

[I wrote after reading the papers of those who were on the roundtable on which I commented and, of course, Paola's intro paper. And I had heard most of Friday night and the Saturday session. I have slightly cleaned up – but not expanded - the English version which follows and (after re-reading my own translation) have eliminated the French version. I would recommend two relevant papers by Laplanche which have influenced my own thinking about these topics; both are in the collection “Entre séduction et inspiration : l'homme {PUF 1999} – 1) *La didactique* (1993) and 2) *Buts du processus psychanalytique* (1996)]

I would like not only to raise questions but also to comment. We have learned there is no such thing as a short question and, a fortiori, a short comment. Just as “a letter always arrives at its destination”, a question always arrives with its comment. At least if a question hopes to be clear, it must present both itself and its problematic (in the sense that Laplanche, and Bachelard before him, uses the word). But as the time I have is limited time I must speak aphoristically.

My comments are entitled:

The Four Fundamental Aspects of Psychoanalytic Training

The four aspects are:

1. Personal analysis
2. Supervision
3. Reading
4. Teaching

For me a recurrent difficulty is the all too frequent concrete conflation some or all of the four conceptually distinct and practically interdependent aspects.

I want to comment on two points:

- the psychoanalytic act – which is central to the first two aspects
- and
- truth: expertise / knowledge / metapsychology / science – which is central to the 3rd and 4th

But first a thought about the word ‘training’. As the last speaker of the conference I have more than one reason to invoke the fundamental rule of plumbing: shit flows downhill. Daniel Heller-Roazen began this conference bringing us back to Rome which was the home of the Cloaca Maxima, perhaps the greatest of all sewer systems. First built in the 4th century BC it was reconstructed by Augustus about the year of the birth of Christ. Sewer systems and sanitation are generally considered as among the triumphs of human civilization and, of course, every such system depends on the toilet training of the individual in the community. Toilet-training, psychoanalytic training. Perhaps it this metonymic aspect which gives the phrase such a bad smell our community. Most analysts sit too much. Perhaps those who train for the marathon have different associations to the word.

You are familiar with the explicit, conscious critique of the word 'training', a critique which, as I understand it, centers on the notion of a training which imposes something on students and analysands: a transference, an ideology, a theory, a therapy, a symptom. In her introductory paper, Paola Mieli emphasizes that the word 'formation' refers both to the act and to its product. The bowl may bear the thumb print of the potter who threw it and yet be a masterpiece. Just as certainly as every pot bears the mark the potter, every analysand is marked by the style, the character, the conscious ideology and the infantile sexual unconscious of his analyst. The important question is "in what way" is he marked, and to what degree. The double face of the word 'formation' does should blind us to this issue.

And what about 'transmission'? As with the word training, it is all too easy hear a troubling slippage. Transmission → contagion → infection – perhaps infection with a sexually transmitted disease.

But let's turn to the four fundamental aspects. Limited time means priority must be given to clinical work, to what is essential in treatment – especially in the treatment of those who become psychoanalysts. We are all concerned with what is specifically analytic in the treatment, what is the sine qua non for a treatment to be an analytic treatment. For Freud the requirement for those who wanted to become psychoanalysts was simply that they acquire a conviction about the existence of the unconscious. In the presentations and the papers prepared for this conference, I would distinguish two crucial moments that are said to be involved or to be required for a treatment to be analytic, and for it to produce an analyst. The first moment has been referred to in terms of recognition: recognition of a divided position/ of a split, a *spaltung* / of a hidden desire stemming "from an instant of seeing for all parlêtres constituted by a Universal determined by an *inassimilable real*". This 'first' moment has also been spoken of in terms of an experience of radical solitariness and the like. It is described as leading to what I am calling the 'second' moment, of course a moment in the après-coup, in which there is a mutation or the assertion of a singularity or the waking of the subject to the Real, or even [Maryse Martin] of the transference. In descriptions of the first moment, some emphasize terms and concepts Lacan used (in a slightly different context) in his comments on habit. A passage with which Paola Meoli prefaced her paper which introduced this conference. The terms include: "*l'effacement, la mise à l'ombre, le recul, l'absence*" for which she gave the translation "the erasure, the casting into shadow, the withdrawal, indeed the absence". (Here I would dare to translate/interpret '*recul*' by the term 'repression' rather than by 'withdrawal' or 'retreat').

I think the essential analytic act (the first moment) is closer to the opposite of these terms. I think the essential analytic act is the opposite of formation. I very much like what Paolo Lollo said – I paraphrase: 'There can be no formation without first a moment of deformation'. This (first) moment is a process of **tearing into pieces – déchirer** – in which the analyst is the *déchireur*; it is (and this word has been emphasized in this conference) a **disaggregation**. Freud's metaphor came from chemical analysis. The notion is to break a whole into its parts in order to see the relation of the parts – both the existing and the potential relations. I would like to ask why not, rather than saying "to disaggregate" saying "to analyze"?

Analyzing the natural world, Aristotle spoke of cutting nature at its joints which combines the first and second moments. Paolo calls the second moment 'creation'. I would choose the less lovely, less romantic, but equally clear term "synthesis". The human subject tends to make meaning, to tell stories, to self-historicize. These creative, synthetic moments need no help from the analyst. And of course they occur in the après-coup.

=====

For Laplanche, all actually existing treatments involve both synthesis and analysis. The synthesis also is a part of all other psychotherapies. The synthesis is the therapy. What distinguishes psychoanalysis from all other psychotherapies is the analysis, the breaking into pieces, not the synthesis.

When the analyst provides or suggests a new synthesis – which inevitably is a large part of all clinical work – it is a therapeutic act. It is when the analyst is a *déchireur* that he is performing the necessary and essential analytic act, helping the analysands to analyze. Analysis v. synthesis; psychoanalysis vs psychotherapy.

=====

A parenthesis: Does one avoid the problems of the 'didactic' analysis by calling it "a personal analysis"? or by saying that every analysis produces an analyst? Or if counting to three makes one an analyst? For me, one key to avoiding the problem of the didactic analysis is for an association (an institute) to accept candidates on an equal basis regardless of which couch they come from – their analyst can be a member of any group, a supervisor, a graduate or a student. In France, in the 1971, this is what the APF did.

Next I want to comment on curricula, on the transmission of knowledge, of expertise, and of truth. I am not afraid of the word truth and don't need a capital T to use it. Similarly for the word science. Consider the third element of Freud's mature definition of psychoanalysis in his 1923 Encyclopedia article:

Psycho-Analysis is the name (1) of a procedure for the investigation of mental processes which are almost inaccessible in any other way, (2) of a method (based upon that investigation) for the treatment of neurotic disorders and (3) of a collection of psychological information obtained along those lines, which is gradually being accumulated into a new scientific discipline. (SE 18)

I am phobic about mystification. I tend to see mystification in the reduction of transmission to what happens subjectively in the personal analysis. Just as some would reduce "the origin of thought" to "a primal hallucination of the mother's breast which give rise to a period of wait until the act is performed", some descriptions of the formative element in the personal analysis remind me of a story. A supplicant who arrives at a Zen monastery. He is put to work in the garden and every day the Zen

master manages to sneak up behind him and smack him in the ass with stick. Is this different from what is described in some of our papers – moments like epiphanies (if you permit me to mix religious metaphors) in which the analysand recognizes his divided position, his hidden desire, as stemming “from *an instant of seeing* for all parlêtres constituted by a Universal determined by an *inassimilable real*” which then leads to a movement “toward another existence framed by an imaginary *spaltung* that becomes active when he casts off both being and thought”.

====

I am very sympathetic to the spirit of what Guillerma Diaz emphasizes, because she does forget that the analysand must be an object of training. She writes in a key passage:

Therefore, the formation of an analyst implies the difficult task of approaching a key issue both in the practice and in the transmission of psychoanalysis from two different dimensions: as the object and as the agent of formation.

=====

I think that someone told me that there is no curriculum at Après-coup (perhaps it was elsewhere). But as I see it, for candidates at Après-coup (whatever candidates are called) there is necessarily a ‘curriculum’. The courses may be elective and the themes of seminars and cartels may change frequently but that does not ensure an expansion of the domain they cover, or an increase in the variability of the texts examined.

=====

As for expertise: experience leads to expertise – at least it can. Experience of the analytic act, of supervision (given and received), of reading and of teaching. It seems truly bizarre to me that we could minimize or deny the value of expertise. Expertise is the reason we are here at this conference: we hoped that others would have expertise and that we could learn from them.