ernest Jones, President of the London Psychoanalytic Society presented his paper on ‘Some Practical Aspects of Psychoanalytic Treatment’. Jones informed the Australasian doctors that:

"the qualifications needed for psychoanalytic practice are a sound knowledge of neurology and psychiatry, especially on the diagnostic side, and a sympathetic interest in psychology, with the patience, objectivity and tact that go with this; indeed no other motive than the latter is likely to lead anyone to take up the work, where the main rewards are the intrinsic interest in it and the satisfaction of being able to alleviate such distressing suffering as is involved in mental disturbance."

So much for the desire of the analyst; the troubles of psychoanalysis in Australia had begun in earnest. The discussion of this paper revolved around the potential short cuts offered by the new reflex theories of Pavlov.19

The year 1914 also saw the outbreak of war. The following year Freud wrote his paper “Thoughts for the Times on War and Death” in which he considers the role of repression and sublimation in civilisation20 — a forerunner of “Civilisation and its Discontents” (1930) — and also on the question of our attitude to death. Words appropriate to recall on the occasion of this homage:

"It is indeed impossible to imagine our own death; and whenever we attempt to do so we can perceive that we are in fact still present as spectators. Hence the psychoanalytic school could venture on the assertion that at bottom no one believes in his own death, or to put the same thing in another way that in the unconscious every one of us is convinced of his own immortality.21"

The war also provided thousands of cases of so-called ‘shell shock’ which could be examined for evidence in support of claims for and against psychoanalytic theory. A vast and heated debate on the relative
merits of suggestion, hypnosis and psychoanalysis in treating such cases extended well into the next decade and was revived again by many of the same protagonists even after the second war.22-23

I will not go in detail into the question of the teaching and influence of psychoanalysis in departments of psychology and philosophy at Australian Universities, other than to say that this began around the year 1919 with Professor Lovell introducing the works of Brill to students of the new psychology courses at Sydney University. There are probably others present who could give a better account of the influence of the development of psychoanalytic ideas in university circles than I.24-25

Let's move on to the first Australians to undergo psychoanalysis. One of these was Dr. Paul Grieg Dane, a graduate of Melbourne University, who on returning from the war became interested in the possibility of treating 'shell shocked' soldiers by electrical stimulation. He soon recognised the futility of such methods and came under the influence of J.W. Springthorpe and Clarence Godfrey another early Melbourne psychotherapist and turned to the practice of psychotherapy with remarkable and often dramatic results. He became the first completely wholehearted and consistent exponent in Victoria of Freud's theories, using the earlier techniques of abreaction and catharsis. In 1928 he left for a prolonged visit to Europe during which he commenced analysis with Joan Riviere. Dane was later instrumental in founding the Melbourne Institute of Psychoanalysis and was the first to use group therapy in Australia after a period of study in America in 1949.26-28

In Sydney, the first analyst was Roy Coupland Winn. A graduate from Sydney University, he joined the Australian Army Medical Corps and after serving at Gallipoli and on the Somme he lost his right foot in the battle of Messines. He was evacuated to England where he had a period of analysis as a consequence of a 'break down'. After sometime in Australia he returned to England to study at the Maudsley Hospital, had a period of further analysis and became a member of the British Psychoanalytic Society. After returning to Australia in 1931 he became the first full time practitioner of psychoanalysis. In the early 30's he spoke widely and published a series of articles on psychoanalysis which drew both violent responses and some enthusiastic support.29-31 In response to one article Dr. McGeorge of Sydney states that: "I would hate to think that the minds of those whom I respect and esteem are the turbulent cesspools of lasciviousness that the psychoanalysts would have us believe."32 In reply J.K. Adey,33 an early supporter of Freud's theories said: "Dr. McGeorge I presume, would 'hate to think' that one of his esteemed and respected friends had, say, a carcinoma of the liver, but the state of Dr. McGeorge's mind would hardly cause a surgeon to alter the diagnosis".

One of Dr. Adey's brightest pupils was Dr. Reginald Ellery. Together they had introduced Wagner-Jauregg's malarial treatment for G.P.I. to Australia in the 20's. When psychiatric clinics began to be established in Australia, Ellery opened the first private Psychopathic Hospital in Melbourne. In the 30's he went to Europe to study the new insulin coma therapy of Sakel, which he introduced to Melbourne and cardiacele shock therapy which had been demonstrated to him by Medina in Hungary. In his book "The Cow Jumped over the Moon" Ellery records his visit to Vienna in these words:34-35

"In this lovely old city of spire and chimne, the home of the Hapsburg Kings, still magically imbued with the grace of Schubert and the gaiety of Lehar, there were many attractions — from the Palace to the Opera; but for the writer one of the greatest of them lay at the far end of a grubby little street known as Bergasse. There at number 19, on the first floor, was the apartment of Sigmund Freud; and there in the street below, an unknown disciple several times loitered, hoping to catch sight of the great man he had so often dreamed of meeting. Once the Master came to the window and stood for a moment looking down into that familiar thoroughfare."

Was his vision directed to any particular object, the watching disciple asked himself or was it musingly turned to the near future — to the time when, in a few short months, because he had dropped from the womb of a Jewish woman in Moravia, the Nazi louts of an Austrian house painter would burn his books and hound him from the country to which he had lent the distinction of his name?

Now, with a letter of introduction and reverently climbing the stairs which lead to the front door, this same disciple called upon the first psychoanalysts; but though he touched his overcoat and walking stick in the hall, and was shown into his study, it was his daughter Anna who received him, explaining (ever the pedagogue) that her father was not well enough to meet strangers.
Melbourne psychiatrists which comprised Dr: Dane, clinic which would teach or give psychotherapeutic help. A group of one of a group of Hungarian child analysts who had been trying to analysts to establish their foundation in the words of the Master would psychoanalytic clinic. Dr. Dane contacted Ernest Jones who suggested Zealand in 1937. Dr. Geroe was a member of a group in Budapest which educationalists since Susan Isaacs had visited Australia and New migrate to New Zealand where there was considerable interest from Albiston, Dr. A.R. Phillips and Dr. P.G. Reynolds wanted this to be a psychoanalytic clinic. Dr. Dane contacted Ernest Jones who suggested that Dr. Clara Geroe would be prepared to come as analyst. She was one of a group of Hungarian child analysts who had been trying to Dr. Winn on October 11th 1940 party. Miss Trail had got cold feet account of the war and reduced her donation to 1,500 pounds. The aims of the institute were to start a clinic for adults and children and to act in an advisory capacity to teachers and parents, to deliver lectures, to start a library and to train analysts. Dr. Winn of Sydney also joined the council of directors which was chaired by Dr. Dane and Ernest Jones agreed to act as a member of the board. Dr. Geroe was very active in the early years in consulting to schools, assessing and analysing patients, in supervising and teaching of candidates and working with probation officers attached to the Children's Court and addressing various medical groups. The provisional opening meeting of the Sydney Institute of Psychoanalysis was held on the 3rd of May 1951 at the Royal Australian College of Physicians in Macquarie Street. Dr. T.M. Greenway, a physician, presided over the meeting. While Dr. Greenway felt that psychoanalysis was one area where clinical medicine had much to learn from a great variety of specialists in other areas, he sounded a warning note: “psychoanalysis was not for the dilettante”. Dr. Greenway thought that “many of the principles laid down by Freud had a far wider application than in the work and studies of doctors and psychiatrists”. He felt that “it was not an exaggeration to say that the degree of interest taken in that field by any community was to some extent an index of its cultural development”.

In December 1952 at an interstate conference organised by the Melbourne Institute the Australian Society of Psychoanalysts was formed. At their conference Dr. Peto presented his classic paper “On so-called Depersonalisation”, in which he refers to Lacan’s concept of the mirror phase. As far as I have been able to trace this was the first discussion of Lacan’s ideas in Australia. Peto takes the mirror stage concept in a genetic way and not in a structural manner as Lacan’s subsequent ideas make clear that this is intended.

Peto has not ceased to wrestle with these problems. Since his departure for New York in 1955 which caused the closure of the Sydney Institute he has continued to theorise on what he calls “the fragmentising function of the ego”, although since 1953 he no longer refers to the work of Lacan. This was of course the year of Lacan’s resignation from the Paris Society and the split in the French Psychoanalytic movement which culminated in 1963 in the banning of Lacan’s teaching by the International Association and his foundation in 1964 of the Freudian School of Paris.

The Australian Society of Psychoanalysts remained a branch of the British Psychoanalytical Society until 1967 when an Australian Study Group was established under a sponsoring committee of the International Psychoanalytic Association headed by Dr. F.D. Wride of London. At the Paris Congress in 1973 the Australian Society was declared by Dr. Rangell as a “full, independent component society of the I.P.A.”. He then proposed that the word ‘independent’ should be a matter for further constitutional debate by the association.
What has been the fate of psychoanalysis in Australia in the last quarter of a century? The medical profession has by and large lost interest. The last entry on psychoanalysis in the Medical Journal of Australia was in 1966. It is one paragraph summarising Dr. Graham’s account of experiments in New York concerning the “objective” recording of interviews.

Psychologists, by and large have been seduced by learning theory models and the lure of quick results, although some recent trends seem to indicate a glimmer of acknowledgement that what goes on inside “the black box” might be important.

For psychiatrists, what might be called a “working knowledge” of psychoanalytic theories (not necessarily those of Freud) has become part of their stock in trade, to be used in various combinations with other more “spectacular” scientific advances. Eclecticism seems to be one of the major forms that resistance to psychoanalysis has taken in this part of the world.

Even among psychoanalysts themselves, who have published little in this country, those writings seem predominantly to be in the fields of applied psychoanalysis, in genetic, developmental and ego psychology, in group work and various therapies profoundly influenced by the so-called post-Freudian ideas — often far from psychoanalysis themselves in their intentions.

This time has also seen the publication of all Freud’s major works, including the important early works on aphasia, the “Project for a Scientific Psychology” and most of the letters to Wilhelm Fliess, enabling one for the first time to survey the overall structure and grandeur of Freud’s conceptions.

In that time too, Freud has undergone what has been called his “French revolution” in the form of a structuralist examination of his thought based on the work of Lacan, summarised in his Ecrits (1966) and the twenty five volumes of his seminars — only one of which has so far appeared in English.

In the early 70’s, Lacan’s ideas gained some hearing in Australia, mostly in academic circles, but also amongst feminist groups particularly in Sydney.

The Freudian School of Melbourne was founded in 1977 by Oscar Zentner, an analyst of the Freudian School of Buenos Aires about whose antecedents we have heard. Since that time this group has held a weekly seminar in two parts — on Freud’s writings and on those of Lacan. We view the entrance of psychoanalysis into Australia up to that time as being only a partial one, and predominantly of those institutionalised aspects of Freud’s resistances to his own discoveries which are called ego psychology.

This homage to Freud marks also the first public presentation of the school, which intends to make public its productions from henceforth so that they can be examined under the light of day.

What pointers does the past give us for the future? Let’s conclude by permitting Freud to speak to us through his text and interpretation of one of his own dreams which touches on the subject of his own death.47

“Old Brucke must have set me some task; STRANGELY ENOUGH, it related to a dissection of the lower part of my own body, my pelvis and legs, which I saw before me as though in the dissecting room, but without noticing their absence in myself and also without a trace of any gruesome feeling. Louise N. was standing beside me and doing the work with me. The pelvis had been eviscerated and it was visible now in its superior, now in its inferior, aspect, the two being mixed together. Thick flesh-coloured protuberances (which, in the dream itself, made me think of haemorrhoids) could be seen. Something which lay over it and was like crumpled silver paper had also to be carefully fished out. (Stan-niel which was an allusion to the book by Stannius on the nervous system of fishes.)

I was then once more in possession of my legs and was making my way through the town, but (being tired) I took a cab. To my astonishment the cab drove through the door of a house, which opened and allowed it to pass along a passage which turned a corner at its end and finally led into the open air again.

Finally I was making a journey through a changing landscape with an alpine guide who was carrying my belongings. Part of the way he carried me too, out of consideration for my tired legs. The ground was boggy; we went round the edge; people were sitting on the ground like Red Indians or gypsies — among them a girl.
Before this I had been making my own way forward over the slippery ground with a constant feeling of surprise that I was able to do it so well after the dissection. At last we reached a small wooden house in the end of which was an open window. There the guide set me down and laid two wooden boards, which were standing ready, upon the window sill, so as to bridge the chasm which had to be crossed over from the window.

At that point I really became frightened about my legs, but instead of the expected crossing, I saw two grown-up men lying on wooden benches that were along the walls of the hut, and what seemed to be two children sleeping beside them. It was as though what was going to make the crossing possible was not the boards, but the children. I awoke in a mental fright.

As Freud goes on to say,

"Anyone who has formed even the slightest idea of the extent of condensation in dreams will easily imagine what a number of pages would be filled by a full analysis of this dream."

Suffice it to say for our purposes that Freud’s key to the interpretation of the dream lay in the interpolation “strangely enough” which related to offering to Louise N. Rider Haggard’s “She.” — “A strange book, book of hidden meaning”, as Freud had begun to explain to her; “the eternal feminine, the immortality of our emotions . . . . . . .”. She had replied: “I know it already. Have you nothing of your own?” Freud replied: “No, my own immortal works have not yet been written.”

“Well, when are we to expect these so-called ultimate explanations of yours which you’ve promised even we shall find readable?” She asked with a touch of sarcasm. Freud says “At that point I saw that someone else was admonishing me through her mouth.” (Brucke)

He interprets the dissection of his own body as representing his self-analysis. The long journey relates to an adventurous road in “She” which had scarcely been trodden before. The wooden house Freud recognised as being an excavated Etruscan grave he had visited. He awoke in a “mental fright”, after the emergence of the idea that children may perhaps achieve what their father has failed to —

The lesson for us contained in this dream is that we must not lose sight of our transferences to our teachers and ultimately to the Master himself and to bear in mind that the prototype of all our theories lies in our own infantile sexual theories with which we first attempt our approach to the unknown.44 45

If I seem to have made harsh judgement of my predecessors and my teachers, my debt to them is no less because of that. If we do not learn from the mistakes of our tutors, we are condemned to repeat them. As Sir Harold Bowden reminds us “facts that are not frankly faced have a habit of stabbing us in the back.”

FOOTNOTES
2 FREUD, S. (1914) Loc. Cit., p. 43 et seq.
16 FREUD, S. (1911) On Psycho-analysis. Trans. Australas. Med. Congr. 9 (2): 839-842 — this paper is presumed to have been written in German, but the original is lost.
20 FREUD, S. (1915) Thoughts for the Times on War and Death. S.E. XIV pps 275-300.
38 Dr. Gerce died in February 1980.
40 Loc. cit. — Dr. Peto, “However, that gain of the ego won by participation in technical progress was neutralised by the increase of guilt which was regarded as the superego’s reaction to ego expansion. Strengthening of some ego qualities implied weakening of others.”
46 For a concise statement in English, of the structural approach to reading Freud see;
French Freud. Structural Studies in psychoanalysis; also,
Mehlman, J. Translator's Introduction to Laplanche, J. (1976)
Life and Death in Psychoanalysis. Baltimore, John Hopkins
University Press.

47 FREUD, S. The Interpretation of Dreams. Standard Edition Vol. V.
p. 452.
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IDEAL OBJECTS AND REPETITION
Rubén Alejandro Cerutti

"... I am sure that in Psychoanalysis it is
necessary to achieve a rigorous formulization in
certain basic matters and starting from it, I will
begin a task of creation comparable to the one
that occurred in mathematics after the epoch of
Hilbert, Cautos and others. But that is not the
only enlightened epoch; another one, long before,
the one of Pascal and Fermat is re-encountered
by Lacan when in a seminar he says: "I would like
to see, being reproduced under the form of
psychoanalysis, that kind of republic. And a
great part of the serious efforts of psychoanalytic
investigations should lead there..."

Extract from a letter
written to Gayle Paull
from Rubén Cerutti.
In psychoanalytic practice it has commonly been observed that the chains of signifiers are oriented towards an "ideal point", point, object, which is a view point, over the triality of the real-imaginary-symbolic, and which constitutes, precisely, its reality.

It is about the formation and existence of that object that we are going to attempt an explanation, studying the topology of the space founded by that triality, but first, what is topology?

We are going to take into account a set X, and a function d, distance between the elements of the cartesian product X x X, and the pair (X,d) which constitutes a metric space.

Given (X,d) in a succession of points{xn} n € N we are going to say that xn converges towards a point x if given a positive number ε , there exists an arbitrary natural number n0, such that for every n > n0 the distance between the points xn and x remains less than ε (d(xn,x)). Said in another way: the sequence {xn}n € N converges to the point x if its points starting from a determined one in the area of the point x, are in an area of radius length, less than ε .

But it is also possible the convergence, only depending on the notion of area is no longer founded in the distance but in the d. The repetition in itself carries on infinitely ever since it appeared as a vicinity, and this is a topological criteria. Topology is the study of the notion of convergence and continuity based on that of area, and it is now that we are going to give an account of the topology of the ideal space where repetition manifests itself.

The repetition is not in itself an object but the 'mise en acte' of the unconscious conflict, and carries on itself that the repetition, transforming in this way the chain in an infinite chain of primary unknown convergence.

The repetition expresses a function of the subject determined by its eccentric position, and this is why it is in control, as far as the translation of the indefinable interior-exterior, to reencounter the primary lost object, now substituted by the limit object of the infinite series.

We can say then that the ideal objects articulate the repetition and fix a direction for the infinite chain. The points ensure in some way, the closure in a direction of the repetition in so far as it is produced in an ideal space which we are going to assimilate to a complete topological space. In a vague and general way, one can say that in a first approximation that a limit point is what should be added to a set of the series of infinite repetitions to ensure its convergence, this is to say, to fix it in a direction in which the chain tends to close itself and therefore not get lost in an absolute non-sense. And here, we are interested in showing the existence of these limit objects which in certain cases and under certain conditions are the regularity of the chain of signifiers.

We are going to take into account the usual space R, and in a sequence {xn}n € N of points which diverge, adding to the R space an ideal point ∞ (infinity), it is possible to ensure that every sequence starting from a certain index value n € N exceeds every finite value, "tends" to the point ∞.

From the topological point of view, the infinite point can be identified with the exteriors of the discs Bn of radius n and centre at the origin, with n growing indefinitely. The ideal point figures in a way as a turning of the space, on itself in a process of an exterior in continuous displacement still very absolute, psychologically, but a displacement which already indicates a movement of the borders. (We will return to this later.)

It is convenient to see in another way the presence, existence of the ideal point, which although present will be unattainable for it will make felt its strength while fixing the direction of the chain that it has concluded.

The repetition in itself carries on infinitely ever since it appeared as far as it is destined to reach the unattainable, to surround the primordial loss for that subject, crossing the borders of the Law, to extend the interior-exterior duality. And it carries the infinity in such a way that it turns upon itself (as the space in the limits) and continues towards the limit object. The turning upon itself has nothing other than the intent of trapping the same original lack (absence) that joins it with the previous ones allowing it to continue its tendency towards the limit.

GRAPHICALLY

In a way it is what happens with the generation of finite cardinals. Accepting the existence of the empty set ∅ (phi) like that which symbolizes the non-identity x ≠ x, the cardinal 0 (zero) is assigned to it. Let us consider now the set whose unique element is the empty set, while having a single element we assign it the cardinal 1 (one).

Following with this process and considering that for finite sets, its cardinal is equal to its ordinal, formally written it would be;
the ideal object exists in the infinite, and cannot be reached by a finite process, how can we discover it in each subject?

Simply by its function of attracting the chain of signifiers (blocked) always escaping (successive ruptures), of not allowing to be trapped, something that theoretically is the place of the movement of the object a.

\[
\phi \{\phi\} \{\phi, \{\phi\}\} \{\phi, \{\phi\}\} \{\phi, \{\phi, \{\phi\}\}\}
\]

\[
\downarrow \quad \downarrow \quad \downarrow \quad \downarrow
\]

0 \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 3

that is to say that it is possible to obtain all the succession of natural numbers that grow indefinitely, considered like cardinals of sets based in the empty. This clarification is important because it already contains the germ of the formations of the infinities starting from other infinities. Let it be the set of all the obtained naturals, symbolised by N and let us consider its sets of parts P(N), this has a greater potency than N, it has potency C, that is to say that departing from \(X_0\) (aleph zero) potency of N we have reached a set of potency C (potency of the continuum).

If we repeat the same preceding process for a set of potency C we will obtain an infinitely larger set. At this point, it is convenient to clarify the border effect which introduces the presence of the first infinity which we have considered, and moreover this implies the existence of a cardinal limit (limit object, ideal object) that does not have an immediate predecessor. In effect if it had an immediate predecessor, it would be finite, since \(X_0\) is the first infinity. Besides it must be infinite because for each cardinal \(\kappa\) less than \(X_0\) is also infinite and less than \(\kappa + 1\). In consequence, the limit transcends everything that originates from a cardinal less than it by the sum of the unity. This suggests a structure of the limit object based in a "no" (non-finite) and in an exclusion (exclusion of it being considered as the biggest cardinal) as it is exceeded by a rupture generated from its interior.

A rupture that repeats the previous rupture, but at the same crossing of barriers, the limit imposed by the Law, contours, bordering the un-nameable localised in the \(\phi\) absence, place of the non-identity, since every rupture does not exhaust the infinite character of the new infinity engendered by it, as a result of the function of the exclusion. From here, it can be suggested that, this process does not tend to reach by finite growing an infinite point, but that it tends to something more transcendent in the formation of the unconscious that has to do with the structure of castration, something like surrounding it, reaching the border, and here we can see again the effect of displacement of the border that we have previously mentioned.

It is clear then, the radical difference between the infinite discourse of the unconscious and the finite discourse upon the unconscious. But...
PEOPLE OF NORTHEAST BRAZIL TALK
ABOUT THEIR LEGENDS:

“JOAO GALAFOICE, IN THE
FISHING ‘WORLD’ ”

Jacques Laberge

“I saw Galafoice — many times. It is a ball of fire, a big ball of fire. It chases someone . . . . . If it does not disappear, the fisherman is not able to get out of the water. If the fisherman comes back to land it frightens him, it comes upon him — the fisherman falls over on his back and his hair stands on end.”

There are few references to Joao Galafoice by Camara Carcudo as well as by other authors. Such lack of more information turned out as an advantage for the legends. Members of the Centre of Freudian Studies of Recife (Centro de Estudos Freudianos do Recife) visited, listened to and improved the legends about Galafoice transmitted by the fishermen themselves.
From that combined work "grupo das lendas — pessoal de pesca," today we start with Romeu's conversation, he appeared much more concerned with dancing the "ciranda de Galafoice" (a sort of square dance of Afro-Brazilian origin) than the one of Lia, from his own homeland — Iamaraaca.

"I saw Galafoice, many, many times! once I went fishing with a straw torch. I then saw another torch fishing: vampo, vampo (a noise naturally made by a torch in a fisherman's hand). It was nobody. Not it was Joao Galafoice fishing. It was him but I thought it was a person. I saw a raft floating on dry land, under full sail with nobody on it but I heard shouting. It was Joao Galafoice. Galafoice drowned in the tide and his son escaped. Galafoice shouts "bring back my son". That is the only thing he says.

Once Iacema was here with a group of University students. (By the way, she confirmed the event, saying that her classmates severely criticised those who feed such popular beliefs.) At night, all in darkness, there the ball of fire appeared, heading north. A boy shouted: "O Galafoice, you dirty bastard!" The ball changed its direction and came towards us. Everyone ran away, Iacema and the boy also ran.

Joao Galafoice can turn himself into anything: a boat, a black ship. Watch out it is going to strike us. He changes himself into a 'phantom' body without a head, throwing a net.

Alone I am afraid!

Another time I found him on a stone as a ball of fire. I said to my friend: let us hurry home. When we came near the mango tree, the ball of fire was right in front of the house. My friend was rigid with terror, fell over, unable to move, with only his heart beating.

As a child I also had the same vision, — Galafoice, the ball of fire was used to calling my mother whenever I needed to defeacate while in the street. Galafoice said to me, "You called your mother," which terrified me. She was disgusted because I used to say: "Mother stay here and watch me." Then my mother shouted, "the ball of fire is coming!" I ran into the house as the ball passed quite close to the door.

If someone strikes a match, Joao Galafoice disappears.

Because of the street light here, he does not come. But at the rivermouth there is no light, then he appears. Even up to the present day he can be seen. If one leaves at 1 o'clock in the morning, it is very difficult not to see him.

His raft turned upside down and he drowned. His son escaped. Galafoice speaks and whistles, he only asks questions about his son.

Appointed successor of the medieval heroes, Joao Galafoice could be a descendant of the French, Jean Delafosse, a particular version of the universal myth the 'fogo-fátuo' (famous fire). Original alliance of the most common Joao and of the most rare Galafoice, Galafoz, Galafoz represented by the frightening fire which accompanies him.

Gala: is a popular word for the human semen. Or gala galalau, 'tall': "infant Galafoice", is the picturesque surname of a young boy from Olinda, who does not go out in the night and does not carry a package either; because his uncommon height transforms him into a shivering visage with hair standing on end. Gal, the etymological "agalma" of Plato is that very detail, that tiny object, an element that shines, a great deal more important than the totality or the whole of it, in order to cause attraction among people.

The privileged instrument of death in common graphic representations, the elevated sickle, is the magic gesture in the play "Tempo de Espera". The miserable fisherman's butt forms the depressing setting of the play. From the beginning to the end, a mortal silence. Hunger — as a question and inertia — as an answer, constitute an implacable routine. The event: the birth of a dead child, the cough of the tuberculous father and the mother's despair. The uncle raises up the sickle — symbol of death and revolt.

-Foi — se — swallowed by the waters, with 's' or 'c'. 'c' scare-crow of death, 's' gone away, — allusion to the sudden and threatening appearance and disappearance of Joao Galafoice. Everyone is left at the disposal of this unexpected and frightening game of presence — absence of the signifier which materialises the instance of death. (Lacan — The Arrived Letter). As "Name-of-the-Father", Galafoice is a discovered truth.

-His versatility is immense. For Romeu, it is a torch, a ball of fire, Joao Galafoice changes himself into nearly everything: rowing boat, black ship, headless body casting the fishing net, whales, shouts. Other fishermen use the following words or expressions: little torch, little blue fire, torch of fire, ghost in a black suit, big basket and hat of straw. He is slipping along smoothly as if on ice: a man wearing a huge hat, who climbs up trees. White ghost standing on a raft, friend in white getting out of the water with a bundle of clothing on his head! Even a fisherman spoke about Joao Galafoice as being a "guitar player", a "crab fisher", not to mention "the leather hat cowboy".
"Although very rarely protecting and helping a fisherman, Joao Galafoice usually invites him to the most horrifying of all dances — the dance of 'supernatural' terror. In northeast Brazil, generally speaking, the stories of 'supernatural' terror are inexhaustable. It is both dangerous and attractive entertainment for a lot of people's conversations. Joao Galafoice belongs in the numerous family of horror makers. He performs with refined skills, his role of horror maker. "If he appears", says Odenia, "I run away". "Whenever someone goes fishing with the thought of him", said Joanna, "he does not even find fish or oysters, he sees nothing".

And Mr. Blu: "Galafoice appeared there and then, we were all pushed over, rolling back to the right side, the net would roll the wrong way. We saw a lot of fish but didn't catch any. We went through short cuts and the mangroves closed up behind us. We could neither go forward nor backward. We ended up lost. The canoeist either hits the rock or gets stuck on the shore. This reminds us of the time when there was no bridge". Blu says that the canoeist came to the point of transporting, no more or less, than Galafoice himself: "When he came to the middle of the river, he said that he saw the man raising himself up from the canoe, with black clothing and a straw basket, the canoe's sail disappeared. He reached the harbour's rock terrified". He sat on the canoe's prow", tells Antonio, "the canoe, with his weight, sinks. If one curses, he comes up to burn the man with fire and the fellow drops as if dead".

Frenetic weaving of pursuits and horrifying sufferings.

Arabesques of undisguised death. Dead, Joao Galafoice calls his son, irresistible appeal of the most violent desire, death. One more story of a dead Father. Another Hamlet's accomplice, outlining — in the darkness of the night, his mysterious winding paths for the impossible dialogue. Once the father is dead, his children dream of overpowering the sea, of a new TOTEM and TABU.

Freud in his researches on totemism, refound the crimes of Oedipus. Making use of Westermarck's observations to ascertain that the dearest dead turn out to be the demons. Enjoying the living they try to kill them. The relatives' death satisfy the children's unconscious desire, which if powerful enough, would cause death. Such a hostility is attributed to the dead itself, for the guilty feeling renders him more powerful than the living. The ambivalence, love — hatred, when still alive transforms itself with the death; when hatred and fear predominate (Totem and Tabu). Joao Galafoice drowned in the tide, but his son survived, he died then, because his son was saved.

The father is dead, but the sea is alive. "O pescador tem dois amores, um bem na terra, um bem na mar". (The fisherman has two loves, one in the sea and one on the land (Caymim). Seduced by the sea, seduced by death. It is the love of the sea, struggle for life, which leads him to face up to the power of death. Seduced by the sea, seduced by the mother. It is quite original, the episode narrated by Romeo, one of the few referring to his mother. "I had the habit of calling mother whenever I was in need to pass faeces in the street. She was disgusted because I used to say; Mother stay here watching me". This year during which Dominique Laporte published her elegant book "Histoire de la Merde", she would be admonished to know that today Romeo's children repeat the same stratagem: "fazer preciso na rua" (to defaecate in the street). For the book begins with a public notice of 1539: of King Francis the First, compelling every family to have its latrine. Right after, she quotes Freud, who contests the hierarchy between shit and knowledge. The only difference, perhaps lies in the 'smell'. And the contemporary kings — not being as blind as Edgar Allan Poe had already shown in 'The Purloined Letter', generally have a stuffy nose. Romeo, "at the time of the collapse of bravery", relies on his mother's complacent look. She, annoyed by being compelled to contemplate the same scene daily — uncommon for us, threatens him with terrors and shouts: "here comes the ball of fire". Usually the mother's desire comes true. Romeo is pleased with mum's looking. She, once the threat is materialised, is called to calm the fear, makes a point of increasing it. Romeo ends up running to mother's arms. Notice the ambivalence of Romeo's fear confronted by his mother's threat. He 'crazily' runs to her side. Between 'a protector and a menace' there is no distance.

Galafoice himself is threatened. He belongs in the cycle of "Pagan souls", a half caste who wanders in pain over the earth, because he died without being baptized.

Didi tells us this way: "A burst of flame 75 cms high was coming towards me. My brother said to another, let's baptize that bloke and then it disappeared. It went far, far away and all of a sudden was extinguished. By the very fact of being threatened, it becomes a threat.

By threatening, the power enjoys the opportunity of transcending the limits when it is a question of the oppressed people. This observation would agree with the problem of letting people interpret their stories. Therefore, it would be an abuse of power for a scholar, a psychoanalyst or another to undertake such a task. But the people are not interested in interpreting. The people live their stories which represent their true history. Their interpretations are implicit allusions — sometimes, explicit
with regard to the unique register: to switch from Galafoice to the political dominant in a sort of mixture of conformism and rebellion. To the uncontrolled sadism of oppression, the people—rendered infantile, devalued, respond with the masochism of their guilt: "we began as children ( . . .) and the fear lives with us", says Deda de Gaibu. The fear used, ever since to put the child to sleep reaches unprecedented levels in the human heart. "All the songs have their master, the sea has one also", remarks Maria das Dores. Antonio confirms: "Every direction has its dominions. If one goes fishing in the mangroves, one only catches fish if 'he' lets you do so. If one goes to the bush, one only hunts if 'he' lets you"—an allusion to a vision of a large land owner whose name is God-mother Fulozinha. "Na águ doce, tern mae-d'água". (In the fresh water there is a mother too.)

"If the master gives permission." Aurino—an expert fisherman knows how to illustrate that permission: "Joao Galafoice, I never saw him. I am not a stupid ass that gets frightened by a mysterious vision. I know it is a fisherman's story, when there are a lot of fish. This generation will never see the abundance of fish that was here. The woman's father cast the net that the fish carried away. Today there is here only a remainder. This pollution ruins it all. Caú was father and mother of the shrimp — today of nothing. This way we live, motionless, unable to fish."

All is permitted to the master, owner of the river, owner of the sea, even as Ambrósio said, "to commit the greatest crime that I ever heard: Twelve thousand families starving to death because the residue of the sugar factories is killing the fish". Protected, the powerful one accumulates his medals as protector of the people. In an upside down world it is indeed the powerful that need protection, without doubt, like the criminal after one of his usual attempts. In the oppressed spaces occupied by the master, he dominates the pain. A labyrinth—each time becoming narrower, where work is forbidden and where to live, is forbidden also.

The transition from the poetic and mythical Galafoice to the one responsible for the pollution. That type of slipping motion is repeated by the fisherwomen when they refer to the politician who prosecutes them. Here is a fragment of their conversation: "I never voted him into office, if he wants to climb, let him climb a coconut palm. On the eve of the election; I put up posters and right after, I took them down. When one thinks of Joao Galafoice, one gets lost in the mangroves, loses the keg too". In front of the imaginary vision, the symbolic language, the tamed rebellion, raises up the reality of the un-nourished body.
PSYCHOANALYSIS AND CURE

Gustavo Ezequiel Etkin

“Es gibt kaum etwas Ähnliches in der Medizin; in den Märchen hören Sie von bösen Geistern, deren Macht gebrochen ist, sobald man ihnen ihren gehiemgehaltenen Namen sagen kann.”

“There is hardly anything like this in Medicine, though in fairy tales you hear of evil spirits whose power is broken as soon as you can tell them their name — the name which they have kept secret.”

Sigmund Freud

“Die zukünftigen Chancen der psychoanalytischen Therapie.” (1910) G.W., 8, 112.

“Qui a interrogé aussi intrépidement que ce clinicien attaché au terre-à-terre de la souffrance, la vie sur son sens, et non pour dire qu’elle n’en a pas, façon commode de s’en laver les mains,
mais qu'elle n'en a qu'un, ou le désir est porté par la mort.

"Who more fearlessly than this clinician, so firmly tied to mundane suffering, has questioned life as to its meaning, and not to say that it has none, which is a convenient way of washing one's hands of the whole business, but to say that it has only one meaning, that in which desire is borne by death?"

Jacques Lacan

"La direction de la cure et les principes de son pouvoir." (1958) Ecrits, P. 642.

A man suffered from faecal incontinence — anytime, anyplace, his sphincter gave free passage to his humiliation. A friend recommended a proctologist to him, but he understood a psychologist. After sometime, his friend found him again and asked him if he was already cured from that illness.

I am quite well, he answered smiling to his friend, I shit myself, but now I don't care.

As all jokes, this joke about psychoanalysis also can be interpreted: What apparently appears as a criticism of the inefficacy of the psychoanalytical treatment is, truly, an expression of a wish which can be manifest under the form of a joke.

In this case, the desire of satisfying anal erotogenicity that the external censorship and the internal repression forbids. But it is also an expression of desires towards psychoanalysis, that if the expression is not totally adequate to what would be the result of a psychoanalytic treatment, it is also not completely erroneous.

We could suppose, hypothetically, that the final faecal untying of the protagonist of the joke was — like the joke itself — a symptom, in that it was a disguised expression which symbolised the desire of obtaining forbidden anal pleasures.

The disguise, would have consisted then in the incremenal détour with which he obtained pleasure in an indirect form. The reason for that détour at the same time would have been the resistance with which his ego, in the service of his moral conscience — would have intended — as a parapraxis impending these pleasures and at the same time punishing the playful protagonist.

The psychoanalytic cure — according to the joke — would have consisted then in the lifting of the resistance which, coming in conflict with its Trieb(drive) produced suffering. From there the concerned protagonist would have been able to defecate with pleasure before the indignation of any witness.

Nevertheless, the mistake consists in that, if it was a symptom, what was wished by the protagonist was something different from his defection. Between many other alternatives, and following the suppositions, it could have been — according to what Freud called the symbolic equation — the desire to exhibit a penis, to have a child, or to display money. In this case, and for that reason, if he had been cured he would not have needed to continue shitting himself to signify his jouissance (pleasure) which then would have been represented in the scene of a fantasy made already conscious, a fantasy which at the same time, would not necessarily accompany such incontinence in the real.

Putting this in another way: it would have made conscious, the desire which because of the repression was unconscious, just as the moral condemnation which, generating guilt and suffering, accompanied it.

And nothing else. The objective of a psychoanalytic treatment is not to operate in the real. Its only reality is the psychic reality of the patient constituted in a particular and unique form in which, through the medium of sexuality, the real was marked with signifiers for him.

Psychoanalysis doesn't work over the real for theoretical and clinical reasons. In the theory, the real has its place: the place of the impossible, the obstacle which should be detoured, of the unnameable, which should be named, of the non-sense, of the insignificant, of the trauma. A place empty of signified, in which the concept of differences has not yet been constituted.

In the clinic — the place of psychoanalysis, the real appears in its dialogue as an intent of designation, as silence, as resistance, as an absence, or as an unnameable residue, when the sense has been found, but always, in one way or another it is the exterior to the sense which, precisely, can be apprehended yet never totally — in the interpretation, under the condition that such exteriority would be, for the patient, a certain eroticised place in a certain manner.

And precisely the discovery of that certain manner — is what gives to an interpretation the status of efficacy — that is to say — because it is true. Because that specific place of the real for the subject (that certain manner), is going to be for him an eroticised hole where both his desire and his castration will converge.
The way of taking into account at the same time, that certain manner, is through the transference — thanks to which the analyst, in the analytic dialogue, is occupying in different moments the place of a specular image or of a sexual object.

From that perspective, one can say then, that the cure in psychoanalysis, is the result of a series of efficacious interpretations articulated in a temporal sequence. Nevertheless at this stage we intend to ask ourselves about what is that result — the cure — obtained as a consequence of what can be optimistically supposed as efficacious interpretation.

Freud, referring to the cure used in German two words in the same sense: die Kur, which means, "to be treated by something" or "surrender to the care of someone," — "submit to a treatment," "being occupied with...," or die Behandlung which alludes etymologically to "a process of treatment with the hands." He doesn't use instead the term "Heilung," which means "restore to health," as applied to the practise of veterinarians and quacks.

If, nevertheless somebody could argue that talking about treatment, or not about healing is a consequence of the previous medical training of Freud that he later abandoned, because medicine also uses "Kur" and "Behandlung", then this is the reason why psychoanalysis doesn't speak of healing either, that is to say of results. There is, we understand, a radical difference in the way that we can take into account the possibilities of those results.

The expected dénouement in medicine — although not always mentioned, is the postponement of death through the restoration of the body. The wounds are closed, deterioration is prevented, the functions are restored, the losses are avoided in so far as they are the anticipation of the Absolute Loss.

Neither can psychoanalysis avoid death, nor is that its aim. On the contrary, it calls death, it summons death — and names it in the particular forms that it acquires in the sexuality of the subject. Because death in psychoanalysis is called castration. And castration at the same time, veiled and designated by the key signifier which Jacques Lacan named the Phallus — not only gives sense to all the other concepts of the theory allowing a coherent articulation, but also in the same psychoanalytic dialogue is the arrow which, through forgetfulness, mistakes, aggressivity, demands, dreams and repetitions, shows the path in which desire circulates. This is so, that when successful, that summons produces its effects: the psychoanalytic dialogue. If before —

in the transference — the summons has immobilised in a specular recurrence (and therefore dual) in the demand of love, in idealised fascination, in reproach, in hate and in revindication, it appears now allowing symbolisation and at the same time minimising the images, giving place to the supremacy of those words which open the way to the memory of other words, those which once had the intention to name that desire and its implicit transgression.

Although also in the subject, already out of the clinical situation, effects are produced to be able to live with his own constitutive, essential, intimate death, — having been able to symbolise it, he will also have access to jouissance (pleasure), because jouissance (pleasure) is the maximum approximation of sexuality to death, which at the same time will produce effects in other vital areas. But here is a limit of psychoanalysis itself, the castration in its own 'corpus': if psychoanalysis, as we heard, doesn't operate in the real, (as we defined before) much less does psychoanalysis operate with behaviour — in so far as it is observable — of the patient in his everyday life. Tiresias was a blind person who listened very well. On the contrary, psychoanalysis would no longer be psychoanalysis, but would become instead a kind of incitement to behaviour modification which, to put it bluntly is an intention of spreading moralities.

For psychoanalysis, even the disappearance of the symptom is an after effect of the analysis of its causes, not its immediate objective. It is because psychoanalysis, to be so, has as its end, precisely analysis and not synthesis. We can venture then an affirmation: psychoanalysis doesn't cure, because it doesn't repair what is irreparable, doesn't give back the lost, doesn't suture any wounds, doesn't proclaim in short either healthy behaviours or happy endings.

The idea, yes, is to be able to live with that wound in such a way that the inevitable pain which is produced — will not develop into a black hole which attracts and absorbs the possibility of 'jouissance' (pleasure) and the tension of life. Nothing more, but nothing less.

As Freud reminds us in one of his most beautiful pages, where he talks of his disagreement with the idea that the thought of the transience of beauty should interfere with our joy in it.

"A flower that blossoms only for a single night does not seem to us that account less lovely."

Vergänglichkeit
G.W. 10 358-361 (1916)
Mach es kurz!
Am Jungsten Tag ist's nur ein...Furz!
Be brief!
The Judgement Day will not be more than a....fart!
Goethe "Zahne, Xenien".

Freud writes to Fliess on 4.12.1896 that he proposes to put a heading in the title "On Resistance" with this verse; but it is only in 1914 at the beginning of Chapter III of the "History of the Psychoanalytic Movement" — Schizmatic Movements — where that epigraph is used.
Psychoanalysis brought the plague and with that built up at once the antibodies in the theory which are its resistance. If the classic has any value, this is the moment to think here again the concepts of the Freudian Unconscious (Unbewusst).

Its pretension of science has accentuated in the last 30 years the separation between theory and practice. This separation does not gain anything if we point out culpability in this pretension, because the remark would still be useless to enable us to reunify theory and practice. We moreover believe that this pretension was the one which made manifest the weakness of a practice fed from its own prestige.

Psychoanalysis is not a profession; less still a profession of scientific faith. It defines as a science having its own object of study; the unconscious, where it poses the Cause as Truth — that which all other sciences do not take into account.

But in this pretension to know the laws and figures of the rhetoric of the unconscious, psychoanalysis does not have any problem in subverting the laws of logic — not from contempt, but yes because it found in them the résumé of a consciousness which gives the order of its own itinerary. This allows many calumnious practitioners of Freud to find mechanistic thought, idealism and contradictions in his theory.

The works of Freud cannot be evaluated in the context of the rest of the sciences because in them the cogito is the result of the cogito itself, and if this is not equal to the object — which the ‘cogito’ thinks about — it always retains the hope that an extensive study of a scientific work will allow that cogito to grasp more exactly that ever elusive object of knowledge. Since for psychoanalysis knowledge is the resistance to the truth, it does not fit well — without mutilations or additions (which most of the time are debatable) — in the corpus of sciences leaving aside the esoteric pretension which finally coexist and interchange quite well with the empiricist pretensions.²

The result is: either that psychoanalysis is the epistemology of sciences, as no small number claim (and for which there is no lack of very convincing reasons) or that psychoanalysis is something radically different. This reasoning is the result of, as well as the practice of, the study of psychoanalysis, and we should confess here that ‘looking behind’ and seeing something less than a small grain of sand doesn’t give us that satisfaction that Rilke² promised us.

Psychoanalysis is neither literature nor art in a wide sense, but certainly its distance from this field is very small. Neither does it give us tranquility nor ‘pax de espirit’ the Althusserian position. To say it promptly and in brief, the question is open. The problem of psychoanalysis is more than an epistemologic rupture.

These brief lines are intended to confine our field within limits which without seeking acceptance, permit discussion of the field so defined. This is our position. But we want to warn nevertheless, in an anticipation of questions that may not arise, that, for the fact of having written this, this reflection is already the third moment if we take into account as the second moment the reconstruction of the clinical experience. The first moment being the discourse of the patient. From here there appears to us a difficulty which even the most objective ‘mathematization’ would be unable to ignore. This difficulty refers to the three filters which the unconscious imposes on our conscious.

Dead the surrealistic fantasy, none of us ignore any more that consciousness is a very little thing, but it is the only compass that we have.

But if Rilke from the ‘belles lettres’ doesn’t procure us any satisfaction, the same happens from philosophy.

It is good to remember and to repeat with Freud — in a seldom quoted passage concerning the servitudes of the ego — that we should not want to make a philosophy of the ego because we know that the ego is the result, not the beginning.

Psychoanalysis is not a Weltanschauung says its creator. And the not is so heavy that it cannot — maybe, and the maybe should remain like that — prevent the appearance of a paradox; an affirmation over riding the negation. This affirmation breaks the structural order of the spectrum of contemporary sciences. Psychoanalysis does not fit well into the mosaic which orders sciences up and down, right and left. In another way, maybe it finds its episteme in a solitary order, the first scheme of which would be its opposition to the rest of the sciences — and to avoid any suspicions, I include the whole corpus of sciences.

If you allow me to continue with this reasoning, the first question would then be if I have not already taken sides in questioning a part of the problem to take the remainder. If this is effectively the case, the answer would be to see in psychoanalysis the guarantee of scientism, a tentative path which would close the circuit answering the question and, rightly or wrongly, would provide a secure and convenient illusion.

But, if we choose another path, and psychoanalysis is another science unlike the scientism of the rest, it excludes absolutely the above idea; then we can improvise other approximations. We are — though — to remain here, keeping these contradictions which we cannot answer.
Now then, it is time to ask ourselves if we have gained something in favour of a wider knowledge, or if we have only obscured the problem. Let us go back then in a direct way to the problem with which we began. What is psychoanalysis?

1) Science, style, or art,
2) All three at once,
3) Epistemology of science, or,
4) Another thing (Sache)²⁴

We are going to leave all the questions open. We do not ask of the interlocutor or more precisely of the listener, any agreement at all in what we have said. We understand at the same time, that each question losing its question mark becomes an answer. But if we do not ask the listener for any agreement except the right to exercise our discourse, haven't we for that reason then, when we thought ourselves very far from our subject, ventured into the Royal Road of the word in psychoanalysis? And this entrance is just that of the Interpretation.

We will affirm from the outset that the Jungian fantasy of the interpretation is not going to blossom again here in a renewed hermeneutics which makes of Jung and Freud two baskets, and is always ready to throw away used ideas to the Jungian basket which is ever ready to answer one by one all the questions even though playing the strong card of the archetypes.

For Jung there are always answers, while for Freud, the fundamental Spaltung of the being means that there are only questions. When that being thinks he has an answer it merely is a repetition.

What is the interpretation if not the manner which is convenient (in the meaning of coming with) to the unconscious for the lifting of the repression? But we would be mistaken to forget two texts, the one “The Wolf Man” answering Jung from the clinic; and the other “Constructions in Psychoanalysis” answering the psychoanalytic deviationism from the theory. “The Wolf Man” has been underlined, and with reason, as a major text. The “Constructions in Psychoanalysis” instead, has been neglected sufficiently enough to withdraw strength from the connection which exists between that work and that one, the implications of the second phase of which we rescue today and of which can be said that it is unconscious because it has never existed, and should be reconstructed. We refer to the text “A Child is Being Beaten”, where Freud speaks of the origin of the perverse fantasies describing three stages in them. The second stage of this fantasy had — in brief — two characteristics: it never existed and it was unconscious. This second stage needed therefore of the psychoanalytic reconstruction. This, is a logical need.

Freud showed in that formula — in a condensed way — the importance that lies both in the impersonal subject who is beaten and in the impersonal subject who beats. This can be easily recognised if we read the title of the paper in a loud voice.

This perverse fantasy needs to create an ambiguous status where the subject sinks in order to preserve his desire, and the only presence is his gaze to see at that very moment in which the lack of love will be associated with that very moment in which the Phallus disappears.

The “Constructions in Psychoanalysis” leads us to interpret, in that very bad misunderstanding between the first and the second theory of Freud which runs from the seduction to the fantasy, that there is a bridge where ignorance has put together Kleinians and Jungians in their respective pastures.

Let us be clear. The child is always either rightly or wrongly erotised by the Other through the progenitors or others; this is to say, seduced. It is upon this point that the analyst — moving away from empiricism — chooses his own course declaring that it is this (the erotogenization by the Other) which constitutes the unconscious fantasy. Because the unconscious fantasy doesn't exist as real, the function of the analyst is to recognise its psychic reality. Rightly so, because it has not existed.

The interpretation is for the subject — so to speak — the inaugural moment of the constitution of his fantasy in conscious reality. This is possible through the function of the analyst as the condition of the patient’s ‘jouissance’.

It would be very difficult indeed, strictly speaking, to separate the psychoanalytic interpretation from the lay interpretation, and, even more, paranoic interpretation, if we do not take the precaution of including the notion of transference understood as resistance. In reference to a classic distinction, we will find in applied psychoanalysis that the punctuation of the transference is not easy to carry out. In applied psychoanalysis, explicitly or not, the analyst more than formulates the interpretation — he applies the construction. But, as we will soon see, it is then the transference now limping, (because it is absent in applied psychoanalysis) that shows the obscurantism in which the post-Freudian analytic development blossomed. And not only on this side of the planet.
I should confess that the transference existed with the first word which animated our thought, because Freud lui-même in the famous-unknown Chapter VII of the "Traumdeutung", conceptualised the transference as: the passage from the Sachvorstellung to the Wortvorstellung. That later post-Freudian psychoanalysis would have taken the other limb of the transference (that of clinical experience) does no more than cast light upon the professionalization of psychoanalysis which found in these fringes good 'material' for entertainment. This enabled the shutting of their ears to a truth which is not easier to grasp because it is there.

Beyond all the different answers with which you want to accept or refute the questions that I left open, there is, as Lacan brilliantly pointed out, a date, a moment of time — 1938 — where Freud, while dying, tries to articulate the last truth. This truth, for being the last, finds a formula that death lends him with the word nothing. Psychoanalysis deals with the truth to which it does not arrive. The most distant point it reaches in direction to the truth is called castration, this is to say, that which makes the subject enter the symbolic order. The mathematical formula of the truth in psychoanalysis is:

Truth = Nothing, (by nothing is meant the impossible).

This was well known by Freud very early when with his radical dualism, he included the categories of Realität and Wirklichkeit.2 This is why it is good for us to know how to put together here also the problem of seduction (real).

That is to say, psychoanalysis deals with the truth insofar as it does not reach it.

We are here taking the truth in a very restricted way, in opposition to a logical truth which in our understanding is that which, by turning the key, produces a tendency to suture the castration — in promising a unified subject. This is to say, without any division between knowledge and truth.

When Freud at the beginning of the seduction theory felt himself deceived by his patients and was tempted to abandon his theory, he did not give up psychoanalysis. And we can see that he pursued this line of thought because he understood that psychoanalysis — although mapping in the field of truth — cannot give a full account of it. Truth speaks all the time, but the truth cannot be spoken. If Lacan's statement that there is no Other of the Other (that is to say that there is no metalanguage) has scientific value; then, the value of this formula is to recall our attention to the impossibility of the suturing of a discourse back upon itself without leaving the scars of castration. We can talk all the time in an attempt to explain everything, but there is no way of avoiding the Spaltung between knowledge and truth.

The psychoanalytic discourse cannot give an account of itself without casting the first rock — that living rock of castration — as a foundation for the discourse.

"On the contrary, it is in this very moment of coincidence (consciousness and subject) in so far as he is captivated by reflection, where according to me we can place the entry of the psychoanalytic experience. Taking this into account relative to time, this subject of the 'I think' reveals what he is: the being of a failure. I am the one who thinks 'therefore, I am' as I have remarked in another place specifying that the 'therefore' — the aspect of the cause — splits in the beginning the 'I am' of existence from the 'I am' of the meaning. This gap (Spalt,*) is, properly speaking, that which psychoanalysis reveals to us in everyday life."

The cause in the beginning — the object small a — is at the same time that towards which the subject is attracted and that which splits the subject. It is that which clinical experience showed us from the theory as castration. The castration inaugurates the subject.

"I say that the philosophic consciousnesses that you find in the philosophers up to the zenith of Sartre, have the function of suturing this béance of the subject in which function the analyst recognises the trick that supposes locking the truth (to which the perfect instrument would obviously be that ideal which Hegel promised us as absolute knowledge)."

From there we should recognise the dense formula of Lacan which transcends the examples of the clinic and says that knowledge is a resistance to the truth. Because, except for absolute knowledge, there is no other knowledge which claims to be capable of resolving (by unity) the Spaltung practised in the subject. We affirm in this sense that the knowledge which is closest to truth always finds it in the emblems of nothingness. This is why the counterpart of an absolute knowledge is death, while the knowledge of man, interpreted as resistance, advances secure within the confines of castration.
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This reminds us of a hero of Freud's who, while dying, asked for more light; Goethe. Freud at the time of his death, not wanting to resist — to know — to suffer any more, asked to be sent to that dream without preamble which imposes the death with its definitive word — nothing.7

Psychoanalysis is transmitted and its communication leads us to the two concepts of transference and resistance. We have mentioned these topics to support our exposition. The "Traumdeutung" is the major work of the theory and in it was already drawn metapsychologically the concept of transference. We know, and Freud says this explicitly, that the phenomenon of transference is not exclusive to psychoanalysis. Psychoanalysis nevertheless gives it a place of privilege and maximum exposure. No doubt the ideal point of an analysis implies its never ending termination of the transference. This was a deep preoccupation of Ferenczi — according to the description of Freud in "Analysis Terminable and Interminable" — the price of which was that curious admonition from Freud: 'You, Ferenczi, want too much', to a Ferenczi who had 'only' posed the suggestion that the analysis with its transference finished when the patient could as a person talk to the analyst as another person. An impossible demand as the French language reminds us, the word 'personne' condenses the English 'person' and 'nobody' simultaneously.

In Lacan's words, this was the anguish that accompanied Ferenczi until the end of his days; asking himself if the confession of the patient shouldn't conclude with that of the analyst.

In the light of these questions, we should make a big effort to dissipate the ironies that we find in all the handy psychoanalytic bibliographies. If Strachey mistakes his translation and if Lacan has near at hand the reasons for those mistakes in a Gesammelte Werke; much less standardized — in the meaning popularised by sociology — then, 'the being which ought to become in the place of It'10 makes this reflection place the being facing death. Here the interpretation silences any word which, no matter how well aimed, it pretends charitably to pass over — in the Imaginary of course — the limits of the notch of castration which the being symbolises by death, and not the reverse. It is not useless to point out that the clue here rests on the term 'symbolise' since every analysis occurs between the real death and the symbolic death.

Our indecision about the place occupied by psychoanalysis in the rest of the corpus of sciences makes more sense now. This is why with the limitation of the case, psychoanalysis makes its appearance as that strange body in the spectrum of the sciences as a symptom — where to annihilate the effects that it creates, the sciences have passed from disavowal to integration. This is seen in the academic discourse. This is why institutionalization, teaching and practice itself, constitute a strange contradiction for those who, loyal to a power — that of their own consciousness — felt themselves exempted from interpreting these things psychoanalytically.

Teaching, governing, analysing were — Freud said — impossible11 tasks. The institutions as a project of the passage to the psychoanalytic act are only what an act is — a parapraxis.

FOOTNOTES

1 Usually 'Jungsten' is written with a small 'j' and if Freud wrote it with a capital 'J' it was to mock Jung.

2 In London, the Kleinians do not have any problem in welcoming in their scientific meetings the Jungians who call themselves the 'real Freudians' (Personal Communication).

3 RILKE, Rainier Maria., "Letters to a Young Poet", letter 1, Paris, February 17th. 1903. "Things are not all so comprehensible and expressible as one would mostly have us believe; most events are inexpressible taking place in a realm which no word has ever entered, and more inexpressible than all works of art, mysterious existence, the life of which, while ours passes away, endures".

4 LACAN, J., "The Individual Myth of the Neurotics or Poetry and Truth in Neurosis". "It is often said that psychoanalysis — properly speaking — is not a science, which would by contrast seem to indicate that we can simply say it is an art. Certainly, such a thing cannot be stated if by art we understand simply technique, operational method, praxis or any other thing of this order. I simply believe that the term art should be employed here with the sense it had in the Middle Ages, when people talked of liberal arts... It is true that which characterises those arts and distinguishes them from other sciences... is the permanence in the first plane of something that can be called its essential relation, fundamental, with the measure of man. I think that psychoanalysis is perhaps at present, the only discipline comparable with those liberal arts".
The Oxford Companion to Art

Liberal Arts: "The classification of the arts most generally prevalent in antiquity was the division between vulgar and liberal arts. Though it became known to the Middle Ages mainly in the Latin terminology of 'artes vulgares or sordidae and artes liberales' was born of the aristocratic spirit of the Greek city states expressed in educational and social theories which distinguished between activities suitable for 'liberal' or free-born citizens and manual occupations fit only for foreigners or serfs. The most complete statement of the distinction in antiquity is that of Galen (Protepticus 14) in the 2nd. c.a.D. A century earlier the younger Seneca (Epistolae 88,21) combined it with a variant classification wing back to the Stoic philosopher Poseidonius into arts which instruct (pueriles) and those which amuse (ludicrae). Later on the liberal arts came to be referred to as 'encyclic', meaning the comprehensive circle embracing all that was necessary to an educated man. In these, as in all classifications which preceded the concept of the FINE ARTS, the word 'art' carries a very different signification from that which it bears in AESTHETIC discourse today, and one closer to the meaning which survives in academic terminology such as 'arts degree'. The Greek conception of techne and the Latin arts embraced the pursuit of knowledge, theoretical and practical sciences, and craftsmanship. The supreme art was held to be philosophy, and the division of the arts into liberal and vulgar was an expression of the Greek preference for activities of the mind and their contempt for salaried labour. It was a preference which in one form or another survived through the Middle Ages up to the RENAISSANCE.

Aristotle accepted music among the liberal arts, though with the proviso that a free-born man should not become a virtuoso performer. (The Greeks generally thought of what we call fine arts from the point of view of performance rather than appreciation). He somewhat doubtfully included an elementary knowledge of painting in the educational curriculum of the citizen. Galen mentioned rhetoric, geometry, arithmetic, and astronomy among the arts which were considered to be liberal. He included the theory of music and acoustics but not its practice (a distinction which remained prevalent through the Middle Ages). About painting and sculpture he was hesitant, writing 'if one wishes, one may consider them as liberal arts'. The classical tradition was systematized in the Middle Ages, one of the earliest formulations being a verse handbook written by Martianus Capella (5th.c) which divided the liberal arts into groups of three and four. This was taken up by Boethius, who gave the name quadrivium to the sciences which studied physical reality (arithmetic, astronomy, geometry and music) and trivium to the arts of grammar, rhetoric and logic. This systematization of the seven liberal arts was elaborated in encyclopedic fashion by Cassiodorus in Book II of his Institutes.

In this medieval system 'music' meant the mathematical theory of music as proportion and none of the activities which later came to be recognised as 'fine arts' was included. The ancient deprecation of the practical activities, including such arts as painting and sculpture and architecture, in comparison with theoretical knowledge and speculation was perpetuated in the theological distinction between praiseworthy and honourable pursuits. Its classical formulation is in a commentary by St. Thomas Aquinas on Aristotle's De Anima, where he says: "Every science is good and not only good but honourable, yet in this regard one science excels over another... Among good things some are praiseworthy, namely those which are useful for an end; others are honourable, namely those which are useful in themselves... The speculative sciences are good and honourable; the practical sciences are only praiseworthy". It was against this medieval depreciation of the plastic arts that LEONARDO protested in his Trattato della Pittura, providing a theoretical basis for the social struggle which took place at the Renaissance to raise them from the lowly status of manual skill to the dignity of a liberal exercise of the spirit. This was achieved by emphasizing the intellectual and scientific aspects of painting in a way which imparted a rationalistic and intellectual bias to art theory for centuries to come, and which is foreign equally to the ROMANTIC and to contemporary outlook.

In Capella's handbook the liberal arts are personified as women holding various ATTRIBUTES and being followed by famous masters of the arts concerned (e.g. Cicero with Rhetoric) and as such they were frequently illustrated throughout the Middle Ages. On the west porch of CHARTRES Cathedral (12th.c.) Geometry is accompanied by Pythagoras. The full system is to be found in 14th.c. works such as ANDREA DA FIRENZE's murals in the Spanish Chapel of St.Maria Novella in Florence or the illustrated manuscripts of Pietro de Bartoli's Canto delle Virtu e delle Scienze (Chantilly).

In the Italian Renaissance the tradition was continued but treated with greater freedom. Sometimes, as in the Tempio Malatestiano at Rimini (c.1455), the Arts and the Muses appear together; elsewhere the cycle is enlarged, as on the tomb of Sixtus IV by POLLAIUOLO (c.1490) where 10 arts were represented. PINtoricchio in the Appartamento Borgia (c.1495) surrounds his seven enthroned Arts with large groups of
anonymous followers. The scheme of RAPHAEL’s Stanza della Segnatura (c.1510), representing the followers of Poetry, Philosophy and Theology, is influenced by this tradition. For the BAROQUE age the types of the liberal arts were codified by Cesare Ripa in his handbook of PERSONIFICATION."

Lacan says that the impossible is the real which according to our understanding is in the same path of the Freudian categories of Realität and Wirklichkeit which are evoked here to say the same in a different manner, because psychoanalysis deals with psychic reality while Wirklichkeit is exactly what the word cannot symbolise. And since psychoanalysis occurs within a discourse, nothing beyond that has psychic reality.

The parenthesis (Spalt) is mine.


On the night of 23rd. September 1939 Freud was put into a coma with morphine by his personal physician according to an old pact between them in which Freud asked for the promise not to suffer unnecessarily.

Wo Es war soll Ich werden.

We should not confuse impossible and impotence, since the first is the searching of the unreachable while the second treats the ‘Trieb’ as an instinct by means of repression.

Part II

ON FEMININITY
THE WOMAN AND THE REAL
AS A PARADIGM OF PSYCHOSIS*

Oscar Zentner

The woman and the real,
The woman constitutes herself at the side of the Law which the symbolic order creates,
The woman is not entirely herself,
She is not entirely 'mad',
Why is she not entirely true?
The phallic logic,
The imaginary identifies her,
To the symbolic order,
From whence her lack because she finds herself complete in the real,
It will make her fail in her attempt to grasp the symbolic,
The real becomes fused with the symbolic,
Making her ride precipitately over the imaginary,
The amorous betrayal of the woman questions the Law by deflecting it,
An entire woman could make us measure the Law in the limits of madness.

* This paper has been read at the IV Congress of the Center of Freudian Studies of Brazil, 1979.
"I would not like any one of these letters to become known to so-called posterity"

Freud's words to Marie Bonaparte.

This paper\(^1\) was born from my reflection as a result of my seminar on Lacan's "Seminar on the Purloined Letter"\(^2\); this is to say, from an unpaid debt. A loss of receipts and for that same reason, unpaid as a debt.

There is nothing of the course of casualty that wouldn't find its place in the laws of chance\(^3\). There where if I find myself it is at the expense of pure loss, because it is proper to the Being to be allowed a place in the interstices of a chain which in its own repetition constitutes it by a delay that allows the Being to live until it finds its destiny.

This delay is the same that Freud grasped — in a titanic intention — in his "Project for a Scientific Psychology", a work that had no title until the editors received it from the hands of a Princess\(^4\). A Princess to whom we owe the Manuscript (Letters to Fliess) and the purloined letters; purloined and revealed to Freud in the 'Royal Boudoir', this is to say, in his consulting room and as a patient. A Princess who delayed — to avoid the destruction which would have occurred — returning those precious letters, purloined, robbed, delayed, that Freud menaced and pleaded without success to recover for the fire. Letters which — if rescued from such a 'destin si funeste' — mark with a true strangeness, how it is not necessary to convene the signifiers since they arrive — no doubt — to destiny, if we remember that these were scientific letters, letters of friendship, of congress meetings and of analysis, and thus charged with an intense transference — this is to say — carrying out a sexuality proper to the interchange between the subjects.

But if Freud wanted to destroy them, isn't it a bit childish to evoke only motives of homosexuality for the one who, in the epigraph to the "Inter-pretation of Dreams" was equal to the circumstances saying: "...if I cannot reconcile the celestial gods, I will move those of Hell" (Flectere si nequeo superos Acheronta movebo). Did Freud know? What? That receiving his own message in an inverted form from the hands of a woman was the beginning of the end? From a woman... that Being for which Freud himself had reserved the role of "...mother, earth and death"\(^5\).

This is why the fate of the signifier was more or less interrogated in Vienna on the 24 of November 1887 by a letter from Freud to Fliess which commenced with a confession of his feelings towards him. But if only 168 letters were published out of a total of 284, the remaining 116 unpublished letters have done nothing else than obscure the kinship between the tale of Poe and the first analyst who felt obliged to make a psychoanalytic study of him. Marie Bonaparte, Princess George of Greece, couldn't escape the mark of the signifier in a purloined letter when she herself had treacherously acquired them to keep them without Freud's knowledge.

The Letters — important and rich in suggestions — remain an enigma which is not clarified by knowing their content. They remain as an enigma, not because some paragraphs were eliminated or because there still are 116 unpublished letters, but because the signifier is not the recollection of data but intersubjective history whose destinies — for being marked from the very beginning — have no other solution than delaying them in order to allow some place to life.

The content is indifferent — we would now say, along with Lacan — if we emphasize, for our own purpose, the fact that a letter — like any other signifier — finishes its circuit when it arrives back to the one who sent it: Freud.

We can then see the debt. And the cynical formulation which would say: "Who is not in debt?" is not sufficient. This statement points out too quickly something which is better to open up than to close. We refer to the challenge to the Law made by Marie Bonaparte who refused to return the letters which she thought she owned by paying 100 pounds. This refusal makes her repeat herself according to the signifier. The Princess — marked as a woman and under the condition of her analysis — cannot do more than resist the content of the letters which was known to Freud. The first letter — a letter of love and pact — placed Freud in an Oedipal position with relation to Fliess and makes the chain appear for our limited aims, as triangular and homosexual. To introduce adequately the woman by its side, the triangular relationship was, in fact, the one of Freud-Breuer-Fliess, the latter being the one who carried the weight of a transference emphasized by all authors.

We have remarked that if a message arrives back to the sender in an inverted form, we are dealing with death, and the singular resemblance between a fact of fiction (Poe's tale) and the real fact of who possessed the letters (Marie Bonaparte) makes us acknowledge Lacan in order to repeat with him that "Truth inhabits fiction". Did Freud know that the surprising encounter almost half a century later with a correspondence sent by him would announce his death by the mere exaggerated fact of only containing his words? The correspondence — as it is said at least — only kept the letters of Freud because he had destroyed the letters from Fliess. Of Fliess there only remains a rather weak account where he accused Freud of an extremely aggressive behaviour in the last Congress
meeting. He has shown nonetheless, the milestones of those encounters in a footnote of letter 138: "...Berlin, Vienna, Salzburg, Dresden, Nuremberg, Breslau, Innsbruck. Our last meeting was in Achensee in the summer of 1900".

A certain passage of a letter — kept by chance — from Breuer to Fliess from the summer of 1895 (that is, many months before the publication of "The Studies on Hysteria") said the following: "...The intellect of Freud is in full flight..." (Did Breuer ignore the relationship between flying and fornicating made by Freud?)... "I see him fly like the clucking hen sees the Falcon". If hen is insufficient to point out the feminine place, as clucking, this is to say brooding and passive, what else can we say about that triangular relationship that we showed at the beginning? Breuer occupied the place of a mother until the arrival of Fliess who facilitated for the son Freud, the entrance to the mystery in which he very early embarked upon to discover what a father was. When Freud on his part rebelled against Fliess, he found in orphanhood the fate of all the sons who are delivered to the world. The synthetic formula for those who may consider it necessary is:

Freud + Fliess + Fliess's wife + Stahl (Book-seller to whom Fliess's wife sold the letters after her husband's death) + Marie Bonaparte, Princess George of Greece + Freud = Freud².

This is why a very intelligent article gets lost in the Labyrinth, fascinated by its scripture rather than by the difference of sounds which would carry it to destiny. And if Lacan in his "Seminar on the Purloined Letter" is both inside and outside of the game of the indentifications, it is because he — as well as Dupin and ourselves — cannot avoid it. It is our function to work over those identifications because those 'mconnu' as countertransference are the ones which make the analysis elapse.

The Woman and the Real

The dilemma which the woman faces — and which Freud wanted to conceptualize is that of a phallic being in front of the discovery of the difference between sexes — is her constitution in the transgression of the Law, not by escaping from it but by being subjected to its side. The woman indicates from there, more than any other being, the order of the real, the hierarchy of which departs from the unknown and remains in that (Lassend wo es war)³.

Returning to a primordial text like "The Purloined Letter" we find that the woman, even not being a Queen, "detests that her principles are put under careful consideration because her clothes owe everything to the mystery of the signifier⁴. It is for this reason that we believe that Freud pointed at the loci of the structure with his formula of the Being which, in spite of being universal, does not assure an equality of destinies. The thing still remains sexual, and if we talk about the woman, what defines her is her extreme affiliation to the real, infiltrated in the symbolic of her thought. But, how does she constitute herself? Only at the back of the Law, because her obverse still affirms itself in the real "...where nothing lacks and nothing can be changed⁵".

The destiny of the woman is not out of the Being, and if in her normalization she, as well, has to abandon 'Being', she will have no remainder to 'Have'. We would appreciate here if the reader would compare, line by line, the above quoted text with Freud's "Introduction to Narcissism". We, having taken that precaution, will continue to show that the radical dualism of Freud presents itself by way of the 'Haven' which is of the Law, and in the Phallus which is of the 'Being'. We can see here the connection of the 'Being' of the woman — no matter how mad she is — with a lack in the 'Having' of the order of the symbolic which paralizes and fascinates her in the imaginary of an impossible which is therefore precipitating.

That is where the interrogation of the signifier condemns: "Eat your own Dasein". It is the same that makes a man identify with the Being (Dupin to the Queen) with a rage which for being feminine is no less revealing, "...Un Destin si funeste s'il n'est digne d'Astre est digne de Thyeste"⁶. If the destiny is so cruel as it was for the heroes of mythology it is — we understand it in this way — for asking of the 'Being' (the woman) not to be a Being in order to Be; and for asking of the 'Having' (the man) not to Be entirely in order to Have. We mark in this way the radical asymmetry between the sexes.

Thus the reply of the signifier:

"You believe you act when I stir you to the caprice of the bows with which I knot your desires. In this way, these grow and multiply themselves in objects that will return you again, to the fragmentation of you rent childhood. Well then, this is what your feast will be until the return of the stone guest which I will be for you since you invoke me"⁷.

The woman is in the mystery and lives from it, but because of not having, she forcibly offers herself. We ought to remember here that data of the clinic which — via the feminine sexuality — brought out the relevance of the Phallus.
The Woman Constitutes Herself at the Side of the Law Which the Symbolic Order Creates

From the Oedipal myth to the tale of "The Purloined Letter" which we use as clinical material alongside this paper, our intention is to show that in order to be so, 'the woman' has to go against the Law. A Law which reversing its multiplication till almost the last effects, has as a norm the separation of her product. A Law that — as Freud accurately advised us — will tend to break (in the Judeo-Christian traditions but outside them as well) because she offers herself like Being and invites to eat a knowledge which makes her even more enigmatic.

If the Sphinx is defeated; the balance of knowledge will be a blindness that in the form of identification is transmitted as the Order of the Law which, far from disclosing, forbids. To avoid the disorder of haste, we will remark that the clinic is here to remind us that knowledge does not eliminate its effects. Freud paused here many times until he was able to designate for the man (an ideal man, of course) the destruction of the Oedipus Complex, leaving instead for the woman, the repression, ready to be reactivated (especially with maternity, this is to say, with the son). What the little girl wants from the father is for him to ignore the Law which he transmits, granting her an obturation to supply a lack rather than a genital union. "Since the subject knows something, there is something lost".

This is why if she was born from the rib of a man — according to Genesis — it shows that her birth, without a father and a mother, situated her as a Being, in a very special relationship to God (figure par excellence of the original Father and of the Law). And so much so, that we are tempted to say that she was created by decree and, as the body of Law shows it, it is proper for decrees to come into contradiction, a contradiction which is resolved by arbitration. The woman is constituted by the repression of an original desire and to come to be herself, she must then enter into that masque which makes her feminine, and whose ideal — not yet well established — comes from the Law that has decreed her. Although it is true that the man will rebel against the Law, he will only do it to hasten a succession; whilst for the woman, the Law will put into play her own Being... which is not.

In spite of all the efforts made by our female analysts, Helen Deutsch has remarked — sincerely enough — that a woman to be such, should be masochistic. This statement leads us into the Todestrieb with the following question. If masochism implies destruction, which does the woman have to destroy in order to constitute herself? The answer seems to be a compromise solution, that of being completely herself, which makes us suspect that behind such enterprise remains something of the real which refuses its entrance into the symbolic order.

The Woman is not Entirely Herself

The man, that King who thinks himself to be so masculine, becomes blind and demands from the woman a double loyalty "as a subject and as a spouse"; blind and deaf, he speaks or gives orders normalising the one who, at the same time, puts him in the place of the master. She, while eating her Dasein because she is not altogether subjected, accepts — though castrated — not being in order to Be (the Phallus).

And it is in her narcissism that we find her feminine; there where she is not available. If the desire of the mother is capable of making her desirable, it is because she — while not being complete and bargaining her castration with her son — relocates him in the only place where the parricide is the antechamber of the true legitimation of power in combination with incest. Not being able to be entirely herself, this 'Spaltung' in her Being is the consequence of a disjunction in the presence of the Law. Even when she thinks she is breaking the Law, she continues to be its legitimator.

She is not Entirely 'Mad'

Lacan says that in all true woman — and the adjective is important — there is something aberrant. This is why the main subject of our analysis (the Queen) knows when she looses and prefers a deferred action in the place of the immediate, thus normalising the one who, at the same time, puts him in the place of the master. She, while eating her Dasein because she is not altogether subjected, accepts — though castrated — not being in order to Be (the Phallus).

That delay is the proof of the compromise by which she, (and all the deviations of our female analysts appear here) pointing to the medulla of her Being does not renounce Having.

But she is not entirely 'mad' and she remains trapped in her desire of Having-Being. This formula of compromise appears again in her by showing that the secret of her lack is by expansion, the use of the whole of her body. Narcissism in the woman is different to the narcissism in the man. In the Woman, far from saving her from castration (Freud comments in the 'Wolf Man' that it is his narcissism which makes him renounce the passive feminine position of having coitus with his father,
With the prerequisite of which would be castration; this is why he renounces his desire, it is restitutive in the literal sense of the word. Thus all her body will play at being the Phallus.

She restitutes a lack and she is not entirely ‘mad’ because there is a body which can support this restitution. But, being trapped in the desire of Having-Being is different to Being or Having. And it is thus in the scansion of the sequence of the three times (the three moments of the Oedipus Complex) which make her castrated, becoming the condition of not being altogether herself — neither truly, nor ‘mad’ (nor) woman, saying in this way her feminine ideal of attaining an ideal ego, which makes every contradiction between feminine and phallic disappear. Freud found — no doubt — in that ideal, the difficulty in explaining the origin of a superego in the woman. The superego finally, had to originate as the result of an imposition of a masculine generation.

Compare this with the Kleinian work of ‘putting order into chaos’ where the Phallus is found in the appearance of ‘the mixed couple of the parents’. This Phallus could be nothing else than paternal; this is to say, a product of the generations. (The Phallus is the signifier which circulates generating the Oedipal structure — in “The Purloined Letter” the Phallus is the letter itself.) This is why the son, as a result of the place he occupies in the phantasy of the mother couldn’t but point to the fourth element of the structure which, although shown après-coup, was anterior. The son was born to meet an impossibility in the lack of the mother.

Why is She Not Entirely True?

In the name of psychoanalysis we show an unnameable remainder which does not inhabit fiction. If, as Lacan says in reply to a clerk: “...the truth cannot be said entirely”, it is because she, the woman, is not entirely herself. This is the condition that leaves her in a narcissistic restitution asking both the Having and the Being. This narcissistic restitution makes the woman — who cannot be mentioned without crossing ‘the’ — neither entirely feminine nor mad. But, yes, she becomes the focus where the truth as an impossibility shows itself in the real, disguising in this way, by a double operation, the lack and the psychosis. Because she knows and she is even able to convince others of a truth that shows her as she is, complete in the real. Dupin shows us his game in “The Purloined Letter” in order for us to get lost in Lemberg. This is the fundamental teaching of the text. It is a double teaching, double in the sense of showing and transmitting: nothing lacks in the real.

The Phallic Logic

...shows the rent of a Being who cannot renounce either Being or Having. This phallic logic (by making her feel the lack, by the difference) authorises her to enter the Oedipal circuit, the entry into which is less problematic than its non exist for the woman. Freud forbade the use of the term Electra for this complex in the woman because it distorted his most radical discovery: the Oedipus Complex and castration make of the unconscious a significant structure. The Oedipus and castration in the unconscious make a significant structure and remind us that Freud didn’t center the Oedipal problem in a real organ, but in a signifier: the Phallus.

The Imaginary Identifies Her

As the more real Being and therefore incapable of creating a succession without perverting it, the woman, more concerned with the recovery of a debt, corrodes the Law or instigates others to crime. But this ‘psychoanalyst par excellence’ knows what the man ignores: that murder legitimises power.

The woman turns her back on power in order to receive in doing so, a signifier which, in spite of changing hands, will arrive at its destiny; a signifier which will make her phallic. Only recall that master-piece of a session where Marie Bonaparte — having already read Buona parte (a good part) of the correspondence from Freud to Fliess — had let Freud know that she possessed some letters that now belonged to her because she had payed for them. Freud, at the time her analyst, offered to pay her half the price in order to destroy them together. The Princess, “resisted with admirable audacity”. Resisted what? We believe that everybody was so fascinated with the correspondence that nobody realised that, from the very moment in which a resistance is not defeated, it makes the subject move thereafter according to the repetition automatism described by Freud in that paper (also well resisted and poorly understood) called “Beyond the Pleasure Principle”. This is a pertinent text to mention here since everybody knows that it is upon its structure that Lacan was able to build the repetition or automatism of the signifier which knocks the subjects, one by one, emphasizing that memory — as it belongs to nobody — will not forget the subject.

That from the moment she possessed the letters, the Princess would dedicate herself — as fate — to the figure of Poe, “who has contributed so much to the modern combinatorial mathematics” can no longer surprise anyone too much. She is made phallic at the point of flashing with the light of her splendor a blindness in all who dare take the letters
Phallus is the privileged signifier with that mark in which the part of the will go much further, because she will repeat punctually each one of the logos away to increase the dbtour what to publish and what to keep. This'is a matter of showing or hiding what will be shown will'enable the hiding of what they do not have, thus awak-
ing transitory heats of passion.

"Let us stop here for an instant to agree that if the hallucination on awakening makes of the 'hysteric princeps' of the analysis, with her arm over her shoulder, numb under the weight of her head, pressed as it was over the back of the chair where she lay, when she fell asleep, facing her veiled father with his death stentor, enlarge that arm into a snake, and as many snakes as she has fingers, it is of the Phallus and not of anything else for which the snake is a symbol. But, to whom does that Phallus "liquette ninque". That that Phallus be recognised indeed, as a belonging today's psychoanalysis so nicely labelled by Raymond Queneau as the "hysteric princeps". That that Phallus be recognised indeed, as a belonging which gives envy to the subject, no matter how womanly she is, will not fix anything if one thinks that the Phallus only emerges in such an inop-

The Princess George — a beautiful ambiguity of language — and both Fraulein Annas show and hide what they don't have in order to Be, even though forming a deliberating couple where the roles were already cast beforehand by the major signifier.

"The symbol of the snake, we suggested from the start in the modulation itself of the phrase that we evoked the phantasy by which Anna O...fell asleep in the "Studies on Hysteria", that snake, which is not the symbol of the libido of course, just as redemption will not be symbolised by the bronze snake, nor is that snake, as Jones professes, the symbol of the penis; but the place where it lacks".

Taking this literally it is nothing more than the lack which preserved the Freudian Discourse.

"Never has there been any thought other than the symbolic, and the scientific thought is that which reduces symbolism on founding the subject in it: that is what is called mathematics in current language." "...psychoanalysis has the privilege that in it symbolism is reduced to the effect of truth which, on extracting it or not from its pathetic forms isolates it in its knot like the counterpart without which nothing of the knowledge is conceived. The knot means the division which engenders the signifier in the sub-
ject, and a true knot insofar as it would be impossible to flatten".

But, returning to the seminar we will observe how everybody, from the minister to Dupin, will become feminine momentarily, this is to say, while they have a power which dilutes itself if it is used (the letter). And if these (the letters) in the course of an analysis, have to be 'en souffrance' perhaps we have finally cast some light on the unsatisfactory notion of countertransference, pointing out that if an identification ensures us of a power, it is by trapping us in an imaghary situation, from the effects of which we are no more free than the patient, even if we try to disguise the situation using the pseudo-concepts for which the analytic colony show-
ed itself to have better tongues than ears. Because we know that he who thinks he is to be the master becomes the slave.

The Queen — the woman — instead, secure alongside the Law, chooses the most fatuous as the rescuer of the letter. An ironic situation which should make us see which power is played by a Queen who, being more than a minister, lets us see nonetheless that the desire is only kept alive if revived... losing it for a time... leaving it sufficiently suspended to identify somebody else as being the absolute power, and playing at being at his mercy. A game of which the hysteric gives proof in an analysis casting the analyst between the impossible dimension of letting him believe that he is where the transference puts him, and the other extreme from which the history gave its proof through Breuer (Anna O. and Breuer).
It is for the fatuous to repeat secrets because they do not know what they are talking about and when they talk they are listened to with suspended attention. But as Lacan advises us, it is not sufficient to be a police Prefect to be invested with imbecility. It is rather necessary to have been situated beforehand by the signer when at the break of day, it distributes the places of the structure in odds and evens.

To the Symbolic Order

"Here the sign and the being, marvelously disarticulated, show us which of the two has the primacy when they are opposed. The man who is man enough to challenge the wrath of the woman to the point of contempt, suffers till the metamorphosis the curse of the sign which has dispossessed her. Because this sign is without doubt the sign of the woman by the fact that in it she makes her being count, by founding it out of the Law, which contains her always due to the effect of the origins in a position of signifier and even of a fetish."

From Whence her Lack Because she Finds Herself Complete in the Real

It is the completeness in the real which is going to make her defectively fulfill the major operation of Being which divides itself in order to Be.

This is why the theory encountered difficulties from the beginning when trying to define feminine sexuality by the simplified intention of making it symmetrical with the masculine sexuality. But as the return of the repressed, sexuality returns to knock in the theory a living ballast from which it can be said with justice that the enigma opened by Freud was rapidly covered by a lock, the hole of which does no more than confirm that it is about castration, and therefore about the Phallus that it deals. Nobody wants to know anything about this. And it is the completeness in the real which shows the effects of a Being where the unconscious — let us say it in this way — contradicts till the last root, a biology useless as a possible guide for the basis of an explanation of femininity. And it was just here that the separation and rupture of Freud and Fliess was inevitable, as the latter failed to see that the lack had no correspondence with any real lack. The defect of this was earlier revealed in the interchange with Freud. Freud wanted to differentiate himself and wanted to preserve his discovery with the famous formula: "Don't sexualise repression". Neither politicise it. Because, as the purloined letter shows us from both sides, (the sexual and the political) to take sides against or in favour of the Dame, does not make much difference, because the signer anticipates the subject, giving the subject an identity that will be sexual.

It Will Make her Fail in her Attempt to Grasp the Symbolic

The woman is a symbol or fetish for the others and this advantage makes her take the symbolic from a dual point of view, because she looks at the other making him a part of her (this is why she transgresses the Law, and is therefore unable to grasp the symbolic). That is why a woman will try to be the Law, despite the fact that she can do nothing more than legitimate it in the betrayal in which she conspires in her aspirations to be a Being. It is the same that from the beginning casts her alongside the Law in the Other (the King) who, even though saying: "The Empire is me", will find in the recognition of the subject (inferior) all the disdain that Freud reminds us of in the lapidary formula by which "Le roi n'est pas sujet". But the Queen, trapped in the imaginary of the blindness in the other, cannot avoid the effect of 'Green lenses', which see that her symbol is the failure to separate from the real, and that her place, the only one which is perceived so clearly in the possession of a letter, carries out a game which if employed, looses its efficacy. This is why the one who rules the official (international) psychoanalytic movement as a woman, while distorting the Freudian discovery, legitimates it to the point where the message is taken again by another man, Lacan.

Freud wrote letters to Fliess which his wife sold, after his death, to a man — Reinhold Stahl — who organised a clean support of steel mesh. Marie Bonaparte bought the letters and showed them to Freud by which the message in an inverted form arrived to the sender. That is why the 'paralysis' of the Queen is not circumstantial; it refers to the price of her Being. A place where Freud disjointed many theorists when showing that the passivity of the woman, far from what Jones wanted to see, was not fixed by declaring that the vagina was an organ of reception. That so-called passivity is the same which carries a minister (in spite of having a penis) who, since he possesses the 'identificatory' letter, can only put it aside — mettre de côté — because its use would put in evidence... What? That the penis is not the Phallus. This is to say that the value of the letter dwells in delaying it, in keeping it, repeating in this manner what the signer wants when one believes one possesses it. And Dupin, truly does not deceive us, because, when he wrote his revenge — an old hatred which Lacan attributes to the 'Congress' of Vienna — the letter
burns him enough for it to become clear that by possessing it, he 'takes
sides' where the Dame is.

But if, as Lacan reminds us again, it is proper to all subjects — obliga-
tions and rights — to receive their own message in an inverted form, we
will see here that the mental phallicism to which the Queen points; not
by feminising the different possessors of the letter prevents it from arriv-
ing at its final destiny; and if the letter on the way inverted two men
momentarily, it hits her back like a boomerang to reaffirm her in that
which while the letter was delayed — en souffrance — she believed im-
aginary — due to her attachment to the real — she could be able to
escape.

The Real Becomes Fused with the Symbolic

Because of her being a symbol for the others (Freud recalls in "Nar-
cissism: An Introduction" that it is proper for the woman to want to be
loved) she is founded in the real which is unreachable and from which is
fed all her mystery, not so much because of what she hides but yes,
because of the unnameable from which she takes her defective advan-
tage of affirming herself as a Being in a place which, if she would fulfill
absolutely, she would be entirely herself and, as such, nothing. In
psychoanalysis, truth is identical to nothing.40

To wish to Have, the only one which permits the access to the sym-
bolic, shows the defect in its excessive attachment to the Being, from
which the real disqualifies her from an access to the symbolic, leaving
her halfway... ‘La Femme’ (the Woman) of which Lacan says that one
cannot talk without at least crossing the ‘Ja’, this is to say, the article
which gives her the gender.41

Making her Ride Precipitately Over the Imaginary

If the Queen resorts to the police Prefect (the visible of the Law which
is exercised by mandate) it is because of the gleaming product of a nar-
cissistic identification which, being imaginary, gives her by means of the
minister, that place of the Absolute Master. A place which, Lacan says,
is a place of absolute weakness, an effect that the Queen ignores due to
the dual relation to the minister, the price of which is giving him a power,
that is the one she aspires to have.

This is why the Queen does not resort to the police Prefect, pushed by
being 'driven to despair', but, by the automatism of the inertia that
emerges always in the duality of the mirage of a desire which is 'fed on
the dreams of reason'42 alienated from the beginning in the formative
matrix of an ego which is so because it is alien.

The Arnorous Betrapl of the Woman Questions the Law by Deflecting it

This is why the Queen of Poe's tale, like the woman of the
psychoanalytic narrative of Freud, has remained until today in the blind
spot of the psychoanalytic discourse.

"What does the woman want?" This is, as we
know, the state of ignorance in which Freud re-
mained till the end in the thing to which he gave
birth'.43

It was on the foundation of a discourse — the discourse of the hysteric
— upon which psychoanalysis developed its inaugural discovery by go-
ing behind the words, words which, in spite of being said with a belle in-
difference, didn't neglect cultivating an ear. This discourse does not ex-
cuse any body from pointing out the deadly effect of the transference of
the hysteric. Despite having taken every precaution, this deadly effect of
the transference doesn't stop promoting us to a place — the place of her
Ideal ego — making of her analysis always a place of exacerbation in a
betrayal which is truly a full expression that the condition of her analysis
is a 'Noli me Tangere'.44

An Entire Woman Could Make us Measure the Law in the
Limits of Madness

And since she is neither entire, nor mad, the sexual relation does not
stop being written in an attempt to seize in the letter what escaped from
the symbolic net and remains in the real. This is why the question about
the Being of the woman invariably leads us to the veils and the masques,
where the veil hides what is not had and the masque expresses under
another mask that it is by not having that the aims are achieved.

A 'true woman' or a 'feminine woman' would be, strictly speaking, a
Being situated on the threshold of the symbolic by an imaginary stair-
case whose structure, by being real, would imply, as we have already
stated, that flagrant incongruence which in the name of Verwerfung
could affirm that a 'feminine woman' would be by her own logic,

something else. The imaginary value of her Being as phallic, is only
achieved in that woman who is not entirely; this is to say feminine,
where the symbolic order makes her, in spite of herself, enter into the
order of a Law which derealises her, splitting her Being, although defi-
ficiently, in that which in grammar we define as gender.
That of the woman which is dragged as a barrier that forbids her complete access to the symbolic, is her Being too much in the real, because there, is the only place from which she can counteract the 'penis neid'.

But the complete paradox that psychoanalysis discovers is that a woman who wouldn't offer all her body as a Phallus would be the entire woman; this is to say, entirely mad. What is more, she would be, it is good to say, unutterable. And here finishes the so called feminine sexuality.

As a consequence, the Queen of our tale (just as the minister and Dupin) is not entirely mad, but she runs the risk imposed on her of wanting to be what she is not. Despite that, she aspires to Have which, well understood, restitutes her to the order of the symbolic.

The madness would send her back again to an ideal of Being before having been made (herself) from which the moral value of the 'Wo es war soll Ich werden' would lose the imperative of the 'ought'. For Sade, the woman becomes perverted by intelligence. We think that this is the essence of what Lacan shows in "Kant avec Sade", where the latter phallicizing the woman awakened her to a philosophic reflection and couldn't stop the use of the categorical and moral imperative (above all moral), in an attempt at an Ethics of the 'Jouissance' which, in spite of failing, made the woman enter into the order of the Law.

We have built the formula of 'Lassend wo es war' with the aim of going back, returning now to the beginning to say that the constitution of the real can only be a restitution; nothing more and nothing less. Because the only thing that cannot be constituted is that which because of Being cannot be said. This argument which was based on our seminar on "The Purloined Letter" reminds us at the end, as Lacan underlines it, that there is a King who, despite being a man is 'Rex and Augur' and who, by the lineage of Tiresias and Oedipus is blind because he has all the answers that came to him from the ear although he is not completely deaf.

FOOTNOTES
1 In order to understand this paper the following bibliography is essential:
   POE, E.A. "The Purloined Letter",
   LACAN, J. "The Seminar on the Purloined Letter",
   LACAN, J. "Encore",
   FREUD, S. "Beyond the Pleasure Principle", 1919.
   FREUD, S. "The Taboo of Virginity", 1918.
   FREUD, S. "From the History of an Infantile Neurosis", 1918.
   FREUD, S. "The Dissolution of the Oedipus Complex", 1924.
   FREUD, S. "The Infantile Genital Organization", 1923.
   FREUD, S. "Die Verneinung", 1925.
   FREUD, S. "Some Psychical Consequences of the Anatomical Distinction between the Sexes", 1925.
   FREUD, S. "Fetishism", 1927.
   FREUD, S. "Female Sexuality", 1931.
   FREUD, S. "Femininity", 1932.
   FREUD, S. "Preface to Marie Bonaparte's 'the Life and Works of Edgar Allan Poe'", 1933.
   FREUD, S. "Correspondence with Fliess".
   FREUD, S. "Analysis Terminable and Interminable", 1937.
   JONES, E. "Life and Works of Sigmund Freud".

2 POE, E.A. "The Purloined Letter".

3 There is an order which has laws whose particularity is to know them 'apres-coup', laws that Freud tried to explain without knowing combinatorial mathematics; laws of language, an order that repeats and plays the matter according to the 'caprice' of that other order which is symbolic.

4 Marie Bonaparte, Anna Freud and Ernst Kris.

5 "We might argue that what is represented here are the three inevitable relations that a man has with a woman — the woman who bears him, the woman who is his mate and the woman who destroys him; or that they are the three forms taken by the figure of the mother in the course of a man's life — the mother herself, the beloved one who is chosen after her pattern, and lastly the Mother Earth who receives him once more. But it is in vain that an old man yearns for the love of woman as he had it first from his
mother; the third of the Fates alone, the silent Goddess of Death, will take him into her arms", FREUD, S., from "The Theme of the Three Caskets".

6 KRIS, E., page 33. Volume XXII, Obras Completas de Freud, Santiago Rueda Editor.

7 Formula of the intersubjectivity where the summa of the subjects including the subject in question never surpasses that subject.

8 DERRIDA, J. "Le Facteur de la Vérité".

9 "Remaining where it was", formula that we have made for our purpose, Oscar Zentner.

10 LACAN, J., "Ecrits".

11 LACAN, J., "Ecrits".

12 POE, E.A., "The Purloined Letter".

13 LACAN, J., "Ecrits".

14 LACAN, J., Seminar on The Symposium, Plato. Quoted by André Green in "Object, Castration and Phantasy in Psychoanalysis".

15 LACAN, J., in idem says: "The desire is constituted over the road of a problem: not to Be".

16 LACAN, J.

17 KLEIN, M.

18 LACAN, J., "Encore".

19 KLOSSOWSKY, P., "Instead the woman, whether monstrous, or as deluded as she can be, is never considered 'abnormal', because this condition is precisely determined in the norms which by nature she has neither reflection nor equilibrium nor measure, and that she always represents the senses, out of control, and she is more or less offered by a reflection prescribed by the man. On the contrary when she is even more monstrous, or crazy, the more fully woman she will be, according with the traditional representation", in "Sade or the Perverse Philosopher", Editorial Granica, Buenos Aires.

20 FREUD, S., "Jokes and Their Relation to the Unconscious", 1905.

21 LACAN, J., "That is to say according to the real it doesn't matter which kind of transformation occurs, everything will still be in its place, the real carries everything stuck to it, without knowing anything to become exiled from it."
42 GOYA, "The dreams are monsters that the reason engenders".

43 LACAN, J.

44 New Testament, John 20:5 to 20:26, Jesus: "Not me touch", in current English: "Do not hold on to me", Page 336, Jesus: "Do not hold on to me for I have not yet returned to the Father. Go instead to my brothers and tell them: 'I am returning to my Father, to my God and your God,'" King James version.

45 Where Melanie Klein makes the mistake of saying that the counterpart of the penis envy in the woman is the 'envy for pregnancy' in the man.


Part III

THE FREUDIAN DISCOURSE
SEXUALITY AND SCIENCE*

Marfa Inés R. de Zentner
and
Oscar Zentner

"In science, unlike magic and religion, knowledge
(in French 'savoir') is communicated".

Jacques Lacan

The body and the Law are essential themes in psychoanalysis; but it is true that they are treated in a particular way. The body which will finally be the monument which stands as a witness to a particular history, and the Law which controls the access of the subject to pleasure (in the sense intended in French by "jouissance"), are the two more general axes which by definition support the unique difference between animal

* This paper has been read at the IX International Congress, Association for Child Psychiatry and Allied Professions, August 1978, Melbourne, Australia.
societies and human societies: language.

“The unconscious only exists in the speaking being. In animals which have no other being than that of being named yet their presence is imposed in the real, there are instincts, that is to say, the knowledge that implies their own survival.”

In sexuality, we differentiate instinct from drive. Freud restricts the concept of instinct to a pre-formed behaviour, characteristic of a species; and which has an object and an aim more or less fixed. The concept denoted by drive concerns sexuality without a pre-formed or fixed object and engaged in pursuit of pleasure itself.

The being who is born is woven and supported by language that will then be the condition of its unconscious. The place of this creature who is born will be pre-established in the phantasy of the parents, and, according to an old clinical conceptual-tradition, he will — as a son — not have more than two possible positions. He will be an heir or an usurper. He will be erotized by the progenitors or others, and from there:

a) he will be part of them who have given him life,
b) he will be separated by an unappealable Law,
c) he will be able to normatize himself through his identifications.

If he is able to transmit the culture it will be as a result of an unpaid burden of debt, that as we said before, he carries in the form of an identification as an heir or an usurper.

This subject — of whose belongings we will take account — will go through the structure of the Oedipus complex, the culminating moment of infantile sexuality, the moment that will leave a mark on everyone according to its possibilities.

The sexuality of this subject will be divided in two phases, the first of which will succumb at such an early age that allowed Freud to differentiate sexuality from its biological function; reproduction. It is only as a consequence of repression that the concept of sexuality could be equated to that of genitality, therefore denying the infantile sexuality. What culminates in the Oedipus complex becomes calm during latency and will reappear with other values in puberty.

The effect of the history of the subject will not be linear and will be overdetermined. What we know of the infantile subject has its starting point in the adult; strange history that is determined après-coup.

We prefer to talk about the child rather than the little boy or girl because it is then a neutral subject with regard to its sexual identity.

The infantile subject, “das Kleine”, elaborates a whole series of infantile sexual theories. Theories that are originated in the psychosexual evolution of its libido, where the subject establishes different positions regarding the lack of an object. The status of the object is more related to its absence than to its presence; as its presence would serve more the support of needs, and find its axis in the instinct that has a fixed object where it finds satisfaction. Desire, unlike instinct, constitutes the support of the status of the lack of an object in psychoanalysis. It is the sinking of the object prior to its disappearance which allows the structuring of the desire.

The desire is properly human or better say, exclusively human. If we are able to place a subject with regard to the lack of an object, it is only so due to the difference between a biological and psychoanalytic explanation. The human desire is structured fundamentally by the laws of the unconscious and eminently constituted as metonymy. The desire, for the subject, is always the desire for another thing.

The masculine and the feminine are not given from the beginning and by grace of God, they are not there from the start. The subject must acquire its sexual identity. The sexual identity is not the biological identity. When the infantile subject arrives at the zenith of its sexuality, the period of latency starts, enabling only in puberty a second phase for its sexuality. This sexual identity, which will only develop in this second phase, is a specific characteristic of mankind. When this infantile sexuality disappears, it represses or drags with it the child’s infantile sexual theories.

A child’s infantile sexual theory is not only a theory that intends to explain the difference between sexes or the origin of children, but it also is a theory of knowing and approaching the world. The infantile curiosity is directed to a common discovery; that of both girls and boys having the organ of the penis. If the evidence of a little girl is placed in front of the eyes of this infantile subject; or if the word of the parents falls on to his ears, it will have no other effect than the stimulation of different theories to explain that the penis will grow afterwards, or that the lack is a response to masturbation and bad thoughts. The presence of the lack is then the result of the phantasy of castration and the child will fear a similar destiny.

The dramatic task of learning has always attracted man’s curiosity. It has been by this curiosity, early organized in what we know as the epistemologic drive, that the history of investigations has produced science. Repression was necessarily the first step for the displacement of the drive, which then seeking pleasure found another object constituting the chain of different objects.
conjectural science talks about the subject, and from there, of the unconscious. The Freudian thought indicates that path. In the pre-analytic epistemology was the conception that the child constructs the world, and which while trying to fit into its patterns, shows that its origin is the result of a repression and, as such, secondary process. The persistence of the question confirms that no answer can fulfill it, because it always asks for something beyond the question.

In latency, it is the child itself who, identifying with the silence, puts an end to those questions and therefore takes from the adults that model of normality that sets the epistemologic drive on the rails that we call education and which repressive function — though inevitable — Freud points out in "Civilization and its Discontents".

The support of these questions is in the subject’s own body which constitutes certain erotogenic zones of interchange with the world. The subject is constituted by the word of the Other — unconscious phantasy of the progenitors that acts on the progeny. He will therefore be a corps-morcelle who between 6 and 18 months of age will end in a whole body crystallized in an image that in its return to him by a mirror will alienate him for ever identifying him with it. This important moment for the constitution of narcissism will make him prisoner of the belief of being the model of everything.

These phantasies have been described by the psychoanalytic theory in three ways;

a) from the phantasies that the adult can express about his childhood,

b) in the development of a psychosis when the body fragments again according to the law that Freud had found like the model of the crystal which when breaking follows predetermined lines,

c) a third way of observing this corps-morcelle is observing an infant during the mirror stage and seeing how his psychic apparatus is ahead of the control of motor coordination of his body.

The true subject of the enunciation in psychoanalysis is the unconscious. In the pre-analytic epistemology every subject of the enunciation was the ego. We can then see here again, how by means of repression the ego hides the effects it suffers from the unconscious. The ego is the effect of the crystallisation of an image, not a beginning.

Human sciences talk about man. Psychoanalysis understood as a conjectural science talks about the subject, and from there, of the unconscious. The Freudian thought indicates that path.

Freud’s discovery of the unconscious has been the biggest narcissistic wound to affect the history of thought. The conscious and the ego succumbed after a long survival of centuries. The unconscious plays its effects upon the ego and the conscious, through those major mechanisms of displacement and condensation.

The displacement — as a result of repression — made the desire unsatisfied by definition. Human sexuality through the desire seeks pleasure (‘Jouissance’) and not the object. If this is denied, the biological-organic models find a place to account for a pre-established relationship of the desire to the object without considering that one of the most valuable contributions of the epistemology of sciences requires as a condition the real value of a concept among the rest that constitute the particular scientific field. The use of a concept in a field that is not its own diminishes it necessarily to the mere level of a term. The relationship between the need and the object is confused with the relationship between desire and pleasure (‘jouissance’).

This is why when psychoanalysis borrowed in its origins concepts from other fields, it re-defined them so as to be able to properly call them concepts of the psychoanalytic theory. Psychoanalysis has criticized certain considerations of sexual development in a Jacksonian way implying hierarchy, the opposite of which is degeneration.

In Freud, the infantile sexuality is perverse, “children are polymorphous perverse”. We find in the anarchy of the drives, in the body that seeks pleasure (‘Jouissance’), the lack of subordination to a totalizing drive. This stage of autoerotism finds in the phallic supremacy, the final structuring of narcissism. The desire and the drive are perverse by definition because they cannot be subordinated beforehand to an object. The impossibility of designating an object “a priori” will open the way to the explanation of fetishism.

Freud has made multiple corrections to his “Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality”, but it was only in 1923 that he introduced openly the importance of the Phallus. In 1905 Freud speaks of the libido as being active by nature in both men and women. It was the origin of the later phallic phase.

Between 1923 — when he specifies the infantile sexual organization as phallic — and 1932 — when he attempts to clarify the problem of femininity — Freud surprises himself and his colleagues when emphasizing the asymmetry of the sexes. It is by the study of feminine sexuality that he discovers a period of union to the mother underlying that to the father. Both the boy and the girl — in the biological sense of the term —
have a long pre-history of a relationship with the mother. The phallic phase, common to both sexes, though explaining it, opens at the same time all the problem that still remains — justifiably — far from being solved. Freud opens here a new perspective in definitely separating the sexual identity from the biological identity.

The Phallus — common to both sexes — finds for the boy and the girl its material support in their phantasies and experiences. Each of them will take their own as universal until life and the multiple phantasies will make the boy build sexual theories that make of the girl, in the beginning, a phallic child — this is to say; equal to him — . This phallic phase — or moment of the primacy of the Phallus — admits for the infantile subject only one organ, the masculine one for both children. This is not a genital primacy but a phallic primacy.

The antithetic pair of "activity-passivity" will change to become the alternative "phallic-castrated" in the phallic phase. Only later in puberty will it become "masculine-feminine". The fate of both boys and girls is asymmetric, and Freud certainly described more accurately the little boy.

The Oedipus complex in the little boy shows the function of the separating Law of the father and its conversion in the super-ego. This Oedipus complex will make love and hate coexist; but due to the menace of castration will let the boy out of it by identifying himself to the ruins of the complex and mainly to the father.

The permanence of the little girl in the phallic phase — through the material support of her body as a whole — will quickly lose favor when the deception of her life will make her live — by means of the little boy — the moment of a difference that she will realize as absolute when her mother will confirm her — in her own lack — that she will never have a penis. Freud explained here the disillusion of the girl with regard to her mother and her approximation to the father. But as we can see, the hatred that this approximation produces in the Oedipus has little to do with a supposed rivalry. It is instead related to that previous accusation of blaming the mother for not having provided her as a boy.

The castration complex in both children work in a different way as it will push the little boy out of the complex, while it will introduce the little girl in it. The destruction of the Oedipus complex in the boy is conditioned by the menace of castration. The menace of castration will be effecti ve because the boy, while considering the girl as an evidence of privation, will find in her the confirmation of what will happen to him if he insists in the union to the mother.

The Oedipus complex in the girl — unlike the boy — will succumb to repression disabling it for the constitution of a very structured super ego as a result of the ruins of the Oedipus. The girl will find another way with the repression of the Oedipus when establishing that symbolic equation that will make penis equal child. Her way out of the Oedipus will be more complicated, it will be a decline ready to be reanimated. In this search, she will approach the father or substitute.

Freud finishes this line of thought in two situations completely asymmetric and that will make the analytic treatment collide with its limit. The man will endure forever the fear of castration whilst the woman will endure forever the envy of the penis. The living rock of castration is the biological imposed end. Only in the earliest phases of the sexual evolution of the libido will the experiences be similar.

It is due to this phallic phase that Freud said that repression should not be sexualized. Freud reconsidered Fliess's concept of bisexuality in the light of the recognition of a sexuality that results in terms of identifications — sexual identity — rather than in a biological opposition of a feminine and masculine pole. The masculine does not repress the feminine and vice versa.

The investigation of the Oedipal mesh takes three generations, as it is the mother who will revive again her own complex when giving birth. The child, its parents and grandparents are engaged in this Oedipal throwing dice8.

We believe it indispensable to emphasize a difference between structure (Oedipus complex) and intersubjective history, concepts that although different are associated because it is upon that association that changes occur. While the structure of the unconscious — not its contents — is characterized by its a-temporality, the unconscious knows nothing of changes. We make the structure prevail because it is in the origin — the cause. Psychoanalysis places the truth as cause. In psychoanalysis the concept that reunites the truth is the concept of the unconscious; characterized — as we said — by those major mechanisms of displacement and condensation.

This is why we do not believe it legitimate to base the change in societies upon the image and model of an organic-evolutionary development. Moreover, if we have accentuated the structure of the Oedipus complex so much it is because it allocates itself in the focus of the constellation of the subject. The discovery of psychoanalysis put the humanist conception of man under careful consideration; subject out of center — in the sense that Kepler gave to this word — determined by its unconscious.
This is why knowledge and even the most abstract and scientific learn-
ings are debtors of that infantile sexuality that has therefore printed them
forever with its mark of origin. This human cub builds and destroys the
most articulate epistemologic postulations, and in order to constitute its
own object of study he must suffer the split of being subject and object at
the same time. Psychoanalysis has named this castration.

FOOTNOTES:
1 LACAN, J. “Psicoanálisis. Radiofonía y Televisión”, Editorial
2 MALLARME, S. “... un coup de dés jamais n’abolira le hasard...”,
“... Toute pensée émet un coup de dés...” — Poesía, Ediciones
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THE FREUDIAN UNCONSCIOUS, SYMBOLISM AND CENSORSHIP

Oscar Zentner

"...the walls will be hung with paintings which guard treasured memories like dried flowers picked long ago in the garden — dead roses, long tresses of hair through which a face is barely visible, shutters behind which Schubert is being played, footprints of naked feet in wet sand, a glove left by a woman once loved and masks which alone are capable, according to Wilde, of telling the truth."

Phillipe Jullian

"...to describe an object is to eliminate three-quarters of the pleasure found in a poem, since poetry is the joy of gradual discovery, the dream is to suggest. That is the perfect use of the mystery which makes up a symbol."

Stephane Mallarmé

* This paper has been read at the First National Psychotherapy Conference, Melbourne, Australia, 1980.
Symbolism is a system proper to the human being, insofar as he is a talking being, because symbolism is a phenomenon of language. When in psychoanalysis we talk of symbolism we also imply its interpretation; thus it occupies in the theory and the technique an outstanding place.

Freud recognised two pre-analytic symbolique techniques for the interpretation of dreams:

1) The prophetic method in which the dream was taken as a whole and transferred to another whole. The important point was the content of the dream and not its narration, the content was then replaced by another content. The dream was thus made comprehensible and analogous in its content to the original one. This interpretation found its limitation when the content of the dream, besides being incomprehensible, was confused.

2) The other method, the method of decodification, was analogous to the deciphering of cryptography. It implied the decodification of one system into another where each word corresponded to another via a 'fixed key word' within an established repertoire. Besides the pre-Freudian techniques of symbolic usage that are examined in the 'Traumdeutung', it is important to mention here the subsequent main theories.

We see that in Jones, the theory of the true symbolism implies, as he developed it in 1916, a characteristic of the primitive mind which, unable to express its ideas, uses symbolism as a result of repression which gives origin to regression. This is to say, that in this theory, only the repressed ideas are symbolised. This was also characteristic of the child and the savage by a lack of discrimination within the mind. We see that the symbol appears here due to a deficiency. Jones associates the theory of symbolism with the philosophy of realism where the universals or general ideas have objective existence. From then on, the symbol became that 'thing' or 'idea' whose characteristic is that of being more 'concrete' than the symbol which is then more 'abstract'. As Jones himself wrote:

"Symbolism is the result of the structure of the undeveloped mind"..."Symbol formation remains a regressive phenomenon, a reversion to a certain stage of pictorial thinking"..."Only what is repressed is symbolised".

For Melanie Klein, everything will become a symbol of unconscious phantasies. In a certain sense, she will approach the position of Jones, enriching his views. It will be from the technique of child analysis that this analyst — who learned from Ferenczi first and later with Abraham — will elaborate her theory of the symbol and its acquisition. The analysis will reveal how for Melanie Klein, every word has its unconscious correlation, and as such, is symbolic. She remarks upon the role of symbolism in sublimation and also notes that excessive anxiety can impede or make the development of symbolism difficult, whilst at the same time considering it indispensable to face anxiety.

For authors like Rank and Sachs, symbolism is the useless repetition of an archaic bond. For Jones, as well as for Ferenczi, the function of symbolism is a hedonic and a playful activity of the pleasure principle.

The analytic method of symbolic interpretation implied a mute relation, in which the patient was unable to produce associations in reference to that particular symbol. This appeared as a thoroughly attractive phenomenon to Freud who had founded his technique of investigation of the unconscious through free association occurring within the transference.

Actually, all the formations of the unconscious are investigated with the associative technique except for symbolism, which does not fall into this category.

For Freud, any interpretation made 'in toto' was debatable. This was the reason why he insisted on the fragmentation of the material and all the legitimate implements that the word authorised. The phenomenon of interpretation is in itself a phenomenon of rupture into smaller associative unities. Only when the process of association was interrupted and the fragmentation was impossible, only then, Freud treated the material as a symbol.

There were for Freud only a few basic ideas that were always symbolised in every individual. These ideas were concerned with the bodily self, the relation to the family, birth, love and death. These basic ideas which were always symbolised and which brought no associations with them, were to appear through more or less fixed symbols in every individual.

A symbol carries no association, this is why Freud called it "mute". A symbol is the relation of a signifier to another signifier an its interpretation should not be understood as the relation between a signifier and a signified.

In the Freudian metapsychology, a signifier reveals itself as such in the afflux of the remaining signifiers. If the connection between the symbolised and the symbol is fixed, it is because the accent falls over the pre-established associations that are placed in the order of the unconscious identifications of the subject. These unconscious identifications will make sure that a history is never forgotten in a direct propor-
tional relationship to the degree of unconsciousness with which it has been registered. These symbols are the battery of signifiers which the subject possesses, and they represent that which constitutes him as a subject; that is to say, the Oedipus Complex and castration.

"The range of things which are given symbolic representation in dreams is not wide: the human body as a whole, parents, children, brothers and sisters, birth, death, nakedness and sexuality..." "The material of the sexual ideas must not be represented as such, but must be replaced in the content of the dream by hints, allusions and similar forms of indirect representation. But unlike other forms of indirect representation, that which is employed in dreams must not be immediately intelligible. The modes of representation which fulfill these conditions are usually described as 'symbols' of the things which they represent. Particular interest has been directed to them since it has been noticed that dreamers speaking the same language make use of the same symbols, and in some cases, indeed, the use of the same symbols extends beyond the use of the same language. Since dreamers themselves are unaware of the meaning of the symbols they use, it is difficult at first sight to discover the source of the connection between the symbol and what they replace and represent".

S. Freud

But, if the symbols are so numerous and the symbolised ideas only a few, this shows an essential relation in the status of the symbol. We believe that this essential relation will necessarily mark the limit of the interpretation. If the branch of a few ideas will twig into so many symbols, it is because the basic situations that are related to the Being are always the same, but there... there will be no history, no neurosis, pain, suffering nor subject.

"The range of things that are given symbolic representation in dreams is not wide; the human body as a whole, parents, children, brothers and sisters, birth, death, nakedness and sexuality." S. Freud

The majority of symbols are sexual symbols — Freud says — and it is exactly in the very first years of life, that we will find the over determination of those infantile desires repeating themselves along the history of the subject.

The question of symbolism makes more evident that the material has to be fragmented for its interpretation. Freud will give the general name of interpretation to the process symmetric and inverse to symbolisation. In the thought of Freud, the symbol was the limit of the psychoanalytic interpretation. We mean by this, that the interpretation can only be based on free association. It is not enough to say that a symbol is that which represents one thing for another if one does not realise that the first one is already raised to the category of being a symbol. This is to say that a symbol can only be a symbol of another symbol: A symbol is not the representation of the thing in its absence. For the empiricist tradition, the word 'milk' would be the representation of the 'thing milk', or, more clearly, the symbol would always refer to an objective reality where the materiality of the thing would be confused with the thing itself.

In Freud, the interpretation of the symbol has sense for 'that' who interprets, because the meaning of the symbol is defined as being foreign to the subject. The symbol needs the discourse of the Other to become significant, that is to say, to enter into an associative chain of thought. The discourse of the Other is the discourse of the analyst. A symbol is therefore not the product of repression, as the symbol itself is not the return of the repressed; and it only is with the interpretation of the analyst, that it will acquire its full value.

The difference between the symbol and the formations of the unconscious (dreams, slips of the tongue, forgetfulness, symptoms) are basically two. The symbol is 1) mute, that is to say, it produces no associations, and 2) it completely lacks meaning for the subject. These two phenomenological aspects of the symbol which I have just mentioned, its muteness and its lack of meaning, still carry another meta-psychological consequence. This is that the symbol does not fall under the control of censorship. Censorship serves itself from symbolism; but the symbol is not censurable, it escapes from its control. This explains why the symbol does not produce associations, why it is mute, since the associative chains of the free associations are only possible if censorship works.

Thus symbolism is a second and independent factor in the distortion of dreams, alongside of the dream censorship. It is plausible to suppose, however, that the dream-censorship finds it con-
venient to make use of symbolism, since it leads towards the same end; the strangeness and incomprehensibility of dreams.”

S. Freud

Freud emphasized four possible orders of the dream of which only one escaped censorship and was characterised by the symbolic.

"A constant relation of this kind between a dream-element and its translation is described by us as a 'symbolic' one, and the dream element itself as a 'symbol' of the unconscious dream-thought. You will recall that earlier, when we were investigating the relations between dream-elements and the 'genuine' thing behind them, I distinguished three such relations, those of a part to a whole, of allusion and of plastic portrayal. This fourth relation is the 'symbolic' one.”

S. Freud

In short, symbolism is not at the service of censorship, unlike the three factors mentioned above; the relation of a part to a whole, of allusion and of plastic portrayal. What Freud called censorship in dreams, he called resistance in the treatment and repression in the theory. In Freud, the symbol did not have a defensive characteristic or a characteristic of resistance. In the Freudian tradition, the symbol is not hedonist nor useless, nor an antidote in front of anguish, neither is it a regressive product. The symbol was — due to its structure — beyond the pleasure principle. This is what Freud came to tell us with the game of the cotton reel displayed by his grandson.

If the extent of the symbol could not be established by any censorship, it was because the symbol was then of a different order, founding of the unconscious. Freud recognised in symbolism the truth that the psychotic intuitions of Dr. Schereber documented forever in his 'Mémoires' when he recognised a fundamental and universal language. If symbolism is unconscious thought, we know then that, being language, we can recognise that in Freud the symbol is the unity which is defined by its relation with other symbols — just as the linguists define a word in relation to another word. Symbolism is the unconscious thought and not part of the formations of the unconscious. Dream-symbolism is not a creation of the dream-work but yes, of the characteristics of the unconscious thought . . .

Symbolism is therefore of the order of language. To say it in another way, it is not the unconscious that forms the symbol, but the symbol insofar as it is language, that structures the unconscious.
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A RADIO CONFERENCE ON FREUD

María Inés Rotmiler de Zentner

Freud wrote in 1935: “This Autobiographical Study shows how psychoanalysis came to be the whole content of my life and rightly assumes that no personal experiences of mine are of any interest in comparison to my relations with that science”.

If I were to give an historical and personal account of Freud I would find myself in the difficult place of choosing between the true biographical data and truths from the point of view of psychoanalytic theory. I will certainly take this second perspective. Taking the path of the analytic truth in no way ignores the biographical path. It means that

*This conference was prepared for a radio programme in August 1979, Melbourne. Organised by Deakin University, the series was called "The Psychoanalytic Revolution". It is now published as it was originally written, with no alterations. Although the whole paper was actually recorded, only the first half was transmitted on the radio.
those biographical references allow me to place in its gaps the so called
analytic truth which is the interpretation of the data in terms of the prin-
ciples of the science of the unconscious. From this perspective, the
chronology will be at times poor and disengaged and even more, there
will be a lot of missing details.

A historical and personal account is always incomplete, and its only
didactic intention is to stimulate the audience to read and investigate the
sources of this information. This is TO READ FREUD. I am not claim-
ing any kind of objectivity since, faithful to the principles of Freud I
would like to repeat with him that the above mentioned impartiality is
always a product of the intellect.

On the 6th. of May 1856 Sigismund Freud was born. He was to
change his name to Sigmund at the age of 21. He was born in Freiberg,
Moravia, today called Pribor. His father, Jacob Freud, was 41 years old
and had two sons by his first marriage. Twice a widower, he then mar-
rried Sigmund’s mother. She was 21 when Sigmund Freud was born and
he was their first son.

“In 1856 — when Freud was born — William James was 10 years old,
Nietzsche 12, Helmholtz 35, Charcot 31, Brentano 18, Breuer 14,
Fechner 55, Schopenhauer 68 and Herbart had died 15 years before.”

When graduating from secondary school his teachers congratulated
him for his brilliant knowledge and style in German. Many years later, in
1930, he would be awarded the Goethe Prize for Literature.

He thought of studying law, but after hearing Goethe’s philosophical
eyessay “On Nature”, he decided to study medicine.

“My interest, after making a lifelong détour through the natural sciences, medicine and
psychotherapy, returned to the cultural problems which had fascinated me long before, when I was
a youth scarcely old enough for thinking. At the
very climax of my psychoanalytic work, in 1912,
I had already attempted in ‘Totem and Taboo’ to
make use of the newly discovered findings of
analysis in order to investigate the origins of
religion and morality. I now carried this work a
stage further in two later essays, ‘The Future of
an Illusion’ (1927) and ‘Civilization and its
Discontents’ (1930). I perceived ever more clearly
that the events of human history, the interactions
between human nature, cultural development
and the precipitates of primaeval experience (the
most prominent example of which is religion) are
no more than a reflection of the dynamic con-
flicts between the ego, the id and the super-ego,
which psychoanalysis studies in the individual —
are the very same processes repeated upon a
wider stage. In “The Future of an Illusion” I ex-
pressed an essentially negative valuation of
religion. Later, I found a formula which did better
justice to it: while granting that its power lies in
the truth which it contains, I showed that the
truth was not a material but an historical truth”.

In 1880 Freud translated 4 essays of John Stuart Mill — “On the
Workers Matters”, “The Emancipation of Women”, “Socialism” and
“Plato” —. We know that at least one of these subjects — the subject of
women — was the land to which Freud could not arrive in his theory
despite giving all the clues to his followers, mainly Jacques Lacan. Freud
reached the zenith of the problem without solving it with his well known
question to Marie Bonaparte: “What does a woman want?”, a question
around which he mounted his work on femininity.

It was in 1880 that Breuer started the cure of Anna O, (Berta Pap-
penheim). Freud finished medicine in 1881 and wished to do research
work and teaching, but lacking financial resources he followed the ad-
vise of friends and teachers and devoted himself to the practice of
medicine. He found general practice boring and would after confess-
with fine irony — that his sadism had never been as strong as the prac-
tice of cure required.

“I have no knowledge of having had any craving
in my early childhood to help suffering humanity.
My innate sadistic disposition was not a very
strong one, so that I had no need to develop this
one of its derivatives. Nor did I ever play the ‘doc-
tor game’; my infantile curiosity evidently chose
other paths. In my youth I felt an overpowering
need to understand something of the riddles of
the world in which we live and perhaps even to
contribute something to their solution”.

Freud’s subversion — when he referred to his lack of sadism to cure —
consisted in continuing the Copernican tradition of closing the eyes to
empiric evidence so as to be able to listen — only then — to how the narrative tried to name what was happening. From there, the path of investigation which he pointed out in the quotation is referred to as the analytic hearing. Nothing better than darkness — as we well know from Freud to Lacan — to avoid any kind of fascination by the sight.

It was in 1885 that he won a fellowship and went to Paris to study with Charcot at La Salpetrière. Greatly influenced by Charcot he would remember years later — like a day residue providing images for a dream — the sentence that Charcot used to repeat without being able to obtain any consequences of what he said: "Mais dans des cas pareils, c'est toujours la chose génitale, toujours, toujours..." (But in similar cases it always is the genital thing, always, always...). He offered himself to translate the conferences of Charcot.

Back in Vienna he informed on his studies with Charcot and gave a conference which produced the effects of a scandal. He started his private practice and married Martha Bernays. In 1887 he sent his first letter to Wilhelm Fliess; a copious and important correspondence would follow.

He began to use hypnosis without abandoning electrotherapy and a year later applied the cathartic method to Frau Emmy von N. It was in 1889 that he travelled to Nancy to see Bernheim and Liébault. He published in 1891 a book on aphasia criticizing the theory of brain localizations.

In 1892 a patient of his — Isabel von R. — imposed on him the method of free association. Psychoanalysis was born. The existence of the unconscious was not in doubt. The method of free association would abolish all previous methods used by Freud.

In the next 4 years he would write about the hypnotic treatment, the "Preliminary Communication" with Breuer, on hysterical paralysis, "Psychoneurosis of Defense", "Obsessions and Phobias", "Studies on Hysteria". At the end of 1895 the last of his 6 children, Anna, was born.

His conflict with Breuer arose in 1896, and this year was also marked by two important deeds. He scandalized the auditorium of a conference about the sexual aetiology of hysteria; his father Jacob died. It was nevertheless exactly one year after this, that Freud made the discovery of the Oedipus Complex. Sexuality and Death appeared here already linked by circumstances of time. But it would only be in the first chapter of "The Psychopathology of Every Day Life" written two years later, that this connection between sexuality and death would become explicit. His early discovery of the universality of the Oedipus Complex — after his father's death — would enlighten the question of the Law since the Law finds its origin in the dead father. A fact that Freud could discover referring to its mythological origin in 'Totem and Taboo' where, from the murder of the father, a legal succession was able to be established that finally set up the laws of interchange — that is to say the prohibition of incest — as well as the legality of succession. This beginning, that Freud points out as mythical, is nonetheless the one that allows him to think of the functioning of the Law, although without questioning its origin. The Law was a way of preserving the real father from murder through this interdiction towards incest — universal of the culture demonstrated nowadays by anthropologists and that does not refer to the father of flesh and bones but to a certain function, that is to say the function of the father, since the Law refers to the dead father — that is to say to the symbolic father.

In 1898 Freud prepared some of his most important works, "The Psychopathology of Every Day Life", "Jokes and Their Relation to the Unconscious", "The Interpretation of Dreams".

With the beginning of the century the history does not stop but it continues until the night of the 23rd. September 1939 when Freud — diagnosed to have cancer in 1923 — abandons the fight against it.

We said we would not respect the biographical data with the calendar, but this has been difficult and time has nevertheless appeared as giving milestones in the life of Sigmund Freud.

"And here I may be allowed to break off these autobiographical notes. The public has no claim to learn any more of my personal affairs — of my struggles, my disappointments, and my successes. I have in any case been more open and frank in some of my writings than people usually are who describe their lives for their contemporaries or for posterity. I have had small thanks for it, and from my experience I cannot recommend anyone to follow my example".

Let us return then to the principles we have outlined in the beginning. Where should we start?

A science should — at least we understand it in this way — fulfill one basic requirement, and that is, to have a particular and genuine object of study, not shared with another science. In psychoanalysis this is called unconscious.
"Every science is based on observations and experiences arrived at through the medium of our psychical apparatus. But since our science has as its subject that apparatus itself, the analogy ends here."

Freud characterised psychic qualities in the psychic apparatus. The concept of what is conscious being no problem for the theory as it would not differ from the concept of consciousness of philosophers and everyday opinion. All the rest in the apparatus is unconscious.

As Freud said: "We are soon led to make an important division in this unconscious. Some processes become conscious easily; they may then cease to be conscious, but can become conscious once more without any trouble: as people say, they can be reproduced or remembered. This reminds us that consciousness is in general a highly fugitive state. What is conscious is conscious only for a moment. If our perceptions do not confirm this, the contradiction is only an apparent one; it is explained by the fact that the stimuli which lead to perception may persist for considerable periods, so that meanwhile the perception of them may be repeated. The whole position is made clear in connection with the conscious perception of our thought-processes: these too may persist for some time, but they may just as well pass in a flash. Everything unconscious that behaves in this way, that can thus easily exchange the unconscious state for the conscious one, is therefore preferably described as 'capable of becoming conscious' or as preconscious. Experience has taught us that there is hardly a psychical process, however complicated it may be, which cannot on occasions, remain preconscious, even though as a rule it will, as we say, push its way forward into consciousness. There are other psychical processes and psychical material which have no such easy access to becoming conscious but must be inferred, recognised and translated into conscious form in the manner described. For such material we reserve the name of the unconscious proper."

"Thus we have attributed three qualities to psychical processes: they are either conscious, preconscious or unconscious. The division between the three classes of material which possess these qualities is neither absolute nor permanent."

The Freudian unconscious can only and uniquely be heard through privileged ways such as the joke, parapraxis, the lapsus-linguae (slips of the tongue), symptoms and dreams. Dreams are the Royal Road of access to the unconscious. These are the roads by which the subject always — in that more or less of what he says — cannot avoid the unconscious speaking for him. This is why almost a century after the description of the Freudian unconscious it still remains so scandalous and awakens resistances, and remains as subversive as it was in the beginning. As psychoanalysis claims a unique and special relation to the truth, the consequences of this cannot but produce a subversive effect. This truth refers to the unconscious as cause. And here a quotation from somebody who is not Freud but whom I consider his most legitimate heir, Lacan.

"All I can do is tell the truth. No, that isn't so — I have missed it. There is no truth that, in passing through awareness, does not lie. But one runs after it all the same."

We insist with our words in calling it the Freudian unconscious. This is not only to distinguish it from that of his predecessors but also from that of some of his followers. Psychoanalysis is not a closed science, nor an absolute knowledge and the repression that gravitates on to it should be lifted. The subversion of Freud justly consisted in saying that 'Ça parle' in us all the time, even when we sleep. The unconscious speaks all the time.

And if we speak of the repression that gravitates on to psychoanalysis is this not the best moment to speak of the role that repression, mainly primary repression plays within the apparatus? Primal repression is that mechanism which is constitutive of the psychic apparatus, its function is primordial and founding. Under no circumstances can this primal repression become an observable fact in the clinic. Whichever sign of repression we see in the clinic it will always be secondary repression or repression proper. The existence of primal repression is inferred mainly through its effects. If secondary repression is the mechanism by which the repressed will tend towards an original pole of attraction; this original pole of attraction cannot but be the result of primal repression, that is to
say, the existence of unconscious formations which have been original, primordial, and not attracted by other formations.

“We have reason to assume that there is a primal repression, a first phase of repression, which consists in the psychical (ideational) representative of the drive being denied entrance into the conscious. With this a fixation is established; the representative in question persists unaltered from then onwards and the drive remains attached to it”.

When we speak of repression we always mean repression of an idea, psychic representation of the trieb. Freud clearly explained which are the ultimate vicissitudes of the trieb. In the case of primary repression, the repressed is an idea that has never been in the conscious and remains fixed in the unconscious. Afterwards, any idea that has been in contact with this first idea, or that would have had any associative link with it will be repressed by attraction to that primary pole and by repulsion from the conscious. Afterwards, it will make a new advance in the conscious — in the discourse of the subject — through those ways that we have previously emphasized, dreams, symptoms, parapraxis, jokes, etc. Anticathexis is the only mechanism of primal repression which will serve the purpose of obstructing the access of unconscious representations and wishes to the conscious and to motility.

“Repression proper affects mental derivatives of the repressed representative, or such trains of thought as, originated elsewhere, have come into associative connection with it. On account of this association, these ideas experience the same fate as to what was primally repressed. Repression proper is therefore, an after-repression. Moreover, it is a mistake to emphasize only the repulsion which operates from the direction of the conscious upon what is to be repressed; quite as important is the attraction exercised by what was primally repressed upon everything with which it can establish a connection. Probably the trend towards repression would fail in its purpose if these two forces did not cooperate, if there were not something previously repressed ready to receive what is repelled by the conscious.”

What is therefore repressed? The Freudian unconscious is far from being an empty structure. But if it is not empty, what does it contain? Although, the fact that it is not an empty structure does not authorize anybody to speak of what the unconscious contains as if it were a receptacle. The question that should be asked is: “What is structured in the unconscious?”

In the unconscious we will find two axes. Death as castration and sexuality as Oedipus that will be structured in and by language. In the beginning of “The Psychopathology of Every Day Life”, the subject Freud is faced with the scientific Freud when…:

“…the name that I tried without success to recall in the example I chose for analysis in 1898 was that of the artist who painted the magnificent frescoes of the ‘Four Last Things’ in Orvieto Cathedral (The ‘Four Last Things’ are Death, Judgement, Hell and Heaven). Instead of the name I was looking for — Signorelli — the name of two other painters — Boticelli and Boltrafio — thrust themselves on me, though they were immediately and decisively rejected by my judgment as incorrect.”

The investigation of the associative chains led Freud to the subject of death and sexuality. And it is this subject’s own determination that makes me want to clarify two points. They are:

1) That repression should not be sexualised and,
2) That in psychoanalysis death is always symbolic and it consequently implies the fear of castration.

“The fear of castration presents a difficult problem to psychoanalysis, for death is an abstract concept with a negative content for which no unconscious correlative can be found… These considerations make it possible to regard the fear of death, like the fear of conscience, as a development of the fear of castration.”

Remember Freud’s friendship with FlEss. FlEss had greatly influenced Freud with his theory of psychic bisexuality as a reflection of organic bisexuality. This theory maintained the idea that the homosexual feelings and experiences were always repressed. That is to say that a man repressed femininity and a woman repressed masculinity. Freud, aware
functions of the super ego were not foreign but agents of the proper or secondary repression formed from the first nucleus left as a pole of attraction by primal repression.

Freud discovered a radical asymmetry of the sexes. In his paper "Some Psychical Consequences of the Anatomical Distinction Between the Sexes" (1925) he shows us how by anatomy he refers to the description of what is visible and corresponds to the surfaces. He in no way speaks of biology — and this is the subversive aspect of sexuality in psychoanalysis. Freud had often mentioned the obscurity enveloping the sexual life of women. In "Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality" (1905) he wrote that:

"...the sexual life of men alone has become accessible to research. That of women...is still veiled in impenetrable obscurity".

In 1908 in his discussion of the sexual theories of children he said:

"In consequence of unfavourable circumstances, both of an external and an internal nature, the following observations apply chiefly to the sexual development of one sex only — that is, of males".

In 1926 he repeated:

"We know less about the sexual life of little girls than of boys. But we need not feel ashamed of this distinction; after all, the sexual life of adult women is a 'dark continent'".

Not only the sharp differences in the sexual development of children of different sexes had astonished his audience. This new — for the time — concept of sexuality had its roots long before in Freud when he characterised the onset of sexual life as being diphasic, occurring in two times, or as he said, "in two waves". The first period taking place up to the culminating moment of the Oedipus, the second from then on. This meant that sexual life could not claim a beginning at puberty, and that its presence could not be denied from the moment of birth when the baby is allocated a place in the world according to the unconscious desire of the parents. Sexuality and genitality are two concepts that do not overlap.

Sexuality is not at the service of reproduction, even more, obtaining pleasure as a function of sexuality often fails to coincide with reproduction. But what is most remarkable is that these were observables for him through the analysis of adults and not through the observation of children. His findings were afterwards verified by observing children, but the way has always been towards the re-construction of the history of the subject. Only afterwards is it possible to know. The concept of 'Nachträglichkeit' or 'après-coup' would apply here.

Again it is easy to understand the prejudices generated by such a theory that made of the innocent and pure child a perverse in miniature. Not even for the precious era of childhood could blindness be an excuse any more. Freud's quantitative concept of libido as the investment of the sexual drive would be crucial to many developments in the field of his metapsychology. The economic point of view while accounting for psychic phenomena would be the central hypothesis of the Freudian theory of the apparatus. This economic point of view in conjunction with the dynamic and topographical aspects, would give an account of the metapsychology.

But it is time now to return to the differences between sexes and I have chosen for it a quotation from Freud that will enlighten the way in which children of different sexes survive the mark of their Oedipus and its relation to castration.

Adding to notions revealed in "The Dissolution of the Oedipus complex", Freud said in 1925:

"We have gained some insight into the prehistory of the Oedipus complex in girls. The corresponding period in boys is more or less unknown. In girls the Oedipus complex is a secondary formation. The operations of the castration complex precede it and prepare for it. As regards the relation between the Oedipus and castration complexes there is a fundamental contrast between the two sexes. Whereas in boys the Oedipus complex is destroyed by the castration complex, in girls it is made possible and led up to by the castration complex. This contradiction is cleared up if we reflect that the castration complex always operates in the sense implied in its subject-matter: it inhibits and limits masculinity and encourages femininity. The difference
between the sexual development of males and females at the stage we have been considering is an intelligible consequence of the anatomical distinction between their genitals and that of the psychical situation involved in it; it corresponds to the difference between a castration that has been carried out and one that has merely been threatened."

"In boys the complex is not simply repressed, it is literally smashed to pieces by the shock of threatened castration. Its libidinal investments are abandoned, desexualised and in part sublimated; its objects are incorporated to the ego, where they form the nucleus of the super-ego and give that new structure its characteristic qualities. In normal, or, it is better to say, in ideal cases, the Oedipus complex exists no longer, even in the unconscious; the super-ego has become its heir..."In girls the motive for the demolition of the Oedipus complex is lacking. Castration has already had its effect, which was to force the child into the situation of the Oedipus complex. Thus the Oedipus complex escapes the fate which it meets in boys: it may be slowly abandoned or dealt with by repression or its effects may persist far into women's mental life. I cannot evade the notion that for women the level of what is ethically normal is different from what it is in men. Their super-ego is never so inexorable, so impersonal, so independent of its emotional origins as we require it to be in men. Character traits which critics of every epoch have brought up against women — that they show less sense of justice than men, that they are less ready to submit to the great exigencies of life, that they are more often influenced in their judgements by feelings of affection or hostility — all these would be amply accounted for by the modification in the formation of their super-ego which we have inferred above. We must not allow ourselves to be deflected from such conclusions by the denials of the feminists, who are anxious to force us to regard the two sexes as completely equal in position and worth; but we shall, of course, willingly agree that the majority of men are also far behind the masculine ideal and that all human individuals, as a result of their bisexual disposition and of cross-inheritance, combine in themselves both masculine and feminine characteristics, so that pure masculinity and femininity remain theoretical constructions of uncertain content."

Psychoanalysis discovers that the subject — in order to constitute himself as such — has to succeed in inserting himself in a symbolic chain that situates him in relation to the genealogies; that is to say, his predecessors and his heirs (his parents and his children). This particular relation in this continuity situates him from the beginning as subject of an instant and perishable. There is no way in which death can be avoided; the necessary destiny of life is death. In that respect we remember Freud saying that everyone owes nature a death and must expect to pay the debt. In his way towards that death the subject is transitory, he lives and dies, or if you want to return to our first statement, the link between sex and death is fundamental.

At the same time, the unique way of situating himself in this line is through the symbolic castration — a moment in which he will assume the difference of sexes and his sexual identity. I have mentioned castration and sexuality in the specific structure that psychoanalysis has discovered for us as the structure of the Oedipus complex. It is here that the subject obeys a Law that will externalize him from the complex, making possible cultural and social development. Would this subject remain in his original place, he would see his entrance in history denied, he would transmit nothing.

Psychoanalysis has, I repeat, discovered the importance of a sexuality (from the perspective of the Oedipus complex) that will be transmitted by language. At the same time, and by means of castration this subject will be allocated in the dimension of death. Castration that as we said is indispensable to constitute himself as such.

But this death of which psychoanalysis speaks is not factual death, just as mutilations are not castration. This dimension, this particular dimension of the being with regard to death will be that final interrogation that will make him wonder "What am I?"
It will be a function of the psychoanalyst to know that he is in a place from where he can return that which talks (Ça Parle) at the time by the mouth of a subject who does not know what he says. Freud tells us that this function occurs between two deaths; psychoanalysis occurs between the real and the symbolic death. Sexuality, in its relation to castration will see its birth hand in hand with death.

If we have mentioned how the psychoanalytic process occurs, it might be now time to bring forth another paradox that psychoanalysis proposes. And this is the asymmetrical dialogue whose unique communication is the word even in the form of silence. This dialogue cannot always avoid trampling through madness. In this psychoanalytic dialogue we will find somebody who says something he does not know to somebody else who listens in a peculiar way of listening. This peculiar way of listening derives from the fact of guarding himself from having truths to say. I will try to explain myself.

The analyst never has truths to say — a common error of our time that makes certain practitioners of Freud's science confuse themselves with moralists. The analyst only hears truths which sometimes are even more true when more deceitful. This means that the more lies the analyst will find himself to be. Because for Freud the subject is always found there from where he can return that which talks ('Ça Parle') at the time by the mouth of a subject who does not know what he says. Freud tells us that this function occurs between two deaths; psychoanalysis occurs between the real and the symbolic death. Sexuality, in its relation to castration will see its birth hand in hand with death.

Freud said in the same article “The Question of Lay Analysis” in 1926:

“For we don't consider it at all desirable for psychoanalysis to be swallowed up by medicine and to find its last resting-place in a textbook of psychiatry under the heading "Methods of Treatment", alongside procedures such as hypnotic suggestion, autosuggestion and persuasion which, born from our ignorance, have to thank the laziness and cowardice of mankind for their short-lived effects. It deserves a better fate and, it may be hoped, will meet with one.”

The concept of transference has been one of the concepts in the theory that has been greatly impoverished. Its significance has been restricted to only one of its dimensions, that is the clinical dimension that considers the emotional relationship between patient and analyst. This transference, positive in many cases, will be a central point in the treatment. Negative other times, it will turn to be the point of displacement for resistance, or even the impossibility for the treatment to continue.

But what I would like to bring back to light today is the metapsychological concept of transference as Freud described it in the Chapter 7 of his “Interpretation of Dreams”. Unfortunately, this concept has fallen in the mist of a practice too worried to do business — to quote Lacan — and not theory.

Freud explained that the unconscious (according to its laws, the laws of the primary process where contradiction and negation do not exist, where everything exists in positive — as a fundamental affirmation, as a being) works with thing-presentations (“Sachvorstellung” or “das Ding”) and needs of a preconscious over-investment (“Wortvorstellung”) to become conscious. This presentation enters already within the laws of secondary process, laws that we could assimilate to the logical conventions. In short, transference would then be the passage from one system of the psychic apparatus to the other.

We spoke of a third dimension of transference, the dimension of transference in the psychoanalytic teaching. When one transmits one cannot avoid the place of transference; as we well know that transference is a phenomena not exclusive to psychoanalysis. One becomes the place of transference of a knowing that is applied to the psychoanalytic theory. This psychoanalytic theory is an open place to quote Pontalis as a fundamental affirmation, as a...
cry. According to Lacan "the-subject-who-is-supposed-to-know" in so far as the patient will recognize him as an analyst.

If we have said before that the psychoanalytic treatment was asymmetric, this is not only because the analyst listens to the transference and works the transference of the patient, but because the analyst becomes the condition of 'puissance' (there is not an English satisfactory translation for this concept, that is why I prefer to leave it as it is, in French, the closest would be the notion of 'sexual enjoyment') of the patient. If the patient is hysterical it will maintain his desire unsatisfied; if the patient is obsessional it will maintain his desire as impossible; if the patient is phobic, between the counter-phobia and the withdrawal he will avoid meeting with his desire as desire. This will be the circumstance by which the phobic will show - through the avoidance of his desire - the object, oscillatory movement between desire and object that will find its stabilization in the fetish - an intermediate object - that will ensure him against the preservation of his desire plus the preservation of an object, whose condition is the disavowal (Verleugnung) of castration.

But we will return now - through the path of the desire - to those mechanisms of the unconscious that are evident in the ordinary language under the forms of figures of speech (metaphor and metonymy for instance) and which, as such, will be found in dreams. It has been often said that the unconscious speaks, that it speaks its own way. We would like to say that the unconscious actually speaks all the time, with its particular syntax. Freud has shown that dreams are the Royal Road of access to the unconscious and that they show again that the desires are indestructible. Dreams are the fulfilment of desire, and an unconscious desire is, by definition not capable of fulfilment. This would make the difference between need and desire even greater, while the former is destructible by satisfaction; the latter is indestructible for being a-temporal. And here we have returned to two concepts previously explained. One is that in the unconscious everything IS. The second, is that again in dreams the subject will present himself split by the original mark of repression. This is why the manifest and latent content will always seem so foreign and disconnected.

We are close to the end. Just a few lines before we finish. Psychoanalysis shows the lack of an object for desire, as the desire refers to the desire of the object of the other and not of an object. What can be more foreign to the common way of thinking than declaring that there is a lack of an object. In "The Drives and their Vicissitudes" Freud spoke of 'trieb' and not of instinct, and he defined the source of the trieb as the somatic place, the end as the object of the trieb, and the object as the means towards that end. He then clearly announced that for the subject in psychoanalysis there is no pre-established harmony between a supposed instinct and an object. In other words, if the object is only what it is - a means - it is because Freud wanted to establish the distance between biology as science and psychoanalysis. In biology there are instincts because there are objects that correspond to them and where they find satisfaction. In the 'trieb', (for which there is no exact translation into English, the closest being perhaps 'drive') instead, this harmony does not exist.

And a last word about the subject and its status in psychoanalysis. If we have chosen to speak on the subject through the ways that Freud privileged as being the ways of access to the unconscious (namely; the slips of the tongue [lapsus linguae], symptoms, dreams, parapraxis and jokes; that Lacan defined as the formations of the unconscious), it was because the subject in psychoanalysis is the product of an original split, that is to say, an original repression which will leave its mark in the form of castration. This subject is like a joke. This subject is like a joke - a compromise solution between desire and repression. The Freudian experience elapses between a lack and a joke, between the lack of an object and a subject.
“I think where I am not and I am where I do not think.” This is how Lacan reads Freud, showing the way in which philosophy intended to mend the subject. No line of thought can flow in psychoanalysis without discovering that this was the truth that Freud revealed with his discovery.

It is only necessary to literally read the different definitions of the ego, that Freud gave from the “Project for a Scientific Psychology” in 1895 to “The Splitting of the Ego in the Process of Defence” in 1938, to understand that psychoanalysis is a science whose object of study, the unconscious, makes of the ego a function, a function of ‘unknowingness’.

* This paper was read in 1977 at the course of Clinical Psychology, Post Graduate Students, Department of Psychology, University of Melbourne, Australia.
When we consider the psychoanalysts engaged in the difficult path of analysis we must always distinguish two types of phantasies: one on the side of those who learn, and another, on the side of those who teach. We who learn want — and it is fair — to know everything that may happen when facing a patient and our phantasy is that he who teaches possesses that knowledge and is able to transmit it. He who teaches has the complementary phantasy that he who listens knows nothing and must learn everything from him. By the function of the ‘imaginaires’ both place themselves in the pre-established positions of knowing and not knowing. And this is why many of us are here now.

The psychoanalyst has to be able to formulate three basic questions to ask to himself when facing the patient. These questions, that are only answered by the interpretation of the patient’s discourse are, in short, the following: a) who speaks?  

b) what is he speaking about?  
c) to whom is he speaking?  

These questions point out the distance between the Cartesian and the Freudian formulations. For the former, the ego was the basis of the statement “I think therefore I am”; for the latter there is no doubt that “I think where I am not”. These rhetoric figures make it abundantly clear that from the beginning of this matter, we point out the split between identity and the identifications of the unconscious. The patient will regard my place as the place of the subject-who-is-supposed-to-know. This introduces us to the concept of transference. A dual situation between the patient and the analyst is thus established, and it depends on us to consider this possibility without falling into the trap that the ‘imaginaires’ stretches out for us.

The language of the analyst preserves all its value when the interpretation arises from his listening. It is here especially that the place of the ‘psychoanalyst’ is based on the support that a scientific theory supplies. And it is here again, where the analyst’s function differs from that of the shaman — the important figure of a sorcerer who cures in indigenous communities and who bases his power on prestige.

I have mentioned the concept of transference because it existed before our encounter here in you, when learning the date of this meeting and in myself when I started to compile these notes. Neither our will nor our wishes can elude transference and it is to make use of it that we mention it here. There is no analysis outside transference, which does not mean that we should proclaim it all the time. Interpreting transference as such, instead of interpreting ‘within the transference’, is nothing other than calling the treatment to an end.

An interpretation given outside the session is an act of aggression — and this is my second lesson. First, I will marginally mention what analysis owes to the discourse of the hysteric. It was Breuer who abandoned the treatment of Anna O. when she threw herself into his arms. He then went for a trip with his wife who became pregnant. Breuer thought that Anna O. loved him. He ignored the question: to whom does the patient address his discourse? It is later on, with Freud, that the question will be asked and the transference will be considered.

As I have appealed to theory from the very beginning, I want to reject the impoverishment suffered by the concept of transference. Transference is the main concept that Freud introduced in his Metapsychology to name the process by which the unconscious thing-presentation is transferred to the verbal pre-Cs engrams. This is the place where theory supplied the basis of the analytic experience. The lifting of the repression (Verdrängung) in the session, tends to render possible the passage from one system (unconscious) to another (conscious); that is to say, from the thing-presentation (Sach-Vorstellung) to the word-presentation (Wort-Vorstellung). This is the principal place in theory where every empirical interpretation should be found.

The presentation as such is able to penetrate into the preconscious, and can only exert its effects, via a connection with an indifferent presentation that belongs already to the preconscious, transferring its intensity on to it and hiding in it. Repeating in transference the past experiences, the ambivalent attitude towards parents, etc. means not that it is a literal repetition but a symbolic equivalent of the transferred.

If in this moment many of you are disappointed with my words, it is because you perhaps may not remember the beginning of my first lesson: the ego is not central and my discourse tends, in its development, to respond to the theory all the time; theory that is not captivated by an ego representative of the subject. Just as you confer upon me the ‘knowing’ because I have something to say; so does the patient’s ego confer upon the subject the ‘knowing’, telling him that he does not know. A statement that we will in no way reject by appealing — God forbid — to rationality. It is us, as psychoanalysts, who have to be aware that the further effects of the treatment will depend on this dual situation.

What I am saying is precisely this: the patient shows his ’knowing’ in his ‘not knowing’ or, in other words, it is by his lips that the truth of his unconscious is always talking, and our ‘listening’ is necessary so that, that which by language comes out of his lips should return in the session, by means of the interpretation, under the form of truth to his ear. By
what means do we recognise the truth or falsehood of an interpretation? We do not depend, certainly, either on our belief or on the patient’s belief. If the interpretation is denied, and indirect or collateral associations appear, we will recognise its truth in them. If the interpretation is accepted, it is still not a sign of truth unless, at the same time, it is confirmed by further collateral associations. If on the contrary, we are talking about constructions, we know that the ‘No’ of the patient can only point out its incompleteness. When emphasizing the associations we are pointing out the direction of the analysis, the indirect way that leads to the lifting of the repression (Verdrängung). This is why the word of the analyst should be said only when the patient’s association finish.

Let us remember that the privileged ways to the unconscious are: the joke, the lapsus-linguae, the parapraxis, the dream and the contradiction in manifest speech. This is why — and this is my third lesson — those psychoanalysts are to be dreaded, who imbued by the ‘furia sanandis’ interpret everything strengthening in this way the resistance. If we know everything from the beginning, it means that something is going wrong. In the science of the unconscious the significant productions have always the particular inverted chronology by which, the last event is the one that gives the meaning and enables the events to be ordered with a logic — the logic of the unconscious. A logic that should be uncovered because most of the literature after Freud has covered its mechanism.

Perhaps by now, most of your minds are impatient, but here then is my fourth lesson: nothing can be said directly, except to say that it cannot be said. This is why, having been invited here, I want to teach using the logic of my own speech in the place of examples; a logic which tries to be coherent with the theory. As you feel the evasiveness of my discourse, so is the discourse of the patient. His words refer us to that other scene, the scene of the unconscious; in the same way that my discourse refers to the theory. The success of this endeavour, takes its value not in my intention, but in your capacity to listen with sufficiently suspended attention, as to be able to tie the loose ends of my discourse.

This fully introduces us to my fifth lesson: how to listen. Keeping the lips closed tightly, so as to let the words get into the ears; words that then become meaningful to us because we are able to link up again what has been eluded in the discourse. It is in no way different to the way in which Freud taught more than 80 years ago — the possibility of turning our ear into a place sensitive enough to let the truth appear by the remnants or disconnections in the discourse, rather than by its grandiloquence. What is relevant from the dream is its narrative, and not the truthfulness of its contents.

And here appears my sixth lesson: for the science of the unconscious (the only place where I recognise my practice) all speech is overdetermined by the logic of the ‘signifier’. And here is one of the most subversive discoveries of Freud which, as pointed out by Jacques Lacan, is none other than that the logic of the language shows, in the rhetoric, all its laws. Laws that Freud discovered in the “Interpretation of Dreams” as condensation and displacement; that is to say, the metaphor and metonymy of the rhetoric.

If there is something which makes us fundamentally different from animals, it is our double ecological niche founded on the pillars of language. It is necessary to point out the danger to analysis from the action of the ‘imaginaire’ which as we know is derived from sight. This is why we grant a privilege to our ‘listening’ in our praxis, because, listening is absolutely deaf to anything but language. And if you perceive in this that there is no praxis outside language and that the wrongly called preverbal levels are unable to explain the processes, you are right. There is nothing in man which is preverbal because it is the word that assists him. The word pre-exists, the subject is given a name and a place prior to any chromosomal interconnections. This makes us examine the place occupied by the subject in question — our patient — in the phantasy of his parents, to know what else is transferred to us.

And it is the word that places the subject in both the Oedipus complex and the castration complex. These are incorporated as such into the language by the parental Law, the short formula to which is to the son “Thou shalt not sleep with your mother” and to the mother “Thou shalt not re-integrate your product”. The unconscious is language, thus the Lacanian formula which expresses that a signifier represents a subject for another signifier. A subject who, in order to constitute himself, submits to the Law that perpetuates him in the chain of language and splits him.

I will then introduce my seventh lesson to answer a question that I believe is approaching: therapeutic success tells us nothing about the truth of a theory, accepting that a reflexologist, a behaviourist, a psychoanalyst or a gestaltist can be effective when facing a patient. But here, worried as we are about the truth, we must distinguish truth from effectiveness. Regarding effectiveness we shall repeat with Freud “the more successful we are with a patient, the less we know what happened”. Science moves towards finding the truth and in this sense, a praxis has to concern itself with its connections with a theory that explains it, even though this might happen a posteriori.
The science of the unconscious, properly called psychoanalysis, places under interrogation a subject who with an identity based on his ego — his shell — does nothing else all the time, but elude, by those main mechanisms ruling the repression of the unconscious (condensation and displacement) that the ego is not the subject.

It is not by the way of eclecticism, taking a bit from here and a bit from there, that we will learn something. When the patient has left we ought to be able to answer: what is a subject? I prefer this formula to that of: what is personality? Because in this way I emphasize the split between the ego and the unconscious, accepting that it is by the splitting or castration that a subject constitutes himself as such. Psychoanalysis does not share its object of study with other sciences. I know that this may sound exaggerated to your ears, but I would like to say that this profession is an art, that, as Jacques Lacan says, is a style. Thinking in terms of effectiveness, is falling to the level of a mere practice that feeds itself from its prestige, and produces that quite unpleasant effect of a dependence which does not end and which Freud very ironically called 'the Cure by Love'.

And here we enter a chapter that no psychoanalyst should leave aside: What is cure? We know that practitioners have their answers according to their theoretical and ideological schemes; answers that are usually proportional to the number of practitioners. Freud clearly cut out the question dedicating a paper to it which is deep enough to blow away any infantilism: analysis is interminable.

This fully introduces us to the eighth lesson: how to interpret. The discourse, and even the words, may be fragmented into those minimum units that by similarity of sound and contiguity, provide that associative material which is no other than the return of the repressed. Let us make the circuit of the answer a bit longer. The session in question, which makes us listen with suspended attention to a discourse, has to be considered as a dream and interpreted as such but never as a whole. The interpretation of a dream starts from the manifest content and little by little, penetrates into the unconscious significant interconnections revealed by the associations of the dream. If I so freely compare the session to the dream it is due to the status that reality occupies in psychoanalysis. We must learn this in such an undoubtful way so as to think and overcome our own resistances. The only reality upon which we work is psychic reality. That this reality is virtual and not empirical is not enough to deny all its significant value.

In the case of the 'Wolf Man' we can see to a certain extent, how a treatment can almost occur in the confines of the exhaustive analysis of a dream, when Freud is able to conquer the patient's resistance while giving him advice in advance of the end of his treatment. We see in this case how we are able to learn when that 'learning' arises from the side of the patient. With this, I want to point out strongly, the importance of clinical praxis. But let us remember again that it gains its value if when deaf in one ear, we tune the other to listen to the signifier; that is to say, to listen in another way. A listening that is completed when the patient has left and we use the time to recollect, according to the sequence of our memory our impressions, the text of the session and interpretations. It is then that we will see the truth linking together, regarding the patient in question; a fundamental and unavoidable moment to explain to ourselves and our practice from the theory, thus converting practice into praxis.

When this reflective task is not carried out, the treatment is more an approximation to the prestige of magic than to a scientific praxis. It is a task which is skilled enough to discourage many people who are desperate to find a regulation that, as a dictionary, would indicate the meaning of every word. If we hasten the interpretation thus breaking an associative chain we would very quickly see resistences growing on the part of the patient. Being a psychoanalyst requires the capacity of resisting the temptation to occupy the place of the subject who knows, a place that develops resistance against truth. By means of the question the patient places the psychoanalyst in the place of knowing.

We are capable of fading (to use a Lacanian concept) as subjects because we are sufficiently dumb (in the sense of being mute). That is why the questions with which our patient pursues us can again constitute themselves in the material of transference. And to calm any kind of sadistic thought that you might have, I want to tell you that if one has to be dumb to the question of the patient, it is because we have to remember that in his demand, he does nothing else than mention objects that are always others. If we answer, we reinforce the 'imaginaire' in which the ego moves trying to ascribe an object to every word. And it is here that I want to make the oddest of statements which is: every patient wants to know, and very early we have to learn that his wish to know, is the resistance to the truth. This exempts us from giving answers. You might here perhaps see, growing excessively, that cliche that even humorists rightly popularized. Certainly, the automatic use by the analyst of the question: "What do you think about it?" makes us say with Jacques Lacan that analysts have seldom used a key unless Freud
showed them at the same time how it opened the lock. The only way of avoiding cliches, and of retaining the mastery of a style, is the possibility of reconsidering in the theory what clinical experience teaches us. There dwells the real richness of our experience.

It is in our own fading as subjects that we allow the patient to receive his own message in an inverted way. If I have spoken to you of a subject that receives his own message in an inverted way — a concept which I will not develop now — it is to warn you how far the analytic experience is from the theory of communication that, besides speaking from the conscious, presupposes a transmitter, a receiver, a channel and a message. There is nothing more distant from the analytic session, so long as its own praxis shows that it is the subject of the unconscious who speaks through the mouth of the patient.

I know that in this moment I must touch deep resistances in many of you that in no way should be ascribed to a problem of communication. I have been asked to speak about the function of the psychoanalyst and of the technique, but that will not let us fall into the trap of thinking, that you will today take away from here a knowledge about the different tactics or strategies with which you can face a patient. Nothing is more distant from reality and again you would do wrong in becoming impatient with me because it is a golden rule for he who is listening, never to listen to what he expects to hear. I want to say that the analytic ‘listening’ only becomes such when we do not expect to hear anything in particular; this is really the suspended attention. Imagine for one second how suspicious is any discourse that says what we already know. In this dwells the basis of the technique. If we hear what we expect, the first mistake is in the expectation.

But if this should happen anyhow, it would be a weighty reason to be on guard and know that the mockery of the patient consists in taking for granted what is really the function of our interpretation. The most eager is the ‘listening’ the further we are from our function and so much more we condition an appearance of normality in the patient, whose unpleasant effect time later will show.

This appearance of normality is shown by the patient adhering to the scale of values of the analyst who, entrapped in the ‘imaginaire’ has placed himself in the place of knowledge.

There is only one rule for the access to the unconscious: the rule of free association. Implicit or explicit approvals or disapprovals develop resistance, thus reinforcing repression. If the rule of analysis is free association, let us remember that its counterpart is suspended attention.

Attention that if, in spite of the advanced hour it still can float among you, will at least leave you the most important possibility for a psychoanalyst: to know that he does not know and therefore to have many more questions than answers.