

Echos, Echoes, Ecos, Echi n°6

THE LETTER

Here is the English version of the Newsletter of the ICG, *Echos n° 6*. This number is translated in our five languages like its predecessors so that everyone can read it in their own tongue.

This number is different for it brings with it an echo of the work of the cartels of the ICG. These are not conclusive works but rather, mid-way, brief texts mostly of a half-page, and which have no other ambition than to give an idea of the discussions between us.

We are including the program of the International Meeting of the School on July 14th in Medellin, with the titles of all the papers that will be given there. We have left them in their language of origin, but they will be translated into the five languages in the definitive program. We also mention for your information the provisional program of the Symposium on the Pass that will take place on the afternoon of Wednesday, July 13, although only those who have taken part in the procedure will be participating.

CONTENTS

- Echoes of the cartels of the ICG
- The next meetings of the ICG and the cartels of the pass
- The Symposium 2016
- The International Meeting of the School
- The Assembly of the School

1. ECHOES OF THE CARTELS

Three cartels have worked by Skype at least once a month when they could meet together.

CARTEL 1. Theme: The step of entering (or not entering) an analysis

“Reinvesting the being of desire”, Sonia Alberti

Among several themes that we have already touched upon in our meetings, the one that concerns the difficulties of entering analysis currently continues to raise questions for me. We have discussed them in terms of the effects of the capitalist discourse that promotes taxonomies and their

correlate medications, as well as in terms of the great variety of psychotherapies available. Consequently, it is not unusual the demands addressed to the analyst are *ready made* [English in the original] as they come from subjects who, identified with a group – religious, ideological, micro-political – come to ask for help on condition that their certainties are not touched. There is significant preliminary work to do that can be quite delicate, in order that the subject can, as Freud says in *Group Psychology*, reinvest his own being of desire to the detriment of what the taxonomies and groups say. Where it is possible for this work to be done, the transference is installed in the process. But it is not always enough that the subject attests to it – by, for example, the account of a dream involving the analyst – it is also necessary that the transference starts to function as an algorithm (according to Lacan in the “Proposition of 9 October”), which means a transference that promotes the defile of the signifying chain starting from the question of the subject himself, as Ana Martínez’s case shows. My question has a relation to the theme of the Meeting of the School this year: the desire of and for psychoanalysis in the world today.

The question that has remained open during this first year of work, and which should be taken up again in my opinion, is this: if the analyst is the S^a that is, the subject supposed to know who allows the Signifier to put the analysis in motion, is there also a place for the impossible and the real of the transference at the moment of entry – perhaps the “meeting of bodies” that Didier takes from Lacan? And in the case that the response is affirmative, how come?

“Passing from the therapeutic to the psychoanalytic”, Ana Martínez

I will refer to the entry into analysis with a clinical case that demonstrates how it is the tenacious insistence of the symptom that allows that entry to occur. A symptom therefore seeks to be analysed without the subject knowing.

It concerns a woman who came to see me for the first time when she was 29 years old because she suffered from anxiety and confusion due to the discovery of her partner's infidelity. She came for a second time four years after the first consultation. This time the problem was sexual. On both occasions a work was established that involved therapeutic effects that satisfied both the patient and the analyst, as they didn't put an obstacle to the completion of the work. And yet, the symptom was not fooled.

Thirty years later the patient returns. Her looks and condition are striking; she has aged, she is obese and is limping. She has disability status and doesn't work. She has been depressed for a long time, but didn't want to come back to see me because she would have to pay.

What happened during this long interval? On the side of the patient, the path of "cheap resources" had been exhausted and she had found no place to accommodate her symptom. On the side of the analyst, I had made my personal journey to clearly distinguish applied psychoanalysis from an entry to analysis.

How to give proof of the passage into the analytic discourse in this case? I will make three remarks about it. Firstly, on this occasion the therapeutic miracle has not been produced and yet she continues to come. Secondly, she is able to confess memories and desires that are very difficult for her speak about, such as her desire to murder her father, a dominant father, to whom she is nevertheless identified in several hated traits. Thirdly, a manifestation of the unconscious emerges

in the transference, and she often asks to go to the toilet just after the session. This is a symptomatic act and she wonders what it might want to say, relating it to what takes place in the sessions.

“At the doorstep ...”, Nadine Cordova

A cartel about the entry into analysis is not a given because it is not a given in practice to tell the analysand whether this passage has occurred or not. The equivocal in the title of our cartel, the “pas” [step/not] of entering [or not entering] presupposes that there is a step from the beginning. What is it that makes a subject cross over the step? The preliminary interviews are a key space for the emergence of a formation of the unconscious that is addressed to the analyst. This moment is unforeseeable; it creates a rupture which has to be grasped. But, if psychoanalysis began with the transference, is it always enough to enable passing to an analysis? Well, that depends. A symptomatic signifier may appear, the offer of analysis may be accepted, but then the subject flees before the treatment begins. The analytic process can become unbearable. On the other hand, the analyst can be taken by surprise by the unexpected effect an intervention has on a subject who does not seem ready for an analysis. Before offering an analysis, something more is necessary, something that takes root in the course of the preliminary sessions, and/or a sort of determination from the future analysand who holds on to ... what $h(a)$ s made a tear for him. But this encounter is subtle. For the analyst, it is about leaving a place for the unconscious and, if that does appear in its place, of letting it take form in order that the preliminary sessions pass to something else. If the subject consents to it.

“A rupture in discourse”, Susan Schwartz

The focus of our cartel on the step of entering, or not entering, an analysis has been valuable for it has made very clear that the way a treatment begins determines whether one is in the field of psychoanalysis or not. Thus the moment that the patient is invited to lie on the couch has precise conditions that concern the ends of analysis.

I approached the question by way of transference love according to Freud and Lacan and in reference to a case in which transference love was particularly strong. The discussions of this and the cases of other cartel members revealed a point of fundamental importance: the engagement of the patient in the process of analysis is not a matter of love for that confines the relation of patient to analyst within the imaginary dimension of the transference. Rather, the step of entering an analysis is marked precisely by a disruption to the discourse of love in the emergence of a formation of the unconscious, something enigmatic. This produces a resistance in discourse, rather than a resistance in the subject. It is the point where the real of the symptom breaks through the imaginary cover of transference love that has kept the patient’s questions at the level of the lack in being.

The analysand addresses the enigma to the analyst in order that he give an interpretation, thereby establishing the analyst as semblant of the subject supposed to know. As for the analyst who knows that he knows nothing about the patient, an act is required that allows him to assume the function of object a in the analytic discourse, an object that, unlike the object of love, cannot be re-absorbed. Thus he is the partner-symptom in a relation of absolute difference with the analysand. He knows that the enigma is real, that the demand for knowledge is urgent and that it pertains to the

jouissance of the drive. Thus the transference has produced an analytic effect on the unconscious indicative of the step of entering the analysis.

"A step of knowledge/non knowledge" [*Un pas de savoir*], Didier Grais [Plus one for the cartel]

To the equivocal of the title of our cartel on the "pas" [step/not] of entering an analysis, I am adding another in referring to the "pas de savoir" [step of knowledge/non knowledge]. For it is both the lack of knowledge, and the first step towards knowledge of the unconscious, that marks the entry into analysis.

We can situate the true start of an analysis – the crossing of a threshold marked by a before and an after – with the production of a signifier that makes a rupture, as it implies a supposed knowledge of unconscious signifiers, namely knowledge in its pure signification of knowledge linked to a supposed subject.

But how to make the question of a person who comes to see us, one who knows how to complain and expose his suffering, evolve into a subject supposed by what causes his suffering? That is, to accept being a subject supposed to know? It is a matter of making the emergence of an enigma possible for the subject, but the analysand must consent to it. It is also up to the analyst to give some premises...in all his ignorance.

The possibility of the "pas" [step/not] of entering an analysis does not come spontaneously during the meeting between an analyst and the one who questions him about the cause of his symptom. Free association will only have its logical pertinence some time later, once the analysis has really begun.

In the last session of the Seminar ...*ou pire*, Lacan refers to the preliminary interviews: "When someone comes to see me in my consulting room for the first time, what is important is this, it is the confrontation of bodies as inaugural for the analytic encounter."

He goes in to say "it starts from there", from the confrontation of bodies as inaugural of the analytic encounter. What (*a*)-body is it a matter of finding between these two bodies?

Fortunately, the cartel as not yet finished!

"Entering an analysis", Colette Soler

From the sediment of the numerous discussions in our cartel about the transference, its relation to knowledge, the analysand's work, the responsibility of the analyst etc., I will draw some remarks about what this work has suggested to me.

There is no way of employing a "*savoir faire*" of the analyst, but there is a knowledge of the psychoanalyst. It bears on the structure of the experience and permits the situating of the aim there. Thus Lacan was able to formulate that an analysis submits the subject "to the question of surplus jouissance [*plus de jouir*]" This question is trans-structural, applying to everyone, and it must raise the idea that there are some contra-indications for analysis. The question rather displaces the famous "Che vuoi?" [What do you want?] that it specifies, and it does so in a very opportune way for making us grasp that the addicts of surplus jouissance of our time are subjects as much as the others.

In putting this question into act, the analyst must make himself the cause of the threshold of the analysis, since conversely, the one who knocks at his door makes himself a cause of his complaint. Now, although they come in many varieties, doesn't a complaint always speak about a jouissance considered to be insufficient and which, one hopes, couldn't but be so?

It is up to the analyst to invent what has to be done to rectify the postulate and give the impression that he knows ... and indeed he knows nothing about the patient other than that there is an other [jouissance], already there although unknown and which, should the subject make a question about it, will make him enter the discourse as the object-agent that commands the production of signifiers. Otherwise, no entry – just, possibly, lies of the half-truths that, alone, cannot be without effect.

CARTEL 2. Theme: From the particular symptom to the desire of the analyst

“Inconvenient particulars”, Gabriel Lombardi

The analytic path passes by way of the symptom of the being who speaks, rather than being paralysed, or acting or fleeing. The analytic path is only that of the symptom, of subjective division $\$$, the only thing really analysable. In starting with the symptom, that is to say with the personal *dysphoria* of each that has been already pointed out by Euripides, Shakespeare, or Freud, the analytic path invites a return by way of the informatisation of knowledges, by finding the ancestral in the games that replace the games, in discerning the symptom in the traces of subjective division veiled by forms of pathological consumption.

What does one find, in the remains of experience, of the passage of the particularity of the analysand's cardinal symptom as subject (subjected, divided or camouflaged) to the point of becoming “the being, singular and strong” that is realised in the act of the analyst? We pose the question now while this particularity is, at the same time, politically incorrect and the object of claims, that is to say of the judgments of opposing signs that surely have repercussions in our School and even there, where such judgments should be suspended, make the *Verleugnung* of the act convenient.

I think that “paying with one's most intimate judgment” should also be applied to the School in order that the questions on the crucial particularities necessary for psychoanalysis in intension and extension can be formulated there. Is it only from neurosis that the singularisation of the pass proceeds? And if not, is this the origin best adapted to the desire of the analyst? How to think the particular in psychosis with regard to a man who does not count on the relief of the father in his position of exception? What about perversion pure and simple, non-transitory, which knows how to delegate subjective division to the partner – is it not diagnosed in our community and is it not analysed as a consequence, and why does it happen that it appears less during the pass, save as camouflaged in neurosis? How is it that there does not appear to be a difference between the analytic course of a man (whose symptom expresses, on his side, the division $\$$ between the universal “everyman” and the exceptional orang-utan) and that of a woman whose nature (without penis but not without the signifier) particularises her at the start at least as symptom of another body, offering to her a different ex-sistence, with less pretention and fixity on the side of the essence, alleviated from the requirements of the phallic universe with its strict correlate, castration?

“An encounter. Chance, singular”, Maria Teresa Maïocchi

The focus of our theme has increasingly tightened (*serré*) around the symptom at the start, and about what passes to the analyst in sustaining the irreducible singularity of the letter with which the fatal destiny is rewritten, and in finding an *other* exit [*sortie*] there, a new “fate” [*sort*]. From the symptom-destiny – “so disastrous, occasionally” – to an hystorised assumption of jouissance: urgent-emergent-contingent: novelty of the sinthome.

Fate [*sort*]¹ – to squeeze together [*serrer*] like little pebbles tied [*serrés*] on a string that fall by chance and make a sign, a good or bad design, the subject’s strange or inconvenient *a*-dventure. ... To my surprise, the terms underlying each of the valuable meetings of our cartel, are knotted around a crucial passage of the “Preface” ... writing, incising or even “litraturating”..., – and also teaching/signing it [*en-seigner*], plaiting, knotting, squeezing [*serrer*], tightening [*tirailleur*] ... The mystery of the work of hands, an act that is singular each time, like the imprint of calligraphy, a pen ... So here this crucial loosening, the “dis-assorting” of the “scattered”: what is it that can squeeze [*serrer*] *in the singular form of the knot*, rather than plait a *common fate* [*sort commun*] that is more or less benevolent ...; the “tightening” [*tiraillement*] that is necessary in order that the knot that is made is of the order of contingency.² This is not to be strung [*s’aligner*] together in a series like a beautiful garland – “*serto*” in Italian – that harmoniously decorates beauty like victory.... Where the “scattered, ill-assorted” [“*épars désassortis*”] do not make this “all” in accord, they show the impotence of the universal. The particularity of the symptom gives a way of reaching the singular, not by Joyce’s path, but by the link to an unprecedented work: capable, or not, of containing the irreducible singular of the style. “If anything is encountered that defines the singular, it is what I have, nevertheless, called by its name, a destiny, that’s what it is, the singular... and that only happens by good luck [*bonne chance*]”. In this text – which has propelled the cartel – the psychoanalyst depends on a contingency of “encounter”, that is, of “seeking this chance”,³ and the act is “the incitement to go by the good hole of what is offered to him, to him, *as singular*”. What is the relation between this “good hole” [*bon trou*] and the condition, the dis-position for this “step”? “The act, I give him a chance of dealing with it”.⁴

Chance, irreducible, untranslatable: the contingency of the “fall”. We have to get used ... to the event, to the ad-vent of a being of *chance*, to the (*a*)dventure of an encounter in order to grasp

¹Translator’s note: the writer points out the etymological links coming from *serère*, of which “*serrer*” is one, and the meanings of which include: to squeeze, to tighten, to grip, grasp and hold. She points to other connections with *sort* and *serrer* in the French words for lock, series, exit, and assorted. Fate can be read from the way pebbles tied to a string fall after they are thrown.

² Lacan emphasizes this in a text that has been an important reference for the cartel, “Sur le plaisir et la règle fondamentale” in *Lettres de l’École freudienne de Paris*, XXIV, 1975.

³ Chance: according to the *Trésor de la langue française*, “chance” comes from “*caance*”, which means fall [*chute*] the substantive of the Latin “*cadentia*” which was employed for the “game of jacks” (Cicero), the throwing of the small bones in animals’ feet in different forms and where the person who was victorious was called “*iactus Verneris*”: all the different facets involve fate [*sort*] with the difference of the feminine *pas-tout*.

⁴ Lacan, J. Dissolution (Letter to *Le Monde* to announce it, 15 January, 1980)

through what dis-being [*dés-être*] a saying [*dire*] is presentified, one that will make the School: “liv[e] on in a social link that has never appeared [*sorti*] until the present”.⁵

“The singular, a destiny? Anne-Marie Combres

My point of departure in the work of the cartel has been Lacan’s response to André Albert in 1975: “it is worthwhile dragging through a series of particulars in order not to miss something singular”.⁶ In this very dense text, Lacan insists on the effort that is necessary in order not to omit this dimension that can sometimes allow the passage from the “particular” of the symptom to the “singular” of the sinthome, “as the unconscious is knotted to the sinthome, which is what there is of the singular in each individual”.⁷

Here he specifies the singular as “destiny”; how is this articulated to the subject’s experiences of jouissance, to a position linked with an ethic that is perhaps already there, beyond its dependence on the discourse of the Other as a certain way of responding to and from the real?

In that *lalangue* and its *moterialité* make a destiny for the subject, his destiny from object *a*, can one, in listening to the testimonies, locate the tightenings of the knot which allow fate’s passage – from which no-one can escape – to the destiny for which one can feel responsible, and deduce from the consequences something as to the direction of the treatment?

If psychoanalysis searches for this “*bonne chance*” [good luck], what are the rules Lacan evokes for this luck, rules that refer to the way of “squeezing the singular”?

It is a matter on knowing whether – when the desire of the analyst is at work – what the passand can pass on to the cartel is transmissible and in what way that could play on the manner in which each one of us is going to re-invent psychoanalysis?

“The psychoanalyst, inventor”, Martine Menès

“What are the conditions (logic) that are required in order that someone (singular) can say of themselves ‘I am a psychoanalyst’?”⁸

I am starting with this question to articulate the work of the cartel with the act of hearing the passes, that of listening/waiting for the mark that an analysis leaves, and which does or does not lead to the desire of the analyst.

What can be grasped of the singular invention of each particular one in the testimonies of the pass, an invention that radically modifies his relation of alienation to the Other (S), his possible preference for imaginary idealisation of the discourses (I), and pacifies the deleterious effects of jouissance (R)?

⁵ Lacan, J. *D’écologie* (11 March, 1980)

⁶ Lacan, J. *Intervention à la suite de l’exposé d’Andre Albert*, 14.6.1975.

⁷ Lacan, J. *Conférence Joyce le symptôme I*.

⁸ Lacan, J. “Problèmes cruciaux pour la psychanalyse”, lesson of 5 May, 1965.

I start from the hypothesis that the desire of the analyst can only be singular, namely that the analyst is urged by his own analysis to reinvent himself based on what is. “One is marked by the psychoanalysis (...) the mark of one’s destiny, but also the destiny of the mark”.⁹ I understand that in psychoanalysis it is a matter of “passing by the good hole of what is offered to him, to him as singular”,¹⁰ of becoming other while remaining himself.

Would the result, the mark of analysis, not be called a style, a style that is the heir of a destiny radically freed [*dé-marqué*] from the Other, an adoption of his name rather than the desire to be made a name? And who bears the desire of the analyst and the desire of and for analysis stripped of the effects of the fantasy? The style, the salient trait of know-how with one’s symptom, which the passands can transmit [*faire passer*]... or cannot?

To follow ...

“The taste of the other”, Cathy Barnier (Plus one for the cartel)

We could say that the desire of the analyst pertains to the particular since it is only for some and not for all. Yet, it is from a singular point, and from something that makes a hole in what the analysand has said, and which is redoubled in the testimony of the pass, that this new desire is located. So does the desire of the analyst pertain to the particular or the singular? Or is a particular desire “contaminated by the singular”? Lacan placed the singular – the unsayable, uninterpretable point because it is outside the signifier – under the term “not-all”. To circumscribe this point, he returns to the cartel of the pass in order to differentiate between the non-analysed, that is, when the fact that “what one says lies” has not been unmasked, and the unanalysable. We find a reference to the unanalysable in “Guiding remarks for a convention on female sexuality”: “At this same point, it is appropriate to investigate whether phallic mediation exhaustively accounts for everything drive-related that can manifest itself in women, especially the whole current of the maternal instinct. Why not posit here that the fact that everything that is analysable is sexual does not mean that everything that is sexual is accessible to analysis?”¹¹ Moreover, here Lacan anticipates what he will later formulate as the not-all. He also says something about what will become of the drive after the treatment. Thus this strange reference to the maternal instinct Isn’t this “instinct” – that is, what has not been taken up in the net of the signifier – the origin of a “taste” that is reiterated in everyone’s speech, of an echo, a singular note that informs/forms each desire of the analyst and makes it comparable with no other. Namely, when “what one says lies” [*ce qu’on dit ment*]¹² changes to condiment, knowledge to flavour [*le savoir à la saveur*].

⁹ Lacan, J. *Conférence à l’évolution psychiatrique*, 23.1.1962.

¹⁰ Lacan, J. *Intervention à la suite de l’exposé d’Andre Albert*, 14.6.1975.

¹¹ J. Lacan, “Guiding remarks for a convention on female sexuality”, *Écrits, The First Complete Edition in English*, trans. B. Fink, WW. Norton, 2006, p. 614

¹² *Le Sinthome*, Seuil, p. 17: “Someone who is not very far from me made the remark apropos of the tongue [*langue*], that as well as designating the instrument of speech, it was the tongue [*langue*] that also bore the taste buds. Well, I responded to him that it is not for nothing that we say *ce qu’on dit ment* [what one says lies (homophonic in French with *condiment*)]”...”the drive is the echo in the body of the fact that there is a saying”.

Cartel 3. Theme: The knowledge that passes

“A difficult relation to knowledge”, Sol Aparicio (Plus one for the cartel)

Speaking off the difficult position in which the psychoanalyst is placed by the analytic discourse, Lacan affirms that *it is his relation to knowledge that is difficult*.

That knowledge differs according to the place that it occupies in each of these discourses, calls for distinct definitions. Concerning what is of interest in the analytic discourse, unconscious knowledge, Lacan put forward a formula that for us, while habitual, is no less paradoxical: an unknown knowledge [*savoir insu*] that cannot be known seems to present a contradiction in terms. Such a knowledge cannot lend itself to the word nor to conjugation, it does not involve the subject any more than the complement, for this knowledge has neither subject nor complement, thus escaping all comprehension. It is to be conceived however as acting by virtue of *lalangue* which has taken root in the body.

We will never know anything about this unknown knowledge that holds the place of truth, other than *what is heard* in *what is said*, in what the analysand has said. There are only some signifiers there – and not those of knowledge – based upon which a lucubration is possible. (The road leading to inventing, to producing knowledge remains to be made in what follows.)

And yet, the experience of the analysand's elaboration, one that the interpretation comes to punctuate, has some manifest effects in the existence of *parlêtres* to which each one testifies. As Lacan said, it is the analytic discourse that takes a portion of jouissance from the neurotic. We can grasp here the action of this desire (for knowledge) on which the possibility of *finding one's way in the unconscious* depends.

“The knowledge of the psychoanalyst and the experience of the pass”, Jean-Jacques Gorog

Our cartel studied Lacan's seminar that took place at the time when the first concrete results of the pass appeared, two years after its establishment in 1969. This seminar puts into play what the psychoanalyst has to know but also what he cannot pretend to know, namely what the analysand is going to say. The surprise must be privileged, and it is what is required of the pass. Lacan did not anticipate what he was going to learn from it. This seminar, itself in a place of exception since it was held at St Anne's, is marked by the methodical narrative of its own course. This course plays a primary role to the point that I am prepared to describe this seminar as “autobiographical”.

But it is also the one where he affirms that he is in the place of the analysand when he teaches, because it is the analysand who speaks. If one acknowledges that it is not a matter of chance, the convergence of these elements forces us to see in this the singular conditions, specific to the one who states them, of the emergence of the psychoanalyst from the analysand. The unknown knowledge, that of the unconscious, a notion that had already been developed for some years, takes on a new accent during this testimony because it involves the passage to analyst in a concrete way. The real on which this knowledge is founded is materialized for Lacan in the wall, in all its connotations, from that of the asylum to the sexual relation that does not exist.

“The unknown-that-knows of knowledge”, Marie-José Latour

Who knows who it is? Or the inverse: who is it that knows? The impossible position of psychoanalysts when it comes to knowledge can make one dizzy. Freud's discovery is a radical questioning of knowledge. Logically, this questioning requires knowing about an end. In the direction of the treatment, the articulation between the knowledge that is necessary, and its necessary suspension in order to catch the surprise of the unconscious, requires a certain improvisatory handling. Lacan knots the question of ethics to this skill, namely the responsibility of the analyst.

From the start of his teaching, Lacan questioned the status of the function of knowledge in psychoanalysis. Reading the acronym SSS from "subject supposed to know" [*sujet supposé savoir*] to "knowledge without a subject" [*savoir sans sujet*] a trajectory takes shape. Lacan makes of this an act [*en prendre acte*] in inventing the instrument of the pass and in reworking his conception of the unconscious, and in so doing, the knowledge of the psychoanalyst as well.

That the unconscious is not a knowledge that is learned but a knowledge that is the sediment of the unknown of the subject, leads Lacan to define the unconscious as a know-how with *lalangue*, and places the psychoanalyst as "the location of what is understood of the obscurity ... of the fact that a signifier has marked a point on the body".¹³

A psychoanalysis would thus be this bizarre [*insolite*] treatment that answers the insolence [*insolence*] of the real. The real is not compatible with what can be known. Who would claim to know about the real? It would be better to circumscribe it as impossible. Thus we keep alive the distinction that Lacan made between the know-how that the unconscious shares with art, and the know-how with one's symptom that is expected at the end of an analysis.

"What (makes) lacks knowledge", Maria Luisa de la Oliva

In "Le savoir du psychanalyste" [The knowledge of the psychoanalyst], Lacan says, "the innovation that psychoanalysis reveals, is unknown knowledge in itself".

What is unknown takes part in the knot of the symptom, it is thus indecipherable, something about which we can only infer by its effects. It is the aspect of what knowledge lacks in order to be known. There is no subject who can say what he knows.

In the lecture given at St Anne, May 4 1972, Lacan says this: "It is the location of what is understood of what is obscured, of what is obscured in understanding, of the fact that a signifier has marked a point on the body".

It concerns locating what, having been obscured, is understood, but also of locating the effect of the obscuring that is produced in understanding and how all that is related to the fact that the signifier marks the body, bites it. In this act there is always a point that is obscure, irreducible, unattainable.

The pass is an instrument that allows this obscurity to be testified to, while knowing the limits the act of testifying brings with it: there is a gap between what is aimed at in the procedure and the limits of the testimonies when it concerns the real. It is precisely this gap that makes its wager so tempting.

¹³ Lacan, J. *Le séminaire livre XIX, Le savoir du psychanalyste*, leçon du 4 mai 1972, in ...ou pire, Paris, Seuil 2011, p 151.

In the testimonies of the Analysts of the School, we can find the marks through which the zone of obscurity could be located, without for all that, coming out of the “fog”.¹⁴

“Some creations of the real”, Ricardo Rojas

The cartels of the pass and the cartels of the ICG open the way: the passands who try to bring to us something of the One, the Ones of the signifying swarm [*essaim/S_I*], of the cause of the repressions attracted to the centre of the binary signifier by the *Urverdrängung*. Passing, arriving beyond, at the “knowing how to do with” that. A creation “...a pure artificer, a man of know-how”,¹⁵ that is to say, the artist of the enigma “*fait/faîte du fait/faîte*”¹⁶ [fact of the apex/apex of the fact], the limit of the said, of the symptom that does not cease writing the real, the symptom that one believes in. Belief that facilitates being directed to the supposed-to-know, the one for whom it is only necessary to decipher the said in the pure, significative *dit-mension*. The one about which Lacan says “the imaginary is what stops the deciphering, that is meaning”¹⁷ which leads us to think that what a signifier represents for another signifier has a “double meaning”: “signification is not what a vain people believes”,¹⁸ that is to say what it signifies, except that meaning and signification are at the same time *Bedeutung*. It is there where the deciphering is not enough to name what, beyond the interpretation, would open us to the real. The creation of a new signifier, would be necessary, *forcing*,¹⁹ that takes this beyond into account, a creation left empty by Lacan, so that we would continue to ask ourselves what is it that the words signify, for example the “double meaning” of the imaginary based on the knot. That outlines the remaining path of what is left for the cartel.

II. THE NEXT MEETINGS OF THE ICG AND THE CARTELS OF THE PASS

The ICG will meet again during the International Meeting in Medellin. Four passes have been concluded currently, two cartels have been composed to hear them. They will meet in Medellin beginning on the morning of Wednesday, July 13.

The following meetings of the ICG, the last for its mandate, and thus those of the last cartels of the pass, are fixed for Monday 28th and Tuesday 29th of November in Paris, after the next Study Days of the SPFLF-France.

We remind you of what was mentioned in *Echoes 5*: the meeting with the incoming ICG for the handover will be held on Sunday 27th at the end of the afternoon, after the closing of the work of the SPFLF-France.

¹⁴ “*Brouillard*” [fog] is the signifier with which Camila Vidal (AS nominated in 2015) names the existence of the opacity of jouissance and the impossibility of illuminating it by la path of meaning.

¹⁵ Lacan J., *Le Séminaire Livre XXIII : Le Sinthome*, Seuil, Paris, 2005, p.118.

¹⁶ Lacan J., *Le Séminaire Livre XXIII : Ibid.*, p.18-19.

¹⁷ Lacan J., *Le Séminaire Livre XXI : Les non-dupes errent*, Lesson of 13 November 1973, unpublished.

¹⁸ Lacan J., *Le Séminaire Livre XXI : L’insu que sait de l’une-bévue s’aile à mourre*, Lesson of 15 March 1977, unpublished.

¹⁹ Lacan J., *Le Séminaire Livre XXV : Le moment du conclure*, Lesson of 10 January 1978, unpublished.

The two last ICGs, the current and the preceding one, requested that CRIF organise the international elections earlier, from the beginning of September, for the following reason: The outgoing ICG had met in Paris at the end of November/beginning of December for the last passes, and then it met again in January with the incoming ICG for the handover of documents and discussion of the various problems encountered during the two years.

We concluded that it would be better if the two ICGs could meet at the end of November/beginning of December, during the final meeting of the outgoing ICG, which would avoid the multiplying the trips that are costly both in terms of fatigue for colleagues who come from afar and in money for the School.

In order that the members of the incoming ICG can plan their trip, it would be necessary for the result of the elections to be known by the end of October, which would not be impossible if the elections begin at the start of September for generally, they extend over two months.

III. THE SYMPOSIUM ON THE PASS, JULY 13, 2016

Organisation:

The list of participants has been drawn up in accordance with the requirements of our texts. The passers who performed their function during the period of the last three ICGs were informed at the end of December 2015 that they would now be able to participate in the Symposium. The definitive lists have been established and are in the process of being transmitted to the local organisers charged with verifying the entries.

The participants in the Symposium will receive by mail an invitation to be presented at the point of entry to the Symposium with the agenda of questions to be debated.

The assembly will be chaired by members of the CIOS.

The Secretariat of the ICG addressed a letter to the two preceding ICGs in order to gather their suggestions. The themes are currently divided in the following way:

- The ICG's assessment of the double formula of cartels: the cartel of the ICG for the duration of the ICG's mandate and cartels of the pass composed on each occasion with respect to the distribution by instrumentalities and by language.
- Statistics for the demands for the pass and the nominations over this period.
- Frequency of the meetings of the ICG.
- The treatment of the demands for the passes:
 - Timing
 - Information to be sent to the ICG by the Secretariats of the pass
 - Incompatibilities that need to be specified
- Three proposals received from a cartel during the period of the preceding ICG:
 - The cartels of the pass, ad hoc or for the duration of the ICG?
 - The non-participation of the Analysts of the School in the Symposium.
 - The passing-on of information and exchanges between the outgoing ICG and the incoming ICG.

IV. PROGRAM FOR THE INTERNATIONAL MEETING OF THE SCHOOL, JULY 14 2016

This has been established following the nominations of two Analysts of the School [AS] in February whom we will hear for the first time, and by taking into account all the instrumentalities of the School.

9.00h **Opening remarks** Ricardo Rojas

I. 9.30h. Session Chair, Sol Aparicio, ICG 2014/2016

Papers from the two new AS,

Marie Noëlle Jacob Duvernet, France, "Couleur de passe"

Vera Iaconelli, Brazil, "Dos confins de uma análise"

11.00/11.30 break

II. The desire of and for psychoanalysis.

In each of the three parts five brief papers will be heard (6000 signs, including spaces)

11.30/13.00h Session Chair, Colette Soler, ICG 2014/2016

The function of the instrument of the pass in the desire of and for psychoanalysis.

Pedro Pablo, Arevalo, A.S. Venezuela, "Pase, transmisión y deseo de psicoanálisis".

Sonia Alberti, Brazil, ICG 2014/2016, "Juri ou cartel?"

Ramon Miralpeix, Spain, ICG 2012/2014, "Cartel, passe, escuela".

Maria Teresa Maiocchi, Italy, ICG 2014/2016, "Ce qui dispose".

Silvia Migdalek, Argentina, ICG 2012/2014, " El deseo de psicoanálisis : un deseo impulsor en el dispositivo del pase".

14.30/16.00h Session Chair, Nadine Cordova, AS, France, ICG 2014/2016

The desire of and for psychoanalysis in the treatment.

José Antonio Pereira Da Silva, Brazil, "O decantar do desejo de psicanálise no Passe".

Jorge Escobar, AS, Colombia, "De un testimonio, al otro".

Jean-Jacques Grog, France, ICG 2014/2016, Le désir de poursuivre après "guérison".

Ana Martinez, Spain, ICG 2014/2016, "El deseo de analizarse, un deseo forzado. A propósito de un caso".

Camila Vidal, AS, Spain, Deseo de psicoanálisis vs deseo del analista.

16.00/16.30 Break

16.30/18.00h Session Chair, Gabriel Lombardi, Argentina, ICG 2014/2016

The desire of and for psychoanalysis outside the treatment.

Sidi Askofaré, France, ICG 2012/2014, "Entre agalma et plus-de-savoir: le désir de psychanalyse"

Marie-José Latour, France, ICG 2014/2016, "La limite du dehors".

Diego Mautino, Italy, "Faire prime sur le marché ?"

Martine Menès, France, ICG 2014/2016, "La psychanalyse s'apprend ou ça prend?"

Leonardo Rodriguez, Australia, "A most fundamental bond".

Closing remarks from the CIOS

V. THE ASSEMBLY OF THE SCHOOL, THE AFTERNOON OF JULY 17

The agenda for the Assembly of the School will be finalised 15 days before the Rendezvous at the same time as that of the Assembly of the IF.

Points already scheduled:

1. The frequency of the Symposium

Let us recall that the aim of this symposium is to make a critical assessment of the procedure and to reflect on possible improvements with those who have contributed to its functioning: members of the cartels, Secretariats, and passers from the three last ICGs.

Currently, it is scheduled to take place every four years. If we maintain this frequency the symposium would regularly occur in Latin America since our Meetings are every two years. As it alternates between the two sides of the Atlantic, it would need to be scheduled every two or every six years.

Our ICG will propose a frequency of every two years, in order to remain informed about how the functioning of the intervening period, but only the last two ICGs, the Secretariats and the corresponding passers would meet on each occasion.

The text of the proposal that will be submitted to the vote will be on the agenda.

2. The question of Analyst Members of the School

Reflections on this question were included in *Echoes 5*, and we will review them. This point will be debated again.

3. Our ICG's proposal for the Assembly of the School

Even if it means that co-optation has existed, it is best that it is as open as possible. Thus we propose:

That from this point the opportunity to propose AMS is not the sole prerogative of AMS, but rather of each member of the School, with the obvious reservation that the proposal can be justified through work shared the colleague proposed.

This proposal poses no threat to the seriousness of our choices, because of the stages established in our procedure for the choice of AMS.

A reminder of the way it functions: each Secretariat of the pass receives proposals for AMS coming from the AMS in their instrumentality. The Secretariat studies them, debates them and on that basis, composes its own list. At the date fixed, the Secretariat sends the list to the International Committee of Accreditation (ICA) composed from within the current ICG. In its turn, the Committee studies the proposals coming from the Secretariats and, according to its own conclusions, composes the definitive list for the current ICG, which is the official list.